Consultation Questionnaire

This template is intended to help stakeholders respond to the questions set out in our consultation document and in its supporting papers.

Responses should be emailed to us at Forum@psr.org.uk in PDF format by no later than **22 September 2017**. Any questions about our consultation can also be sent to Forum@psr.org.uk

Whilst we welcome feedback from any participant on any question, not all questions in this consultation will be relevant to the wide range of stakeholders in the Payments Community. We have sign posted the questions to clarify which are most relevant for your organisations, and where we would most value your feedback.

Thank you in advance for your contribution to this consultation process.

Basic Details

Consultation title	Blueprint for the Future of UK Payments
Name of respondent	Accenture - Jeremy Light
Contact details / job title	Managing Director - Payments
Representing (self or organisation/s)	Accenture
Email	jeremy.light@accenture.com
Address	30 Fenchurch Street, London, EC3M 3BD, United Kingdom

Responding to the consultation and publication of responses

Subject to express requests for confidentiality, please note that we will publish views or submissions in full or in part. In responding, we therefore ask you to minimise elements of your submissions which you want to be treated as confidential. Where you do submit both confidential and non-confidential material, you should submit a non-confidential version, which you consent for us to publish, marked 'for publication' and another version marked 'confidential'.

In responding to this consultation, you are sharing your response with the Forum secretariat (1). Confidential information provided in these circumstances is confidential within the meaning of FSBRA and it is a criminal offence to disclose it without requisite authority (2).

Notes:

(1) The Forum secretariat work for the Payment Systems Regulator Limited, 'the PSR', and are considered primary recipients for the purposes of the Financial Services (Banking Reform) Act 2013 (FSBRA).

(2) The PSR has the power to disclose confidential information in certain circumstances for the purposes of facilitating its functions and may impose conditions on the use of that information.

Declaration

'I confirm that our response supplied with this cover sheet is a formal consultation response that the Forum can publish, unless it is clearly marked 'confidential'.

Jeremy Light

1.0 A New Payments Architecture

Question 1.1

Consumers PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors

Do you agree with our recommendation to move towards a 'push' payment mechanism for all payment types?

Yes ◯ No ◉

If not, please explain why.

This recommendation is confusing. "Push" and "Pull" refer to the way a payment is initiated – "Push" payments are initiated by the payer, "Pull" payments by the payee. The payment itself in both cases is the application of a debit on one account (payer) and a corresponding credit on another account (payee), or a series of corresponding credits on multiple accounts that sum to the

---

Question 1.2

PSPs Vendors

In the proposed transition approach it is expected that Third Party Service Providers including current independent software providers, bureaux and gateway providers will update their systems to enable existing payment formats to continue to operate with no or limited negative impact on the current users of services such as Direct Debit.

As a PSP or TPSP, do you agree we have identified the implications of adopting a push model adequately?

Yes ◯ No ◉

If not, please set out any additional impacts that need to be considered.

Notwithstanding the confusion of the NPA's push-model, the implication of the NPA is that direct debits will change – scheme rules, formats and processing. Given that direct debits are a pervasive feature of the UK economy, the full implication of this change on end users – on their IT systems and business processes, from small billers to large corporates, and on consumers

---

Question 1.3

Consumers PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors SMEs

As a potential vendor, participant or user of the NPA, are there any other design considerations that should be included in the NPA, especially with regards to considering the needs of end-users?

Yes ◉ No ◯

If yes, please provide a description of those areas and why they are important to explore.

Accenture expects the majority, if not all interbank payments over the next 5 – 15 years to migrate to processing in real-time, 24 x7, either as single payments or as bulk payments.

Question 1.4 PSPs Vendors

The nature of the layering approach enables new components to be added or updated with minimal impact on components in other layers. We believe this will support greater levels of competition and innovation especially in the upper layers of the NPA.

In your view, as a vendor or service provider, will layering the NPA in this way simplify access and improve your ability to compete in the UK payments market?

Yes (●) No ( )

If not, please explain why.

A layered approach is a good way to approach the NPA. However, the layers shown are in an unusual configuration, with for example two overlay layers. The examples shown in the appendix appear inconsistent in the layering approach, and appear to have activities in the wrong layer – for example, payee disaggregation by PSPs in the end user overlay services layer, which is a

---

Question 1.5 PSPs Vendors

With the recommended centralised clearing and settlement option, as a participant or vendor who is accessing or delivering the clearing and settlement service, do you think:

a. We have reached the right conclusion in recommending this option?

