1	STATE OF CONNECTICUT	CERTIFIED
2	DEPARTMENT OF BANKING	COPY
3	)	
4	IN THE MATTER OF:	
5	THE APPLICATION OF THE ORGANIZERS )	
6	OF BANKING CIRCLE US, )	
7	STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT )	
8	)	
9		
10	PUBLIC HEARING	
11	HELD VIA TELECONFERENCE AND IN PER	SON
12	HEARING ROOM B	
13	450 Columbus Avenue, Hartford, Connecti	cut 06103
14		
15	HELD BEFORE:	
16	JORGE L. PEREZ, BANKING COMMISSIO	NER
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	COURT REPORTER: JESSICA NOBLE, CS	R 402

1	APPEARANCES
2	VIA TELECONFERENCE, FOR THE APPLICANT:
3	ANDERS LA COUR
4	MARY DENT
5	GORDON WERKEMA
6	KJELD OLSON
7	JESPER JOHANSEN
8	GILBERT SCHWARTZ
9	
10	VIA TELECONFERENCE, FOR FS VECTOR:
11	DAVID COTNEY
12	TREVOR TANIFUM
13	JASPER SNEFF NANNI
14	
15	DEPARTMENT OF BANKING STAFF:
16	MATTHEW SAUNIG, FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION ATTORNEY
17	ERIN SULLIVAN, ASSOCIATE FINANCIAL EXAMINER
18	MARY ELLEN O'NEILL, DIRECTOR OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
19	DIVISION
20	AMY LaCHANCE, BANKING DEPARTMENT MANAGER
21	MARYANN STRATTON, PARALEGAL
22	TINA DAIGLE, PARALEGAL
23	EMILY BOCHMAN, PARALEGAL
24	
25	

1 (On the record at 2:04 p.m.)

COMMISSIONER PEREZ: Good afternoon. My name is Jorge L. Perez. I am the banking commissioner of the state of Connecticut. The banking commissioner is authorized by law to render a final decision in this hearing.

I will be assisted this morning by Mary

Ellen O'Neill, director of financial institutions division;

Matt Saunig, financial institutions division attorney; Erin

Sullivan, associate financial examiner; Amy LaChance,

banking department manager; and Maryann Stratton, paralegal.

At this time I would ask my other members of the Department of Banking represented at this hearing who have been assigned to work on or assist in this proceeding to identify him or herself.

MS. BOCHMAN: Emily Bochman, paralegal.

MS. DAIGLE: Tina Daigle, paralegal.

COMMISSIONER PEREZ: The hearing is being held in person and via Microsoft Teams and is being recorded for the sake of clarity for the record. I ask that anyone not speaking at a given time mute themself. I will now turn it over to Attorney Saunig, who will read the rest of the opening statement. Attorney?

ATTORNEY SAUNIG: Thank you, Commissioner.

This hearing has been called in order to

consider the application filed by the organizers of Banking Circle US to organize an uninsured bank pursuant to Section 36a-70 of the Connecticut General Statutes.

This section provides that the banking commissioner acting alone is the approving authority for an uninsured bank. This is a hearing conducted in accordance with Chapter 54 of the Connecticut General Statutes, the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act, and Sections 36a-1-19 through 36a-1-57 of the regulations of Connecticut state agencies setting forth a procedure to be followed by persons filing applications in contested cases. Both the statutes and regulations are available here in the room and online if anyone should wish to consult them.

The purpose of this hearing to provide an opportunity to introduce all evidence that is relevant, material, and not unduly repetitious concerning the matters that the banking commissioner must consider before determining whether or not to approve the application and to issue a temporary certificate authorizing the completion of the organization of this proposed bank.

The organizers have requested confidential treatment of various documents related to their application, including sections of the feasibility study required by statute that analyze and discuss these documents. It has been determined that these documents will be held

confidential pursuant to Sections 1-2-10 and 36a-21 of the Connecticut General Statutes. In addition, it has been determined to be appropriate to enter these documents under seal.

