

[X] Public – [] Internal Use – [] Confidential – [] Strictest Confidence

Distribution: General Public

SUMMARY

7th MEETING of the Steering Committee of the Mobile Proxy Forum (Conference call held on 23 February 2017: 11:00 - 12:00)

(Approved by the Steering Committee)

1. Welcome

The Chair, J. Maynard opened the conference call and welcomed the participants (see annex I for the list of attendees).

2. Approval of the agenda (SCP2P 008-17)

The agenda was approved unchanged.

3. Approval of the summary and review of the action points of the sixth meeting of the Steering Committee (SCP2P 007-17)

The summary was approved and will be published in due course on the EPC website.

4. Finalisation of the draft rules for operating, joining and participating in the SPL service (SCP2P 018-16)

The Steering Committee reviewed the additional rules in relation to the Standardised Proxy Lookup (SPL) service. An updated version, based on the approved changes will be distributed to the Technical Working Group (TWG) as input to their first meeting scheduled on 28 February 2017.

M. Torres reiterated that a transaction should not be cancelled in case multiple look-up responses are received without a preference/timestamp indication. As an alternative he suggested for example to prioritize responses that provide the beneficiary name, prioritize responses from RRP's that support SCT Inst, or even allow the IRP to decide whether they are willing to accept a random choice answer or not. As these alternatives were not supported by the majority of the Steering Committee it was decided to stick with the current polling hierarchy.

It was furthermore agreed that an RRP (Responding Registry Provider) response should be provided within a reasonable timeframe (e.g., within one second) to avoid delays and discussions on why a certain response was not taken into account.

5. Funding of the SPL Service

Prior to the meeting the Chair had sent an email to invite the members of the Steering Committee to consider the challenge the MPF faces in delivering the SPL as currently designed, and whether the efforts and resources the SPL solution requires can be met from their organisations.

The members had also been invited to indicate if they would be able to contribute to Legal Working Group (LWG) and Market Implementation Group (MIWG), via nominating experts (or a Chair) or via providing secretariat support. So far only a couple of members had nominated experts but no one had offered to Chair or provide secretariat support. It was agreed that a reminder could be distributed.

The Chair invited the members to indicate their preference for either the SPL solution (as currently designed) or the eDelivery solution and asked how they could contribute. A summary of the responses is provided below:

- D. Scaffidi (ACI Worldwide): In favour of continuing with current roadmap (i.e. SPL solution as currently designed).
- M. Blom (Dutch Payments Association): Would not be against eDelivery if user experience is satisfactory.
- P. Plompen (EBA Clearing): We are neutral and willing to contribute via providing knowledge and experience.
- A.L Wretman (GetSwish AB / Swish): We do not have enough information as yet to compare the two solutions. Currently preference would be to continue with the SPL solution as currently designed.
- M. Esteban (MasterCard): eDelivery could be a viable solution but further analysis is required. We are involved in the TWG.
- R. Mårtenson (Nordea): Neutral position. We need an interoperable solution and the technology behind this is not that important. Slight preference for the SPL service as currently designed. Will check if we can nominate someone to the TWG.
- M. Torres (Redsys): Both solutions are acceptable so no specific preference. None of the solutions are perfect but they are workable.
- N. Lubomir (Viamo): Preference for eDelivery. As a small start-up we are unable to provide resources or funding.
- M. Butler (Vocalink): Two solutions are workable so no preference. We are involved in the TWG.
- K. Glahn (equensWordline): eDelivery has a funding advantage but may also have too many limitations. Still too early to decide as further analysis is required. We are involved in the TWG.
- A. Castelli (Conorzio CBI): It is important that it is a client driven solution. We feel that the SPL service as currently designed is more client driven. We however cannot provide resources.
- P.Y. Esclapez (European Commission): No preference. The length and complexity of the process of the eDelivery solution should however be taken into consideration. Hence the suggestion to check with the eDelivery project team whether the process can indeed be completed within the required timeframe.

6. AOB

No other topics were discussed.

7. Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on 30 March 2017 in Brussels

8. Closure of the meeting

The Chair thanked the members for their valuable contribution and closed the meeting at 12.00 CET.

ANNEX I: List of attendees of the 7th meeting of the Steering Committee

N°	Organisation	Representative	Attendance
Steering Committee Members			
1.	ACI Worldwide	Scaffidi Domenico	Yes
2.	Banca Sella	Lucon Diego	
3.	Barclays	Foulds Darren	
4.	Bundesverband deutscher Banken	Tenner Tobias	
5.	Caixa Bank	Herrero Francesc Xavier	
6.	Caixa Geral de Depositos	Leite Monica	
7.	Consorzio CBI	David Simona (alternate: Castelli Alessio)	(Yes)
8.	Cringle	Kocaoglu Elif	
9.	Danske Bank	Olsen Sylvest Kasper	
10.	Dutch Payments Association	Blom Marnix (alternate: Boudewijn Gijs)	Yes
11.	EBA Clearing	Plompen Petra	Yes
12.	Electronic Money Association (EMA)	Crawford Judith (alternate: Gerhartinger Hartwig)	
13.	Elisa / Ekisa Rahoitus Oy	Heikkinen Mari	Apologies
14.	Erste Bank	Kazmi Zaf	
15.	EPIF	Cowling Robert (alternate: Garcia Paloma)	
16.	equensWordline	Regnault Guillaume (alternate: Glahn Kay)	(Yes)
17.	Fire Financial Services	Davey Paul	
18.	French Banking Federation	Meyer Rodolphe	Yes
19.	Gemalto	Gaston Lorenzo	
20.	GetSwish AB / Swish	Wretman Anna-Lena (alternate: Gunnel Silvén)	Yes
21.	ICBPI	Miotto Giovanni	
22.	MasterCard	Perryman Mark (alternate: Martin Esteban)	(Yes)
23.	Nordea Mobile & Emerging Payments	Mårtensson Rasmus	Yes
24.	Payfriendz	Allen Howard	
25.	Paym	Maynard John	Yes
26.	Pietsch Consult	Pietsch Thomas	
27.	Polski Standard Platności	Mazurkiewicz Dariusz	
28.	Redsýs	Torres Miguel	Yes
29.	Seamless	Fredell Peter	Apologies
30.	SIA	Polissi Marco (alternate: Joliveau Jean-Philippe)	
31.	SIBS	Mesquita Teresa	Apologies
32.	SRC Security Research & Consulting	Machielse Wijnand (alternate: Scheja Ortwin)	Apologies
33.	SWIFT	Kuntz Vincent	

34.	UBS	Schilling David (alternate: Stahel Philipp)	(Yes)
35.	Viamo	Nadasky Lubomir	Yes
36.	VocaLink	Senechal Nick (alternate: Butler Martin)	(Yes)
37.	Wone	Tuzi Daren	
Observers			
38.	ECB	Tur Hartmann Francisco	
39.	ECB	Plooij Mirjam	Yes
40.	European Commission	Esclapez Pierre-Yves	Yes
EPC Secretariat			
41.	EPC	Goosse Etienne	Yes
42.	EPC	Godefroi Christophe	Yes

Annex II: List of action points

Ref.	Action	Owner	Status/Target
7.01	Reconsider possible contribution (experts, Chair, secretariat support) to the TWG, LWG and MIWG.	Steering Committee Members	Next meeting
7.02	Check timeframe of eDelivery solution process.	P.Y. Esclapez	In due course.
7.03	Provide updated rules document to the TWG (as input document for their first meeting).	EPC Secretariat	In due course