Yes (●) No ( )

If not, please explain why.

For clearing, the alternative to centralised clearing is the use of bilateral clearing agreements. Bilateral agreements create differences in the end user experience and result in inefficient duplication of bank processing capabilities. Given the number of UK banks, the number of bilateral agreements required would be impractical (in the hundreds), and would also act as a barrier

b. The right balance of managing risk versus competition has been achieved?

Yes ( ) No (●)

If not, please explain why.

While the provision of access to clearing, and liquidity for settlement, are competitive - where a PSP or end user chooses a third party to do either or both on their behalf, clearing and settlement themselves are not competitive functions . There should be no trade off necessary between competition and risk

---

Question 1.6 PSPs Vendors

Do you agree with our analysis of each of the clearing and settlement deployment approaches?

Yes ( ) No (●)

Which is your preferred deployment approach?

The analysis described is confusing. It is not clear from the analysis how a centralised clearing and settlement function would operate under multiple vendor nodes, it appears to be a contradiction. Analysis is missing on netting versus gross settlement.

Question 1.7 PSPs Vendors

As a vendor of services in any layer of the NPA, do you think that more work is required to prove any of the main concepts of NPA before embarking on the procurement process?

Yes (●) No ( )

If so, please explain which areas and why.

As per our answer to 1.3, there are many design considerations that are unanswered, or unclear in the NPA. Accenture expects that further analysis and research is conducted to clarify these design considerations. However, while at this stage in its definition the NPA is insufficiently detailed and clear to embark on a RFP procurement process, the NPSO could issue an initial

---

2.0 Collaborative Requirements and Rules for the three End-User Solutions

Question 2.1 Corporates Govt. SMEs

As a payee,

a. Does your organisation serve customers who experience challenges paying regular bills?

Yes ( ) No ( )

b. Does your organisation experience unpaid direct debits?

Yes ( ) No ( )

Please comment on the extent to which you experience this and any trends you see in this area.

N/A

Question 2.2 Corporates Govt. SMEs

Request to Pay provides visibility to payees on the intentions of a payer. Would the increased visibility benefit your business?

Yes ( ) No ( )

If so, how?

N/A

Question 2.3 Corporates Govt. SMEs

Request to Pay will result in increased communication between the payee and the payer. As a payee:

a. Would the increased communication present a challenge?

Yes ◯ No ◯

If so, in what way?

N/A

b. What benefits could you envisage from this increased communication?

N/A

c. Do you see any additional potential benefits resulting from Request to Pay other than those described?

Yes ◯ No ◯

If so, which ones?

N/A

Question 2.4 Corporates Govt. SMEs

We have recommended the minimum information that should be contained in a Request to Pay message. As a payee:

a. With the exception of reference ID, are you able to provide other items of information with every payment request?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

b. Is there additional information, specific to your business, that you would have to provide to payers as part of the Request to Pay message?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

Question 2.5 Corporates Govt. SMEs

We envisage payees stipulating a payment period during which the payer will be required to make the payment. As a payee, how do you think this payment period might be applied within your organisation?

N/A

Question 2.6 Corporates Govt. SMEs

Request to Pay will offer payers flexibility over payment time as well as amount and method. As a payee:

a. Does your business model support offering payment plans and the ability for payers to spread their payments?

Yes ◯ No ◯

If so, please provide more details as to how these plans are offered, their conditions and to which customers.

N/A

b. Do you have a predominant payment method used by your payers?

Yes ◯ No ◯

If so, what percentage of customers use it?

N/A

c. Do you offer your payers a choice of payment methods?

Yes ◯ No ◯

If yes, what determines how much choice you offer? If not, what are the barriers preventing you from doing this?

N/A

d. Are there any incentives to use one payment method over another?

Yes ◯ No ◯

If so, what is the rationale?

N/A

Question 2.7 Corporates Govt. SMEs

A minority of payers may not be able to pay within the payment period. Through Request to Pay they will be able to request an extension to the payment period. As a payee:

a. Do you currently offer your payers the capability to extend a payment period, request a payment holiday or make late payments?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

b. What are the conditions and eligibility criteria under which this is offered?

N/A

c. If you currently don't, what are the barriers preventing you from offering this capability?