This meeting may also go into an executive session pursuant to Section 1-225(f) and 1-210(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes should the circumstances warrant. All witnesses will be sworn in. Members of the public will be allowed to participate toward the end of the hearing. However, I request that remarks be kept brief and any extended comments be submitted in writing.

Pursuant to Subsection D of Section 4-177 of the Connecticut General Statutes and Section 36a-1-34, which defines the record in a contested case, I would like to enter into the record as exhibits, unless there's objection, the following documents: Exhibit 1, nonconfidential portions of the application dated October 30, 2020; Exhibit 2, copy of the Department of Banking news bulletin Number 2958; Exhibit 3, copy of the letter to the organizers with the order for feasibility study dated November 13, 2020, and corresponding letter to the feasibility preparer of the same date; Exhibit 4, nonconfidential sections of the independent feasibility study prepared by FS Vector dated May 28, 2021; Exhibit 5, copy of the order for hearing and letter to the organizers dated June 2, 2021; Exhibit 6, copy

of the Department of Banking news bulletin number 2989;
Exhibit 7, copy of public notice in the Stamford Advocate
for June 3, 2021, June 4, 2021, and June 7, 2021; Exhibit 8,
copy of the amended order for hearing changing the location
of the hearing dated June 15, 2021; Exhibit 9, copy of the
Department of Banking news bulletin number 2990; and
Exhibit 10, email confirmation for and copy of the public
notice for special meeting.

Additionally, as previously mentioned, unless there are any objections, I'd like to enter into the record the following documents under seal that have been determined to be confidential: Exhibits E1A and E1B, confidential portions of the application dated October 30, 2020; and Exhibit E2, confidential sections of the feasibility study dated May 28, 2021.

Now I'll turn it back over to Commissioner Perez.

COMMISSIONER PEREZ: Thank you, Matt.

I will now ask the organizers to identify theirselves, get sworn in by the court reporter, and offer any additional statements, testimony, or evidence relevant to this matter. Swear them in.

ATTORNEY SAUNIG: Excuse me. If everybody could raise their right hands.

(Witnesses sworn.)

1 2

3

4

COI

COMMISSIONER PEREZ: I have read the

reports, and I'm comfortable with what they say. My one

question was, there's a section there that was a

recommendation about --

5

ATTORNEY SAUNIG: They need to make their

presentations.

7

8

6

COMMISSIONER PEREZ: So I would now like to

ask for any testimony by the presenters.

Can they hear me or --

10

MR. LA COUR: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

11

My name is Anders la Cour. I'm the director

So, first, let me thank you and the staff

12

of Banking Circle US Holding, Inc., which is the entity

13

applying to the State of Connecticut Department of Banking

14

to establish Connecticut state-chartered commercial bank,

15

Banking Circle US. I'm also one of first directors of

16

Banking Circle US.

17

for giving us the opportunity to present our business plan

19

18

here today and allowing us to participate remotely during a

20

time where travel is restricted and challenging. I'll now

21

give a bit of background on the participants on our side and

22

So joining me on the call as proposed

then present Banking Circle US in further detail.

24

independent directors of Banking Circle US are Mary Dent and

Gordon Werkema, both of whom bring extensive banking

7

experience to the Banking Circle US board. Mary is an experienced corporate board member with a deep expertise in financial services. She's served previously as the CEO of Green Dot Bank and as general counsel of Silicon Valley Bank. Mary has global expertise and extensive experience with leadership at companies of all stages and sizes and in particular, with nontraditional bank business models, domestic payments, financial technology companies, and intercompany affiliate governance and oversight.

where he supported executive leadership in areas of experience strategy, risk, audit, finance, governance, cyber security, and payments as well as technology, operations, and leadership development. He previously served as the chief operating officer and national product director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago as well as other federal reserve roles, just as he directed groundbreaking federal reserve and brought payment industry to define and implement safer and faster payments in the United States.

