**JROC Workplan Implementation Group (JWIG) – 5 August 2024**

**Attendees:**

Chair: Henk Van Hulle (OBL)

Secretariat: John Crossley (OBL)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** |
| **Henk Van Hulle** | OBL |
| **Richard Koch** | OBL |
| **Marion King** | OBL |
| **MB Christie** | OBL |
| **John Crossley** | OBL |
| **Christian Delesalle** | OBL |
| **Danh Nguyen** | OBL |
| **Ian Pegg** | OBL |
| **Nick Davey** | OBL |
| **Nilixa Devlukia** | OFA |
| **Thaer Sabri** | EMA |
| **Jon Roughley** | Experian |
| **Peter Cornforth** | FCA |
| **Amber Boodt** | Nationwide |
| **Shrey Agarwal** | Revolut |
| **Tony Herbert** | Which? |
| **Andrea Macleay** | FSB |
| **Euan Ballantyne** | Pay.UK |
| **Ghela Boskovich** | FData |
| **Philip Mind** | UK Finance |
| **Joel Lewis** | PSR |
| **Adam Jackson** | Innovate Finance |
| **Michael Allison** | FCA |
| **Riccardo Tordera** | Payments Association |
| **Andrew Self** | PSR |
| **Jack WIlson** | Truelayer |

**New actions arising:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Owner** |
| Attendees to review Terms of Reference and provide comments by 12 August | All |
| RK to bring an update to the September JWIG on the WS3 consumer protection scope and approach | RK/JC |
| RK to circulate the packs from other governance meetings | RK |

**Summary of meeting:**

Welcome and introduction.

* HvH welcomed everyone to the inaugural JWIG as well setting out the objectives and approach for the meeting.

Terms of reference

* JC provided an overview of the ToR and asked for comments by 12 August.
* Question asked on whether the papers would be published to allow for broader review. RK confirmed that he is happy to publish the papers and ensure maximum transparency.
* Asked to clarify whether Premium APIs are in scope. RK noted that that it was in the overall scope of the Programme deliverables but is an activity that will be progressed by the FCA.

Plan on a page

* RK provided an overview of the plan on a page. Some of the key points he picked out:
  + WS1 and 2a – roundtables being held to understand lack of data supply.
  + WS2b – pilot banks now using TRIs for live decisioning. Remain concerns about the volume of data. Crucially we need to understand whether the analysis being provided by the participating banks will allow the efficacy of TRIs to be understood.
  + WS4 – standards release has been delivered and OBL is now monitoring the implementation. JROC will then be given an update on the implementation progress.
  + WS3 – reviewing the overlap with WS5 VRPs. WS5 looking at VRP protections and then highlight future roadmap requirements which falls into WS3, hence there is currently a time lag on this workstream.
  + WS5 – Two working group meetings have been held to date. The first focused on the dispute mechanism to identify the business requirements and option evaluation criteria. Aiming to conclude this by the end of August so that we have a clear candidate and can commence the build activity. The second focused on the MLA propositional contents via a gap analysis between the VRP blueprint recommendations and the model clause document. This identified five gaps that will be addressed. Stakeholder feedback has been requested.
  + RK highlighted the need for swift decisions to be made in order to maintain the momentum and achieve the planned delivery timelines.
* Questions asked about the plan on a page:
  + Could there be more visibility on the consumer protection scope?
    - RK agreed to bring an update to the next JWIG on the WS3 consumer protection scope and approach
  + Should there be a separate dispute handling system for VRPs or could this be combined into one of the existing dispute handling systems?
    - RK confirmed that there are a range of mechanisms being considered
  + Asked if the commercial development activity needs to be brought forward?
    - RK said that the approach is being reviewed by the PSR and additional meetings would be set up if needed
  + Asked for clarify on the difference between wave 1 and 2?
    - RK confirmed that wave 1 broadly aligns to original PSR suggestion, whilst wave 2 is an extension to low-risk e-commerce. The exact details of wave 2 is yet to be confirmed.
  + Is the programme adopting a risk-based MVP delivery approach?
    - RK confirmed this to be the case with the aim of getting VRPs delivered to market as soon as possible.

WS5 assumptions and dependencies

* ND provided an overview of the assumptions and dependencies relating to WS5. A key assumption is that the development of the MLA is being done on a scheme agnostic basis. Whilst this does create some risk, it allows the programme to continue ahead of a decision being made on the scheme operator.
* Questions and points asked about the WS5 assumptions and dependencies:
  + Does JROC have a clear set of evaluation criteria for the programme decisions?
    - RK said that this is a question for JROC and expected the evaluation criteria to differ by decision.
  + There was some surprise that JROC were making a choice on MLA ownership by 7 Oct and that the decision is being made ahead of the MLA sign-off. It was asked whether the MLA operator decision relates to just wave 1 or subsequent waves, especially as other operators may want to bring along their own MLAs.
  + The timings around the MLA was highlighted as major risk to the programme issues and hence will need careful management.

Status update

* RK provided an overview of the status of the programme, highlighting those workstreams that are showing amber or red.
* WS1 and 2a – There are concerns around the volume of data being made available. Roundtables are being held to understand the reasons and then making recommendations to JROC.
* WS5 – There are two areas of concern:
  + Disputes – this is reporting amber due to the need for a decision on the disputes mechanism and the uncertainty around the build timeline which differs by solution. Work is well underway to make the decision and understand the build implications. Aiming to have a proposal for the September JROC Board
  + MLA – reporting amber due to the need for a decision on the procurement approach for the legal support. Discussions nearing completion to allow this to progress so that legal support is onboarded for early September.
* Questions and points asked about the WS5 assumptions and dependencies:
  + What are the key takeaways from the WS1/2a workshops?
    - CD explained that we are still waiting for the survey responses from the participating firms.
  + Will the governance structure evolve as the programme develops?
    - RK explained that the governance structure will be under continual review to ensure to ensure it is fit for purpose and it allows for the efficient delivery of the programme objectives.

Procurement approach for MLA legal support

* Danh N provided an overview of the options and discussions to date. He reiterated the point that this needs to be progressed swiftly to ensure that subsequent programme dates are not threatened. The aim is to use August to select the legal firm and then onboard them by early September to commence the MLA drafting.
* Danh was asked whether panel firms were being included in the tender process to speed up the tender process. He explained that we are issuing the RFP to firms where there is trust and knowledge, hence this could be broader then existing panel firms.
* HvH confirmed that we are on schedule to issue the RFP early next week.
* It was highlighted that there is a risk that around the future owner of the MLA may disavow the MLA wording if they did not lead the MLA development process. This was noted and aiming to mitigate via including all parties in the development process.

Broader WS5 overview

* RK provided an overview of the WS5 detailed scope slides and asked for questions.
* it was questioned whether the ‘black box’ approach used in the EU to determine the commercial model was too long winded and expensive.
  + RK explained that at present no work is progressing on the commercial model, but acknowledged there is a needs for a solution. We need to see the PSR announcement before progress can be made on the commercial model
* Euan commented if FPS pricing changes are required for the commercial model (e.g. free for sending) then Pay.UK have an outline delivery plan for this.

Future meeting calendar

* JC gave an overview of the future meeting calendar, noting that this is subject to change as the programme evolves. The topics at future meetings across the programme will be made as transparent as possible to ensure that all organisations are able to prepare.

AOB

* None