N/A

Question 2.8 Corporates Govt. SMEs

Request to Pay will offer payers the option to decline a request. The purpose of this option is to provide an immediate alert in case the request was received as an error or will be paid by other means. As a payee:

a. Would you find this information useful?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

b. Do you have any concerns about providing this capability?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

Question 2.9

Consumers Corporates SMEs

Does the Request to Pay service as described address:

a. The detriments identified in our Strategy?

Yes ◉ No ○

b. The challenges experienced by your customers? Does it introduce any new challenges?

Yes ◉ No ○

Does it introduce any new challenges?

The proposition is currently lacking a post-transaction guarantee such as the dispute resolution for cards transactions

---

Question 2.10

Corporates Govt. SMEs

As a payee, considering the information provided in this document,

a. What is the extent of change you think you will need to carry out internally to offer Request to Pay?

N/A

b. What challenges do you see that might prevent your organisation adopting Request to Pay?

N/A

c. What is the timeframe you think you will need to be able to offer Request to Pay?

N/A

Question 2.11

Corporates Govt. SMEs

What are the features or rules that could be built into Request to Pay that would make it more valuable to your organisation, or more likely for you to adopt it?

N/A

Question 2.12

Consumers PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors SMEs

We have highlighted several risks and considerations relevant to the delivery of Request to Pay. As an end-user of Request to Pay:

a. Are there any risks that we have not addressed or highlighted that would like to add?

Yes (●) No ( )

Overcome confusion between request for pay, card transactions and direct debit services: e.g. differences in liabilities and customer protection.

b. Are there additional unintended consequences that we should consider?

Yes ( ) No (●)

None identified

Question 2.13

Consumers PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors SMEs

We recognise that additional work needs to be done in identifying potential safeguards including liability considerations associated with Request to Pay. As an end-user of Request to Pay:

a. What are some of the potential liability concerns that you may have?

Agree that further work needs to be done. We believe that issues could be mitigated through increased fraud protection using new technology and data analytics. Other learnings should be taken from other countries that are going through this journey (e.g. USA, Canada), or have already a more mature market in electronic payments processing (e.g. Nordics)

b. Would you be interested in working with the Forum to define, at a high level, the liability considerations for Request to Pay?

Yes (●) No ( )

If so, please contact us as soon as convenient through the Forum website so we can get you involved.

We would be happy to provide our views based on our business experience subject to client confidentiality obligations.

Question 2.14 PSPs

As a PSP:

Do you currently offer real-time balance information to your clients?

Yes ◯ No ◯

What information do you offer them? If not, what are the constraints?

N/A

Question 2.15 Consumers PSPs Corporates SMEs

We have presented two CoP response approaches (Approach 1 and Approach 2).

a. As a payer, what would be your preferred approach? Why?

N/A

b. As a PSP, what would be your preferred approach? Why?

N/A

c. As a regulator,

I. What are applicable considerations that must be made for each approach?

N/A

II. What safeguards must be put in place for each approach?

N/A

Question 2.16 PSPs

As a PSP:

a. Would you be able to offer CoP as described to your customers?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

b. What is the extent of change that you would need to carry out internally to offer CoP?

Whilst Accenture is not a PSP, we believe that in delivering parts of the solution, some functionality that already exists around the use of the central billers database, the CASS database, or the PayM database could be used. Should an SPI solution be used, then elements of PSD2 / Open Banking could be used (e.g. API management tools)

Question 2.17 PSPs

The successful delivery of CoP is largely dependent on universal acceptance by all PSPs to provide payee information. As a PSP:

a. Would you participate in a CoP service?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

b. Are there any constraints that would hinder you providing this service?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

Question 2.18 PSPs

The NPA will fully support the functionality for PSPs to provide payment status and tracking.

a. As a PSP, what is the extent of change you think you will need to carry out internally to offer Payments Status Tracking?

Whilst Accenture is not a PSP, we believe that the payers' PSPs will require functionality to provide the Payee with information regarding the debit status once the payment is initiated, and the Payees' PSPs must provide information on the credit status to the payee and the payer. The extent of change will vary depending on the PSP's internal infrastructure, however the information

b. What challenges do you see that might prevent your organisation adopting Payments Status Tracking?