Kjeld Olson, who is sitting here next to me, is the proposed CEO of Banking Circle US. Kjeld has 30 years of experience in the financial services sector with particular focus on international transactions, operations, and managements. His operations and payment background has enabled Kjeld to design, build, and operate the Banking

Circle payment platform in Europe, and Kjeld joined us as the fifth employee on the journey we've been on so far.

Kjeld has also previously advised and led contributions to the safer payment systems in Europe as well as other payment systems on behalf of the Danish government and authority stakeholders.

Joining here today on the session we also have our in-house legal counsel, Jesper Johansen, as well as our U.S. legal expert and advisor, Gilbert Schwartz, who is assisting us with the Banking Circle US application and establishment process.

In terms of my background, I'm a lawyer and the cofounder of Banking Circle, which was founded in Europe in 2013 and launched in 2015 and have served as CEO since day one. I bring to the Banking Circle US board and business the entirety of that expertise, growing a financial institution from zero to a very successful business now owned by EQT Partners; and I very much look forward to working with Mary, Gordon, and Kjeld to make Banking Circle US successful as well.

I'll now turn to first some more background on who Banking Circle is; second, what we're doing in the U.S. and why; and third, how we plan to achieve it and when. So who is Banking Circle? Banking Circle is a fully clouded scalable financial infrastructure provider building the

first and only real-time clearing cell network globally.

Our mission is to build proprietary access to all of the world's major currencies on one platform and create a financial ecosystem that cuts out the time and cost of cross-border payments, enabling a new way for financial institutions and corporates to serve as our end merchants.

In five years since its launch, the business in Europe has reached 60 million in bank transfers settled on behalf of payment companies, banks, and marketplaces equating to \$180 billion and with a client base of more than 150 financial institutions and large marketplaces, including Stripe and (unintelligible).

Banking Circle in Europe delivers access to 12 local clearance schemes through a combination of direct clearing and partner banks, enabling cross-border payments of 25 currencies. We will also build partnerships with banks globally, enabling the payout capability clients need in geographies and currencies where we do not currently offer local currency.

So what are we doing in the U.S. and why?

We will launch Banking Circle US in Stamford, Connecticut,
in 2021, which will focus on providing domestic cross-border
payments, FX, and deposit accounts to U.S. and foreign banks
and payments of businesses. Establishing a bank rather than
opening a branch office is preferred given the nature of

Banking Circle US's business plan.

Financial institutions and other large corporate customers often have higher regards for freestanding well-capitalized bank over a branch or a foreign bank, and Banking Circle US wants to have the most robust U.S. presence. The Connecticut charter matches very well with Banking Circle US business case, and Banking Circle US is set to deliver faster cost-efficient payments and banking services to financial technology service providers. That could be banks, larger transaction companies, including payment providers, card acquirers, and marketplaces and all the covered customers they serve.

So the opportunity in the U.S. in this market is very significant both in terms of B2B flow and C2B flow. We believe the bank will provide benefits for the public and the local community in the form of increased employment and well-paid jobs, improved payment services, and recognition of Connecticut as a leader in fostering improved banking services to the economy.

Our goal is deliver direct access to the U.S. clearing to be one of only a very few banks that are able to deliver real-time payments at the lowest possible closing cost between the major clearings globally. So how will we attempt to achieve the business plan and when? The local organization will be established in Stamford,

Connecticut, with 10, 15 AFTs initially, growing to 60 by 2024. We have engaged a recruitment firm and begun recruitment efforts. We'll start interviews with business candidates during the next month, and we also retained a real estate broker and are now looking for space in Stamford. The best properties are planned to be inspected and assessed and selection made during July.

We are aiming for an office location that's in walking distance from the train station. It could be Harbor Point or a similar area. We are creating a senior team to let Banking Circle US operations together with Kjeld and the positions we are hiring for include chief financial officer, chief operating officer, chief compliance officer, chief risk officer, and an internal auditor. Our product plan aims to have office and organization in place in Q4.

