[**X**] Public – [ ] Internal Use – [ ] Confidential – [ ] Strictest Confidence
Distribution: General Public

SUMMARY
3rd MEETING of the Steering Committee of the Mobile Proxy Forum
(Meeting held on 29 June 2016: 12:30 - 16:30)

(Venue: EPC Secretariat, Cours Saint-Michel 30a, B-1040 Brussels)

(Approved by the Steering Committee)

1. **Welcome (SCP2P 001-16)**

The Chair, J. Maynard opened the meeting and welcomed the participants (see annex I for the list of attendees), especially newcomer EBA Clearing, to the third meeting of the Steering Committee.

2. **Approval of the agenda (SCP2P 014-16)**

The agenda was approved unchanged.

3. **Approval of the summary and review of the action points of the second meeting of the Steering Committee (SCP2P 013-16)**

The summary was reviewed and approved subject to a couple of minor editorial updates. The approved summary will be published shortly on the EPC website.

As part of the review of the action points, the Chair presented the proposal prepared by G. Silvén (GetSwish AB / Swish), which describes how the Standardised Proxy Lookup (SPL) service could work in a scenario whereby the sending and receiving party do not want to share customer IBANs and which is based on validation of proxies. The Chair suggested to revisit this topic at a later stage as the current idea is to propose a service that is relatively simple and which can be setup in a short period of time.

4. **Report on the 13 June 2016 meeting of the Euro Retail Payments Board (ERPB)**

The vice-Chair, K. S. Olsen attended the June 2016 ERPB meeting to present a status update on the activities of the Steering Committee.

The ERPB statement[1] which was distributed for information to the members of the Steering Committee prior to the meeting, reports the following:

"The ERPB welcomed the progress made in this field and invited the Steering Committee to submit a progress report to the ERPB meeting in November, including in particular a detailed work plan with clear deliverables and milestones to be aligned with those for the Instant SEPA Credit Transfer scheme and which can be translated into tangible results by November 2017."

---

[1] http://www.ecb.europa.eu/paym/retpaym/euro/html/index.en.html#erpb

5. Approval of the Terms of Reference of the Steering Committee (SCP2P 005-16)

An updated draft version (with and without track changes) of the Terms of Reference (ToR) was distributed to the members prior to the meeting. In addition, J. Crawford (E-Money Association (EMA)) had also provided further change suggestions to the Steering Committee members.

The Steering Committee concurred that the initial focus should be on 'proxy + IBAN', in line with the ERPB recommendations and also in view of the challenging deadline. In a next phase, the Steering Committee will also look at additional proxy types and account identifiers[2]. The IBAN will however be essential as the SPL service needs to be aligned with the SEPA Instant Credit Transfer (SCT Inst) scheme (which is based on IBAN).

Also, it was stressed that members of the Steering Committee are expected to actively contribute (including, when required, financial support). This was seen as an important addition to the ToR in order to avoid surprises at a later stage. Members that have not attended the two last meetings will be contacted to ensure that they are still on board.

The Steering Committee approved the ToR following a detailed review of all the change suggestions, including those provided by EMA.

6. Review draft project plan and agree on milestones (SC2P 006-16)

The draft project plan had been updated and now includes additional columns to indicate milestones and interdependencies between the different project steps.

In view of the aforementioned ERPB statement, the Steering Committee agreed on the following two main milestones:

- Present a working draft of the Rulebook at the November 2016 ERPB meeting.
- Work towards a launch of the SPL service in November 2017.

7. Rules development

At the May 2016 meeting of the Steering Committee, the majority of members indicated their interest to contribute to the development of the rules for operating, joining and participating in the SPL service. As a result and in view of the tight deadline it was agreed that the Steering Committee itself would develop the SPL rules and as such there would be no need to create a separate subgroup.

The Steering Committee members were invited to share their initial views concerning possible SPL service rules. The first preliminary result of this brainstorming is listed below:

- SPL service only ever returns one IBAN in response to a lookup.
- Payment via existing (SEPA) rails, otherwise out of scope.
- It should be assumed that any information shared through the SPL may be disclosed to the payer (proxy owner's name, account details etc.).

---

[2] This was also highlighted on slide 7 of the presentation SCP2P 010-16 'Simple Proxy Lookup' which was provided at the 24 May 2016 meeting of the Steering Committee.

- It will be assumed that all required consents have been collected for any information disclosed via the SPL.
- Any licensed PSP can conduct a lookup.
- A PSP can only respond to a lookup if it is the account servicing PSP (AS PSP) of the beneficiary.
- The payer's PSP responding to a lookup is obliged to send the payment to the specified IBAN.
- Just because the SPL has returned an IBAN there is no obligation on the payer's PSP to complete the payment (for example if it would breach internal policy).
- In constructing the payment message (following the look-up) the payer's PSP should include the recipient's proxy (any other information required?).
- The lookup request function can be done by anyone who fulfils the SPL service membership requirements.
- The answer to a lookup request can only be provided by AS PSPs.
- (Note: assumption would be that following the implementation of PSD2 and open banking APIs, TPPs will be notified by the AS PSP when one of their customers receives a payment).

It was commented that in addition to the rules, a definition of the scope and business requirements of the SPL service should also be defined.

It could be worthwhile to organise a poll to see whether the current P2P mobile solutions disclose IBANs. It was commented that in Poland a decision was made to withdraw from disclosing IBANs. In Italy, the name of the account holder cannot be disclosed.