Alongside specific infrastructure changes which will vary depending on PSP, there will be a number of additional considerations including the need to potentially enhance security to protect end-users' details from phishing and fraud and guaranteeing data privacy and protection. Controls may also be required to ensure PSPs comply with the Proceeds of Crime Act and to identify and

Question 2.19

Consumers PSPs Corporates Govt. SMEs

We have highlighted several considerations relevant to the delivery of Assurance Data. As an end-user of Assurance Data:

a. Are there any risks that we have not addressed or highlighted that you would like to add?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

b. Are there any unintended consequences that we should consider?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

Question 2.20

Consumers PSPs Corporates Govt. SMEs

As a payer:

a. How would you use Enhanced Data?

N/A

b. What Enhanced Data would you add to payments?

N/A

Question 2.21

Corporates Govt. SMEs

As a payee:

a. How would you use Enhanced Data?

N/A

b. What Enhanced Data would you add to payments?

N/A

Question 2.22

Consumers PSPs Corporates Govt.

Does the Enhanced Data capability as described address the detriments identified in our Strategy?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

Question 2.23

Consumers PSPs Corporates Govt.

Some changes will be required to enable the loading and retrieval of Enhanced Data. For example, corporates will need to modify their internal systems. As an end-user, what internal change will be needed to allow you to add and receive Enhanced Data through the NPA?

N/A

Question 2.24

Consumers PSPs Corporates Govt. SMEs

We have highlighted several considerations relevant to the delivery of Enhanced Data. As an end-user of Enhanced Data:

a. Are there any risks that we have not addressed or highlighted that you would like to add?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

b. Are there any unintended consequences that we should consider?

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

Question 2.25 Consumers PSPs Corporates Govt. SMEs

We recognise that additional work needs to be done in identifying safeguards including liability considerations associated with Enhanced Data. As an end-user of Enhanced Data:

a. What are some of the liability concerns that you may have?

N/A

b. Would you be interested in working with the Forum to define, at a high-level, the various liability considerations required for Enhanced Data?

Yes ◯ No ◯

If so, please contact us as soon as convenient through the Forum website so we can get you involved.

N/A

3.0 Implementation Plan

Question 3.1 Consumers PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors SMEs

Are there any additional principles you think we should add or significant amendments that should be made to those already stated?

Yes ◉ No ◯

There could be significant opportunities for greater business efficiency in the SME and national businesses to reduce the amount of paper in the economy e.g. paper invoices, receipts, paper tax returns etc. by the industry expanding the payments value chain to the creation of e-invoicing, automated alerts and receipts

---

Question 3.2 Consumers PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors SMEs

Are there any additional assumptions you think we should add or significant amendments that should be made to those already stated?

Yes ◉ No ◯

In our opinion, the current set of assumptions sufficiently capture the need to mitigate impact to PSUs and systems during the transition to NPA. However, an additional key assumption to consider is:
- Sufficient development of transition solutions to support the transition to NPA, e.g. Direct access provision to non-bank PSPs

Question 3.3

PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors SMEs

Do you agree with the sequence of events laid out in the implementation plan?

Yes ◯ No ◯

If not, what approach to sequencing would you suggest?

N/A

Question 3.4

PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors SMEs

Do you agree with the high-level timetable laid out in the implementation plan?

Yes ◯ No ◉

If not, what timing would you suggest?

Given the timetable for ring-fencing we are uncertain whether proposed work on the Push only mechanism (clearing and settlement system?) should be delayed until after-2018, given the focus from the big 5 UK banks will be on ensuring compliance with ring-fencing legislation. And , given the dependency on the new Bank of England RTGS system, the timing of the delivery

---

Question 3.5

PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors SMEs

Are there any significant potential risks that you think the implementation plan does not consider?

Yes ◉ No ◯

If the answer is yes, then please provide input about what they are and how we can best address them.

Availability of SMEs within the banks, as well as at an industry level should be considered with many institutions all looking to deliver many changes programmes, restricting capacity. In addition, development of central tools for testing should be considered to de-risk delivery

---

Question 3.6

PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors SMEs

Do you agree with our proposed transition approach?

Yes ◯ No ◯

If not, please provide your reasoning.

N/A

4.0 Cost Benefit Analysis of the NPA

Question 4.1

PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors SMEs Investors

Are there any material quantifiable benefits that have not been included?

Yes (●) No ( )

If so, please provide details.

There may be some additional benefits: reduced collateral requirements, or reduced annual change costs during the 'run' phase that follows NPA migration.

Question 4.2

PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors SMEs Investors

Do you agree with the cost assumptions with regards to the NPA and each of the overlay services (Request to Pay, Enhanced Data, Assurance Data)?