In summary, we believe that, one, Banking
Circle US has presented a robust and realistic business
plan; two, the proposed directors and officers bring very
extensive, highly relevant experience to the bank; and
three, Banking Circle US will contribute positively to
Connecticut and serve the public interest. It's our
understanding that the independent consultant appointed by
the Connecticut Department of Banking to assist the Banking
Circle US business plan, FS Vector, who you'll hear from
later in this hearing, has reached similar conclusions.

We have had a good and constructive dialogue with Connecticut Department of Banking already from the beginning of our discussions in 2019. We're very appreciative of the guidance we have received from the department and the staff. They have been excellent to work with. Mr. Commissioner should be very proud of the professionalism and openness.

With that, I complete my introduction to Banking Circle US and I hand back the microphone to you, Mr. Commissioner. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER PEREZ: Thank you. I thank you for the comments about the staff. That's very much appreciated and something that I do agree with also.

Any other of your presenters want to say anything else before I ask the one question I do have? Like I stated before, I did read the report, and the one area that I would like a little more clarification for the record is the report recommended that the area of compliance be strengthened up a little bit more. Can you add a little bit more to that content, how you reacted to it? Because I know you responded to it, but I want it for the record.

MR. OLSON: Can you repeat your question, please?

COMMISSIONER PEREZ: In the feasibility study, there was a section that discussed the compliance

area and there was some recommendation to consider strengthening up that area a little bit more. I know you responded to staff questions on that. I was wondering if there's anything that you can add to that on the record.

MR. OLSON: To answer the question from the commissioner, the area of compliance has the highest priority within our organization. We have an aim to be the best in class. We want to produce transparent payments, and that's why we will hire experienced and sophisticated AML professionals to undertake these duties in the organization.

At the same time, we have a very sophisticated payment monitoring system that we are currently also used in our sister company in Europe and we will use the same system, which is based on advanced technology, such as machine learning, so I think that in combination will give us a very strong and very high priority on -- in this area.

MR. LA COUR: I think if I can add to that, the comment has been duly noted, so we definitely take that into consideration. And as Kjeld also alluded to, AML is something that we, in the sister company in Europe, has invested a lot in. It's also something that over time we expect to be able to have an add-on as an additional project to enhance the offering towards the banks that are our clients. With that in mind, I think we both use the

available technology, but also take into consideration the comments noted by in the report and staff up on the (unintelligible).

COMMISSIONER PEREZ: Thank you for the response.

I will now open it for any public comment or any public testimony. Is there any?

ATTORNEY SAUNIG: And just in terms of process on this, for the record, there's no one from the public physically in the hearing room. And I don't see that anyone has dialed in, but anyone who is joining us via Teams who wishes to participate, we ask that you raise your hand at this time.

COMMISSIONER PEREZ: Or if they can't figure out how to they raise their hand, wave or something.

ATTORNEY SAUNIG: For the record, I see that no one is indicating that they have a public comment at this point in the hearing.

COMMISSIONER PEREZ: Well, seeing that there's no public comment at this point in the hearing, at this point I would like to ask if there -- I would like to ask presentations be made from the feasibility study preparer if there's any comments, remarks they would like to make.

ATTORNEY SAUNIG: And, again, if you could

please, if you're going to be presenting, raise your right hand and get sworn in.

(Witnesses sworn.)

ATTORNEY SAUNIG: If you could state your name for the record.

MR. COTNEY: David Cotney.

MR. TANIFUM: Trevor Tanifum.

MR. NANNI: Jasper Sneff Nanni.

ATTORNEY SAUNIG: Okay. You can begin.

MR. COTNEY: Well, thank you. And thank you, Commissioner Perez. Thank you for the opportunity to testify at today's hearing on the application by Banking Circle US for an uninsured Connecticut charter.

My name is David Cotney, and I am a senior advisor at FS Vector, a consulting firm that focuses on advising Fintech firms, including banks in the Fintech space. We're going to move through the slides quickly. We can go right into the introductions.

