

## Appendix 1: Participation Model and Rules of Approach

Areas to be Addressed	Benefit being sought by participant <sup>1</sup>	Short term Deliverable (in 2016)	Medium term Deliverable (in 2017) <sup>2</sup>	Long term Deliverable (2018 +) <sup>2</sup>	
<sup>1</sup> Benefits to be sought, clarified and extended in June 2016 by stakeholder group		<sup>2</sup> Medium and Long Term Deliverables to be Clarified and Confirmed by 31 Oct 2016			
1	Common terminology				
	Terminology should be the same across the PSOs unless there is good reason for variance to enhance user understanding, including technology and infrastructure terminology	Ease understanding and therefore time	Common top level definitions and mapping to scheme specific definitions  Initial quick wins to identify any common terms currently in use across all Schemes  Agree a control mechanism to keep alignment over time	Review public-facing (web?) content, updating to new terms where necessary  Identify whether there should be sub categories of commonality e.g. LINK, Visa and MasterCard in one category, BACS, Chaps, Faster Payments, Cheque and Credit Clearing in another  Commence update of scheme documentation with terms from industry glossary	Common terminology across schemes and the PSR  Review and update all Scheme documentation, on a rolling basis as part of regular review  Identify whether terminology can be amended to align with other Schemes  Complete update of scheme documentation with terms from industry glossary
2	Common eligibility criteria				
	Eligibility criteria and baseline requirements for every PSO should be made common where possible (those with additional regulatory obligations may have different requirements)	Clarity on what is needed to join the schemes	Consolidated table of criteria across schemes  Reverse table outlining for a particular PSP type the eligibility	Governance approval to changes; then apply changes where necessary  Medium to Long term, identify whether eligibility should be aligned. As with above this may need to be within sub categories  Modify and agree eligibility criteria in scheme rules to align with high-level proposal	Medium to Long term, identify whether eligibility should be aligned. As with above this may need to be within sub categories
3	Categorisation of Participants				
	At present, each PSO categorises participants in a different way (e.g. by volume/ value, etc.). It is important to understand why there are differences between participants	Participant understands categorisation and purpose	Definitions of Categorisations (e.g. Direct/indirect)  Categorisation and Mapping table explaining where used and why	Common Catagorisation  Governance approval to changes; then apply changes where necessary	
4	Articulation of payment products common by PSO				

	There is a need for commonality between the way products are referred to and the way their features and core characteristics are defined	Ease of understanding	Table outlining scheme products and their characteristics  Publish table		
5	Engagement with indirect participants prospective entrants and providers				
	Improving awareness, involvement, communication and the PSPs and interested parties voice to PSOs	Understanding of what might be possible	Best practice shared across schemes	Consider Case Studies, reach out to BSA, ABCUL etc. to spread message wider  Not Applicable to Link as Members are direct Members  Relaunch/replace current Affiliates Group	Ensure resourced to handle potential demand  Not Applicable to Link as Members are direct Members
6	Rules, Procedures and Participant Agreements				
	Consider how rules are different and if they should be different	Simpler to understand and comply.	Table outlining Commonality and difference in rules and reason for differences  Guide to rules pointing to areas/documents - to be at a suitable elevated level	Focus on Visa and MasterCard as commonality with ISOCC less clear  Commence execution of plan for alignment	Alignment of Rules and agreements where appropriate
7	Technical Accreditation Process				
	Some PSOs have technical requirements. Clarity is needed on the differences between PSOs' requirements and why they exist	Reduce cost in gaining accreditation	High level cross scheme technical requirements document (including accreditation)	Document technical differences	
8	Assurance process				
	Managing the risk that a new or existing participant brings to the PSO (assurance models are currently managed by individual PSOs)	Answer a question once that is applicable to all schemes reduces effort.	Documented common assurance requirements.	Review process in light of feedback and refine  Medium term, there will be some commonality with ISOCC but possibly more so with Visa and MasterCard e.g. Independent ATM Deployers are very different and distinct from a Financial Institution, don't need to be regulated etc.  Commence execution of plan for alignment	Continue to review to ensure assurance remains relevant

9	On-boarding process and migration to common connectivity models				
	Common project plans, standard engagement models, sharing expertise between PSOs, providing budget and cost estimates for participants (will vary widely)	Allows PSP to conduct better planning	Publish average timeline for joining schemes		
	At present each PSO has different connectivity model. Consider how a more common approach could reduce cost and complexity	Reduce cost by adding competition to provide connectivity Aid migration to other providers	Current focus is on deployment of the aggregator model simplify PSP connectivity	Explore how a separate communications layer could facilitate easier access – allow PSPs to select a provider, rather than have to use infrastructure’s preferred supplier	Decouple communications layer to benefit PSPs and aggregators A big topic that needs consideration in its own right
10	Access to information and documentation				
	Information is currently tightly controlled, making it difficult for PSPs and advisors to develop solutions or provide advice. There are currently a number of NDAs in place which may act as a barrier to communication and transparency, although it is acknowledged that a PSP and PSO may enter into an NDA for mutual protection.	Enable greater understanding of work needed by the PSP because they have all the information	For all schemes, list documents by title and when in the on-boarding process they are made available	Having reviewed Rules/Procedures etc., look to make more documentation publicly available Medium term Schemes should then align on the point at which an NDA is required. Where it can’t be aligned identify why Documentation updates/ development to improve information quality	