Yes ( ) No ( )

If not, please state your reasons and, if possible, suggest alternatives analysis.

N/A

Question 4.3

PSPs Corporates Govt. Vendors SMEs Investors

Do you agree with our description of the alternative minimum upgrade?

Yes ( ) No ( )

If not, please explain your reasoning.

N/A

5.0 NPA Commercial Approach and Economic Models

Question 5.1 PSPs Vendors

Does our competition framework adequately capture the types of competition that may exist in payments?

Yes ◯ No ◯

Please explain.

N/A

Question 5.2 PSPs Vendors

Do you agree with the NPA competition categories described? If not, please explain why.

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

Question 5.3 Vendors

Does our framework capture the dynamic roles the NPSO may play in the market?

Yes ◉ No ◯

The framework captures the dynamic roles NPSO may play in the market. However, a couple of additional activities that the NPSO could perform include:
a) having a clear assessment of the profit model (i.e. business case) before taking the requirements to the vendors;

Question 5.4 PSPs Vendors Investors

Are there any other important criteria that we should use to assess the funding options we have identified?

Yes ◉ No ◯

The criteria mentioned in the report cover all the key aspects. However, the 'risk profile' elements can also have a view of the market adoption of the solution as part of the assessment (both from a financial as well as operational perspective). One way to do that is to perform an assessment of overall economics i.e. both from investment and benefit perspectives

Question 5.5 Investors

Do you agree with our NPA competition assessment? If not, please explain why.

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

Question 5.6 PSPs Vendors Investors

Do you agree with our assessment of End-User Needs Solutions? If not, please explain why.

Yes ◉ No ◯

We agree with the assessment of end user needs solutions. To support the adoption or implementation, NSPO could also provide guidance on the implementation roadmap along with the synergies with upcoming regulations e.g. PSDII and Open Banking, in addition to the outlined responsibilities of setting standards and proving market demand to industry participants, as

---

Question 5.7 PSPs Vendors Investors

Do you agree with our list of funding stakeholders? If not, please explain why.

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

Question 5.8 PSPs Corporates Vendors

Are there other significant sources of funding or types of funding instruments the NSPO could secure that have not been described? If not please explain why.

Yes ◯ No ◯

N/A

6.0 Improving Trust in Payments

Question 6.1

PSPs Corporates Vendors

Do you agree with the outlined participant categories identified for the Payments Transaction Data Sharing and Data Analytics strategic solution?

Yes ◉ No ○

Are there other categories that should be considered for inclusion?

Yes ○ No ◉

Please explain your response.

The participant categories listed in Section 6.2.3 cover the value chain for payments (on the assumption that payments schemes covers Payments System Operators).

Question 6.2

PSPs Corporates Vendors

What is your opinion on the role non-payments industry participants should have as part of the Payments Transaction Data Sharing and Data Analytics strategic solution? (This could include Government, Law Enforcement, or others). If appropriate, please outline usage of the system, provision of data to the system, and legal considerations for participation.

The roles of both industry participants, and non-payments industry participants should be clearly defined and agreed, and actions limited to those for permitted purpose. Should this be to fight financial crime, typical activities would include processing of SARs to increase accuracy / speed of processing, but in this instance, would not include activities, for example to determine

---

Question 6.3

PSPs Corporates Vendors

Do you agree with the potential use cases outlined for the Payments Transaction Data Sharing and Data Analytics strategic solution?

Yes ◉ No ○

If not, please provide your reasoning. Please indicate if there are other potential uses for the system that should be considered.

The use cases outlined would benefit from a central system.

Question 6.4 PSPs Corporates Vendors

Do you agree with key principles we have outlined for the implementation of the Payments Transaction Data Sharing and Data Analytics strategic solution?

In addition to the key principles outlined, the ability to audit activity should be considered.

Question 6.5 PSPs Corporates SMEs Vendors

Other than those already listed, what stakeholders should be consulted and engaged during the design and implementation of the Payments Transaction Data Sharing and Data Analytics Strategic Solution?

Future stakeholders should also be considered, these might include companies applying for various banking or payments licences, and software providers - specifically those involving electronic currencies.

Question 6.6 PSPs Corporates Vendors

Do you agree with the high-level timeline for the Payments Transaction Data Sharing and Data Analytics strategic solution?