I was formerly commissioner of banks in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for six years and spent a total of 26 years at the Massachusetts Division of Banks.

It's a pleasure obviously to see you here again today,

Commissioner, and to be here with your staff.

I am here today with two of my colleagues, who also worked on the feasibility study of Banking Circle

on behalf of the banking department. I will let them introduce themselves to you.

MR. TANIFUM: It's a pleasure to be here with you, Commissioner Perez. My name is Trevor Tanifum. I am a principal with FS Vector. I am a lawyer by training. I studied at the George Washington University Law School, and it was my privilege to help support the work completed in this feasibility study.

MR. NANNI: My name is a Jasper Sneff Nanni. Hello, Commissioner and staff. It's a pleasure to be here with you today. I am also a principal at FS Vector, where I have worked for the last year, and previously worked in the financial markets advisory group at BlackRock and before that, at Promontory Financial Group, a consulting firm specializing in compliance and risk management for financial firms. And I have an undergraduate degree from Princeton University.

MR. COTNEY: Thank you both. So we're going to go into the next side. You obviously, Matt Saunig, ran through the background and the legal basis for the application and noted that FS Vector submitted its feasibility study to the department on May 28th. We relied upon the application that was submitted to the department. That includes both the public portion as well as the materials that were labeled confidential. We had the

opportunity to review all of the information, including the financials. We requested additional information, and we had the opportunity to interview many of the folks that are on the call today from Banking Circle.

And we -- as well, we relied on our own knowledge and experience working with clients in the Fintech space. That includes both banks and nonbanks. Importantly, I just want to note this presentation summarizes our findings from the public report that we submitted. As was noted, we did submit a parallel report containing confidential information.

And following this presentation, we are happy to answer your questions. To the extent that a question requires a reference to any confidential information, we will let you know and we can either respond in writing or if -- or go into an executive session at your discretion.

So on to the next side, the executive summary, as noted here, we conclude that Banking Circle US has made a strong case to demonstrate the feasibility of its model here in the U.S. market. Certainly every de novo applicant faces risks, and that is true of this applicant. In addition to the risks that I will note here, there are certainly macroeconomic factors as we emerge from the pandemic and the economic shocks that were caused by COVID,

but in terms of the risks to the viability of the Banking Circle application, those include new competitors and new kinds of competitors who go into these that are entering into the U.S. cross-border market, pressures from the disruptions that are going on in the payments landscape. That includes what could be faster-than-anticipated adoption of central bank digital currencies, or CBDCs, and then, of course, just the uncertainty of building the new client base. There will be competition from existing intermediaries in the correspondent banking space as well as other banks and nontraditional service providers entering the space, but Banking Circle plans to differentiate itself in a number of ways that includes lower costs, faster processing times, and greater transparency.

There's been a lot, of course, written about the U.S. payments market and how it has fallen behind other parts of the world, and certainly there have been efforts to address those, and Banking Circle wants to tackle several of those shortcomings in the U.S. market. Overall, in preparing the independent financial projections, as stated earlier, we believe that they have demonstrated that the business model is both viable and meets the statutory factors in Connecticut law.

So now we're going to jump into some of the findings. Our report makes a number of recommendations, and

we just want to briefly highlight those for you. I will start out and hand it over to my colleague Trevor, but the first issue has to do with the Federal Reserve master account. This is clearly a crucial part of the business plan, and then without it, they would be reliant upon a partnership with a bank in the U.S. That, of course, really would defeat the intended purpose of the application, so our recommendation is -- and this is our only recommendation to you, Commissioner. The rest of the recommendations are to the applicant or to the business plan. Our recommendation to you would be that if you are inclined to approve the application that you may want to include a condition -- condition the approval on their obtaining approval from the Federal Reserve for a master account.

And now I'll turn it over to Trevor.