A detailed debate took place on the polling hierarchy in member states where there exist multiple solutions (i.e. several solutions have a claim on the same IBAN). This discussion had also taken place at the level of the ERPB Working group on P2P mobile payments where it was concurred that this would be something that should be solved on a national level. Some Steering Committee members were not convinced that this would be the best approach and hence other alternatives were discussed such as for example polling via a random number generator or via letting the receiver decide to which account the money should be sent. The latter scenario would however complicate things as it would mean that participants would have to build an extra functionality which goes against the principle of avoiding the need to change the current systems. Moreover, as the SPL service will be based on instant payments it would be not acceptable that the SPL would have to wait until the receiver has indicated its preference (i.e. could take seconds, minutes, hours…). The Chair also noted that if the polling hierarchy topic could not be solved via a policy then as an alternative you could solve it via market forces. The EC representative however commented that the EC would not be in favour of for example letting companies pay to be on the top of the list.

The fact that some countries might not even have a national solution should also be taken into account. The Chair argued that this as such would not be an issue as nobody is obliged to participate. He added that in case of international solutions, an option could be to upload this data into the local databases. Moreover, a group of countries could also agree to work together.

One member commented that the SPL service should be seen as a platform for transmitting data and that the polling hierarchy as such should not necessarily be a part of this service as participating organisations could also agree on the hierarchy on a bilateral basis (as is currently the case in the telecommunications world).

The Chair suggested to park this discussion and invited the members to propose (by 13 July 2016) a practical solution for a polling hierarchy in a scenario where multiple solutions co-exist. The outcome of this action point should also provide an answer to the question whether individual PSP's should be allowed to connect directly to the SPL service.

In a next phase, the SPL service will be contracted to one or more commercial organisations and hence a commercial structure will need to be setup for organisations that want to collaborate. This would however not need to take place before the publication of the Rulebook. Furthermore, it was discussed whether a public consultation for the rulebook would need to be organised taking into account that any party with a vested interest is able to participate to the Steering Committee.

8. AOB

No any other business was discussed.

9. Next meeting

The next meeting is scheduled to take place on 13 October 2016. Further updates on the rules development will be communicated via email prior to this date.

10. Closure of the meeting

The Chair thanked the members for their valuable contribution and closed the meeting around 16.30 CET.

ANNEX I: List of attendees of the 3rd meeting of the Steering Committee on 29 June 2016

N°	Organisation	Representative	Attendance
Steering Committee Members			
1.	Banca Sella	Susta Enrico	Apologies
2.	Barclays	Foulds Darren	
3.	Bundesverband deutscher Banken	Tenner Tobias	Yes
4.	Caixa Bank	Herrero Francesc Xavier	Yes
5.	Caixa Geral de Depositos	Leite Monica	Apologies
6.	Consorzio CBI	David Simona	
7.	Cringle	Bandov Frane	
8.	Danske Bank	Olsen Sylvest Kasper	Apologies
9.	Dutch Payments Association	Boudewijn Gijs	Apologies
10.	Electronic Money Association (EMA)	Crawford Judith (alternate: Gerhartinger Hartwig)	(Yes)
11.	Elisa / Ekisa Rahoitus Oy	Mari Heikkinen	Apologies
12.	Erste Bank	Kazmi Zaf	Apologies
13.	EPIF	Cowling Robert (alternate: Garcia Paloma)	(Yes)
14.	Fire Financial Services	Davey Paul	Apologies
15.	EBA Clearing	Plompen Petra	Yes
16.	Gemalto	Gaston Lorenzo	Yes
17.	GetSwish AB / Swish	Silvén Gunnel	Apologies
18.	ICBPI	Miotto Giovanni	
19.	MasterCard	Perryman Mark (alternate: Martin Esteban)	(Yes)
20.	Nordea Mobile & Emerging Payments	Mårtenson Rasmus	Apologies
21.	Payfriendz	Allen Howard	
22.	Paym	Maynard John	Yes
23.	Pietsch Consult	Pietsch Thomas	
24.	Polski Standard Platności	Mazurkiewicz Dariusz	Yes
25.	Redsýs	Torres Miguel	Yes
26.	Seamless	Fredell Peter	Apologies
27.	SEQR Benelux	van der Hart Peter	
28.	SIA	Polissi Marco	Yes
29.	SIBS	Mesquita Teresa	Yes
30.	SRC Security Research & Consulting	Machielse Wijnand (alternate: Ortwin Scheja)	Yes
31.	SWIFT	Kuntz Vincent	Apologies
32.	UBS	Schilling David (alternate: Stahel Philipp)	
33.	VocaLink	Senechal Nick	Yes
34.	Wone	Tuzi Daren	Yes
35.	Wordline	Deudon Arnaud	
Observers			
36.	ECB	Tur Hartmann Francisco	Yes
37.	European Commission	Esclapez Pierre-Yves	Yes
EPC Secretariat			
38.	EPC	Goosse Etienne	Apologies
39.	EPC	Godefroi Christophe	Yes

Annex II: List of action points

Ref.	Action	Owner	Status/Target
3.01	Provide a proposal for a polling hierarchy in a scenario whereby multiple solutions have a claim on the same mobile telephone number (i.e. in which order should these solutions be polled?)	Steering Committee members	By 13 July 2016
3.02	Publish the approved summary of the 2nd meeting on the EPC website	EPC Secretariat	By 8 July 2016