ACCC CDR Rules Framework-Submission

SunTec Business Solutions

October 2018

The power to **xelerate**

SunTec™

Contents

The power to xelerate

1   About SunTec Business Solutions

At SunTec Business Solutions, we help our clients increase the lifetime value of their customer relationships through effective revenue management and real-time customer experience orchestration. With a legacy of about 70 deployments in over 44 countries, SunTec is a trusted partner to some of the world's leading banks, digital and communication services, travel, and retail providers. Headquartered in India, we have our offices in the USA, UK, Germany, UAE and Singapore.

1.1   SunTec's play in the Open banking space

Actively working with organizations moving towards platform-based business models for the past 20 months across geographies including Europe, Middle East, APAC and now expanding in Australia & North America.

In active conversations with about 50 banks in Europe. Closely working with them on their post PSD2 compliance Open banking strategies.

SunTec's offering for enterprises can enable transformation towards a true value aggregator. The advisory offering enables them identify the right platformification strategy.

SunTec has developed itself as a thoughtleader in the Open banking space, especially in Europe.

The power to xelerate

2 Overview

At the onset SunTec would like to thank the Australian Government and ACCC - Australian Competition & Consumer Commission for this opportunity to state our views on the **"CDR Rules Framework"**. SunTec Business Solutions has been closely working on Open Banking for the past 20 months and has been in active conversations with key banks in Europe and other geographies to enable them achieve their open banking and platformification strategy.

We at SunTec Business Solutions have referred to various document published for review & consultation named as **"ACCC CDR Rules Framework - PDF"**. For specific feedback & suggestions and ease of reference to the document, we have mentioned the specific section names as sub-headers (e.g. 3.1, 3.2 & so on) in section 3 of this document.

3 Suggestions & feedback on specific sections

3.1 General obligations and structure of the rules framework (Section 1, Page 12)

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	Product attributes which can be shared can be dependent on the product type. For ex: the details shared for credit card product can be different from a mortgage product.

3.2 Sharing data with third party recipients (Section 2, Page 13)

Input type	Inputs
Clarification	Will there be API standards (by consumer type, product type, transaction type etc.) which will be published for to which the data holder has to comply with? Which governing body is responsible for publishing these API standards?

3.3 Sharing must not attract a fee (Section 2.3, Page 13)

Input type	Inputs
Clarification	Is there a possibility in future for charging the data/information provided by data holder? Does ACCC propose all the data to be shared free of charge which is mandated and leave it to the discretion of data holder whether they want to charge for the additional data or not? Some instances of value added data needed from customer, transaction and product perspective would help in clarifying the concept better.

3.4 CDR consumer – who may take advantage of the CDR? (Section 3, Page 14)

Input type	Inputs
Clarification	When is it envisaged to bring "Offline consumers" in scope of CDR and is there any timeline identified for this? Points which need to be considered are mentioned below for consideration -

Input type	Inputs
	- "Consent", "Authentication", "Authorization"- How will it happen for offline consumers? - How will the data sharing happen to ADRs? - How will the proposals flow from ADRs to consumers? - There should be additional initiatives from ACCC to bring offline consumers online.
Clarification	What is the specification or criteria for identifying "Large business customers" and other segments?

3.5 Former customers (Section 3, Page 14)

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	Purge of former customer data - Data holder will need to purge the former customer data after a certain period of time. This time period has to be defined. Till the time of purge, what are the obligations on the data holder?

3.6 Exemptions (Section 4.4, Page 17)

Input type	Inputs
Clarification	Are there any definite rules & parameters identified by ACCC for exemption of ADR?

3.7 Derived data (Section 5.2, Page 18)

Input type	Inputs
Clarification	Is there any timeline identified for bringing in the derived/value- added data to be brought in further versions? Parameters should be clearly defined to define the level of sophistication to differentiate levels of derived data. A derived data can range from data processing which can be based on simple rule based calculation to dynamic machine learning algorithms.

3.8 Data sets (Section 5.3, Page 18)

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	This can be considered when ACCC plans to extend the scope to "Former consumers". If the relationship with the data holder ended before Jan 1, 2017, such consumers can be kept completely out of scope.

3.9 Transaction data (Section 5.3.2, Page 19)

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	More specific definition on what is called as "Reasonably identified CDR consumer". Any information about consumer or combination of information which classifies as being called "identity" of the consumer.
Suggestion	Some of the possible meta-data parameters are listed down below for further consideration – - Transaction time - Geo-location of transaction - Currency of transaction - Channel of transaction

Input type	Inputs
	- Device ID - Transaction type (Cr./ Dr. /Interest payment & so on) - Segment / Sub-segment - Product type - Account type - Transaction origination partner - Partner ID - Tax parameters - Waivers - Reversal (Y/N) - Status And so on.

3.10 Reciprocity (Section 5.4, Page 21)

Input type	Inputs
Clarification	It is understood that ACCC does not propose to make any rule regarding reciprocity in first version of the rules framework. Does this also mean that ADR is not entitled to further share consumer's data to any further parties and the origination of data sharing is only from data holder in version 1?

3.11 Accreditation (Section 6, Page 22)

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	Already registered as a certified AISP, PISP (under PSD2) can be one of the parameters for reduced accreditation requirement. For the accredited entities, is there a periodic review process identified to be performed by ACCC?

3.12 Accreditation status disclosure (Section 6.2.2, Page 27)

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	For version 1, it is suggestible to go ahead with the format used by FCA in UK. Additional details can be included like "date till which the accreditation holds" etc.

3.13 Consequences of revocation or suspension of accreditation (Section 6.7.1, Page 29)

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	In case of revocation or suspension of accreditation, ACCC should make sure that the data already received by ADR is deleted permanently as this presents a higher risk of data being misused by the ADR.

3.14 Joint accounts and complex authorizations (Section 8.1.1, Page 33)

Input type	Inputs

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	In case of joint account holders, an explicit information can be held at account level to make any of the account holder as the "Consent provider". For new accounts, this information can be sought at the time of account opening while for the existing accounts, information can be sought as an update action from the account holders.

3.15 Minors (Section 8.1.2, Page 33)

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	For minor accounts, ACCC can look at making a parent/guardian as a "Consent provider".

3.16 Consent should be time limited (Section 8.3.1, Page 37)

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	ACCC can also look at the consent renewal. When the consent expires, the data holder is informed of the same and it can be extended if the data holder wishes to.

3.17 Consumer dashboard (Section 9.8, Page 45)

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	A centralized dashboard which can be maintained by the central agency (or ACCC) which gives a consolidated view of all the consents given by the consumer to all the data holders in a single shot.

3.18 Disclosure of consumer data to other parties (Section 12.1, Page 48)

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	For version 1, ACCC can come out with limited categories of non-ADRs (depending on the use cases identified) with whom the consumer data can be shared which can be extended in further versions of CDR rules.

3.19 Safeguard 12: Correction of CDR data (Section 13, Page 57)

Input type	Inputs
Suggestion	An audit trail of the changes made to CDR data should be maintained to accommodate for traceability & reversals.

3.20 General approach (Section 14.1, Page 57)

Input type	Inputs
Clarification	Some examples and instances on multi-lateral contract cases will help in further clarifying this concept.