MR. TANIFUM: Thank you very much, David.

related to sufficiency of staffing surrounds the impact of technological solutions on the number of compliance and BSA/AML personnel. To summarize the very many words in that box, we recommended to the bank to consider adding additional staff because in our experience, technological solutions often require more human intervention and support than anticipated, particularly early after implementation when there might still be false positives or calibrations of

certain systems. And as you heard earlier, Commissioner, the bank is committed to addressing this observation.

We could move to the next slide. From the top, where you see COVID-19 recovery, this observation relates to the economic effect of COVID-19 on the payments markets. With many industries being heavily disrupted, we noted that the bank may want to focus its early efforts on those industries that have been disrupted the least or that may have been disrupted but are likely to recover quickly and strongly. And we noted the wholesale e-commerce market as an example of such an industry.

Next, regarding new entrants into the cross-border payments market, straightforwardly this is a market-oriented observation with a market-oriented recommendation. The cross-border payments market is ripe for disruption, and the Banking Circle team are one of many that are aware of this. So our recommendation here is for them to continue to seek opportunities to differentiate themselves from other market entrants. And we, again, provided an example or two of how they may do so.

Regarding customers becoming competitors,
like the previous observation, this is around the payments
market getting smaller. So in the previous slide, that was
the market getting smaller because of new entrants; and
here, this is the market getting smaller because prospective

customers might be exiting the market and reentering as competitors. One way this is being encouraged is by the granting of access to the payments rails by the Fed.

Ongoing discussions are happening about this.

About a month ago, the Federal Reserve Bank invited comment on proposed guidelines about how the Fed should think about access to accounts. And our recommendation here is similar to the previous page, where we suggest the bank continues to think around opportunities to innovate and provide long-term value and seek to become a payments -- not just a payments processer, but also more of a business partner.

Still on that same slide, regarding central bank digital currencies, again, we are here highlighting the introduction of central bank digital currencies and the potential they have to impact Banking Circle's target market. We would note here that when this study was finalized, the Bank for International Settlements had stated that 86 percent of central banks were very likely to issue central bank digital currencies.

Since then, China has created a CBDC; and the U.S. federal government, though no particular agency has come out and stated it officially, several federal officials and Congresspeople have noted that conversations around CBDCs are occurring at the highest level. So, again, here

our recommendation, Commissioner, is for the bank to remain vigilant and not be caught with a platform that cannot accommodate such an emerging technology.

I think that concludes my portion of the slide, and I'll hand this page over to Jasper.

MR. NANNI: Great. Thank you very much, Trevor.

So here you see our summary of the economic viability section of the feasibility study. Our analysis determined that the bank's proposed starting capital levels and business model are economically viable and meet the statutory requirements under Connecticut law.

we further identified that the controlling entities for the bank are contractually committed to maintaining sufficient capital levels. So in assessing the economic viability of the bank, we evaluated the proposed starting capital level and then the bank's revenue and expense projections and also prepared an independent set of revenue and expense projections, which, again, found that the business model was wholly feasible.

There is one recommendation that we included here, which is a result of the sensitivities that we identified through our sensitivity testing that we performed on the independent financial model, which is that the bank should disproportionally target customers at the higher end

of its addressable market to ensure that there is a high volume of cross-border payments, and this is a result of the sensitivity testing that we performed on the noninterest revenue.

And we can move to the next slide, which includes just an illustration of this primary driver of the bank's profitability, which is noninterest revenue from wire fees and foreign exchange fees. And what we've done here is just decomposed the underlying assumptions that drive the volume of wire fees and the volume of FX fees, and these are some of the underlying assumptions that we applied shocks to in the sensitivity testing of the independent financial projections.

So if you look at items A, B, and C, you'll see this is just the number of clients onboarded, how many payments are made per client per month, and the net fees per transaction, which the product of these is the wire fees earned by the bank.

And then separately, if you look at items A, B, D, E, and F -- so that's the clients onboarded, payments per client per month, the average size of each transaction, and what portion of those transactions require foreign exchange and what is the margin that's charged on those foreign exchange transactions, that leaves us with the foreign exchange fees.