Yes (●) No ( )

If not, what timing would you suggest and why?

Further assessment for timings should be considered following completion of a design phase, and any re-planning on the NPA architecture or other change programmes where functionality might be leveraged.

Question 6.7 PSPs Corporates SMEs Vendors

Do you agree with the establishment of the recommended framework for the sharing and exchanging of a core set of SME customer data overseen by a governance body?

Yes (●) No ( )

If not, please explain your reasoning.

A data sharing model with standards that helps us manage our internal KYC processes, and our clients' their KYC processes, is welcomed.

Question 6.8 PSPs Corporates

We are keen to get your input on the benefits provided by the framework.

a. Do you agree that the focus on sharing a core set of SME customer data is beneficial for the KYC processes in your organisation?

Yes (●) No ( )

If not, please explain your reasoning.

It would speed up collection of KYC data within the initial due diligence of onboarding and periodic review processes but will still require us to validate using our risk methodology. Also, internal policies may need to shift to begin or increase adoption of centralised repositories of SME data without acquiring documentary evidence of its source e.g. XML time-stamp at field level can

b. Which other business activities could be supported by / benefit from the described sharing and exchanging a core set of SME customer data?

Legal processes to populate SME's entity profile, maintaining 'golden' internal SME record of identifiable information e.g. legal name, registered address etc. - these are all critical for other regulatory requirements such as PSD2 etc.

Question 6.9 PSPs Corporates SMEs Vendors

Do you agree that the topics covered by the standards will provide sufficient guidance in order to implement the data sharing framework without being too prescriptive?

Yes ( ) No ( )

Are there additional topics you believe should be included?

N/A

Question 6.10 PSPs Corporates SMEs Vendors

To engender trust in the sharing and exchanging of a core set of SME customer data, are there other responsibilities you would expect the governance body to have oversight over?

Compliance on the use cases of data within the participants (SMEs, PSPs, Data Providers etc.)
- Checking that the data is being used as intended
- Be a 'go-to' body for the consenting owner of the data when the shared data is thought to/has been mis-used

Question 6.11 PSPs Corporates SMEs Vendors

In your view, do any existing bodies (industry or other), already perform this oversight role?

Yes ○ No ●

If not, is there an existing body you believe should perform this role, or would you expect a new body to be established?

We support an approach where oversight can be performed with little or no overlap with other bodies however appreciate the specialist nature of SME customer data sharing for KYC purposes. Given the latter, a new body could be established so that data sharing standards can be upheld and have adequate industry knowledge of all the participants in the framework

---

Question 6.12 PSPs Vendors

Do you think a temporary testing environment as described is the right approach? If not, please explain your reasoning.

Yes ○ No ○

N/A

Question 6.13 PSPs Vendors

Are there any other key features you would expect in the temporary testing environment?

Yes ● No ○

We expect the testing environment to be used primarily by technical users and product owners so functionality similar to those offered by 'GitHub' might be useful in this context. Being able to provide access control, collaboration (e.g. wiki), and easier change/release management may encourage more innovation

---

Question 6.14 Vendors

Do you agree that value-added service providers would benefit from the data sharing environment enabled by the framework?

Yes ○ No ○

N/A

Question 6.15 PSPs Corporates

Are the arguments put forward compelling enough to encourage net data providers to engage?

Yes ◯ No ◯

If not, please provide examples of what else would be required to make them participate.

N/A

Question 6.16 PSPs Corporates

Do you see other advantages or challenges for net data consumers that were not listed above?

Yes ◯ No ◯

Please explain your answer.

N/A

Question 6.17 PSPs Corporates SMEs Vendors

Do you agree with the high-level implementation timeline for the Trusted KYC Data Sharing solution?

Yes ◉ No ◯

If not, what timing would you suggest and why?

The timelines appear to be feasible but we believe consideration should be taken with the impact of GDPR as it will apply in the UK from 25 May 2018.

Question 6.18 PSPs Corporates SMEs Vendors

Are there other initiatives with a similar focus that should be considered in order to deliver the Trusted KYC Data Sharing solution?

Not similar, but may impact definition of data sharing standards and solutions developed by the net data providers - GDPR.

Accenture is positioning to develop an 'AML / KYC' technical utility for mid and top tier banks - a proposition as a 'KYC Service

Save Questionnaire*

* Please save your questionnaire and email to us at Forum@psr.org.uk in PDF format by no later than **22 September 2017**.