So in shocking the independent financial assumptions, we also -- we applied shocks to the transaction account, so that's item B. We applied shocks to the transaction size, so that's item D. And we also applied a set of shocks to the FX share of payments. So that is item E. And in all cases found that the model was robust to the sensitivity shocks.

I think that summarizes the analysis of the economic viability of the business plan. So moving on to the next page, I will turn it back over to David to discuss the statutory factors.

MR. COTNEY: Thank you, Jasper.

So under Connecticut law, Commissioner, as you well know, you're required to make affirmative determination that the applicant meets certain statutory factors; and our analysis is -- was that the applicant meets these, the first being that the interest of the public will be served to advantage by the establishment of the proposed Connecticut bank, a very traditional standard when granting a charter. Although this is not a traditional community bank model, which would have a geographic -- you know, a concentrated geographic market, we believe that the interest of the public will be served.

The population of the market includes potentially thousands of commercial customers and then

potentially millions of customers of those. It is likely to increase the availability and the quality of payment services. It would have a beneficial impact on financial institutions who use those services, and those could include community financial institutions and that the needs -- convenience and needs of that market certainly will be served by faster and lower-cost services.

Secondly, the proposed bank has to show reasonable promise of successful operation. And as you just heard from Jasper, we have conducted a financial analysis that shows that they have a likelihood of success. They have an API base product that is faster, less expensive, and more transparent. They have what we believe to be reasonable assumptions built into the business plan, and we found they will achieve profitability and maintain adequate capital during their de novo period, even after running the shock scenarios and adjusting some of the base case assumptions.

And then finally, the proposed directors and officers must possess the capacity, character, and experience for the duties for which they will be charged. You heard from the organizers in terms of the level of their experience, which is considerable. That experience is extensive in financial services as well as bank supervision. They appear to have the character and capacity to serve as

directors, and the proposed CEO has over 30 years'
experience, including his current role as the chief
operating officer of the affiliate Banking Circle SA.

So that concludes our presentation,

Commissioner. We would be happy to answer any questions you

might have.

read the report. I agree with its conclusion so far. I don't know -- staff don't have anything else that they would like to clarify, so therefore, at this point, I would like to give the public a chance again to ask any questions.

Anybody from the public that has any questions?

at this time, we ask that you raise your hand or otherwise indicate.

Seeing none for the record, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER PEREZ: Seeing none for the record, at this point we will give the organizers a chance to respond to any of those questions, but there's none, so there's no need for that. So then I'll open up in general. Anybody from staff, from the public, anyone has any questions that they would like to ask or need to respond?

Seeing none, before we close, let me state that in order to grant a temporary certificate of authority, pursuant to Section 36a-70, there are several things I must consider and factors I must take into account. Those are, A, the population of the area to be served by the proposed bank; B, the competitive effects of the proposed bank on the availability and quality of services in the market area to be served; C, the likely impact of the proposed bank on other financial institutions in the market area to be served; and D, convenience and needs of the market area to be served.

In addition, before temporary certificate of authority can be issued, I must determine that the interest of the public will be served to the advantage by the establishment of the proposed bank; the proposed bank shows reasonable promise of successful operation; and C, the proposed directors possess the capacity, character, experience for the duties and responsibility for which they will be charged.

I will consider the application and supporting documentation in light of that information presented today and render my decision in writing as soon as possible and practical. This concludes the hearing portion of the proceeding. Thank you everybody for your participation, and I wish you all a good rest of your day.

```
1
     Hearing is over.
                      (Off the record at 2:48 p.m.)
2
 3
4
 5
 6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

## CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

I hereby certify that the foregoing 29 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken of the hearing held by remote access in re: the application of the organizers of Banking Circle US, Stamford, Connecticut, which was held remotely before JORGE L. PEREZ, BANKING COMMISSIONER, on June 24, 2021.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 12th day of July, 2021.

Jessica Noble Notary Public

CT License No. 402

My Commission expires: September 30, 2021