1	DAY 2 – PERSONAL BANKING SERVICES MARKET STUDY CONFERENCE
2	SESSION 5 – OPEN BANKING (CONTINUED)
4	SESSION 3 - OF EN BANKING (CONTINCED)
5	14 MAY 2024
6 7	
8	Adjournment from 10.37 am to 11.05 am
9	JOHN SMALL: We'll recommence the session in just a tick, but just before we do, just a little
10	shout out to our friend Katherine over in the corner here who's recording all this diligently.
11	And also, I guess, associated with that a reminder that we're all speaking loudly and clearly
12	in our best inside voices and saying our names so Katherine can pick all that up. Thank
13	you very much and Bryan's going to lead us off.
14	BRYAN CHAPPLE: Thanks John, thanks Katherine. I just wanted to move on from the sort of
15	more general discussion we started with this morning and just pick up some of the detail in
16	the submissions. One of the ones we had was from Worldline that Kiwibank inclusion is
17	key for adoption of open banking. So just wanted to check with other fintechs how much
18	that mattered and why it mattered, if anyone's got a perspective on that that they want to
19	share.
20	JULIA NICOL: Hi, Julia here from Worldline. A bit weird commenting on your own
21	submission, but I would just like to double down on that point. So we've been told by
22	Inland Revenue and NZTA that they won't stop accepting POLi and move to our product
23	Online EFTPOS which is an open banking payments product, until Kiwibank is on board.
24	So that's quite a big blocker, especially when Adam from Revolut said something that
25	changes consumer behaviour is if government agencies support open banking products.
26	SHAUN FORGIE: Hi, Shaun Forgie from Bill Rush. I mentioned in some of my previous
27	comments around this, these notions of profiles. Open banking's quite a it's an elaborate,
28	big, evolving specification. And in order to unlock value that had pre-defined scopes and
29	contexts, this notions of profiles around consumer to consumer, business to consumer,
30	business to business, government to consumer are very valuable constructs for us to get our
31	heads around because they unlock pre-defined sets of benefits to different parts of society.
32	I think that's going to be the way forward for us because it will allow banks, and
33	other open banking participants, to announce compliance or support for those profiles. And
34	once released those profiles are likely to be quite stable. It will allow for evolution in
35	different areas and it will allow for banks to adopt different sizes, including Kiwibank, to

adopt the open banking standard as a series of releases rather than one large monolithic design and build.

So we need to get our heads around how do we release this in a modular way, how do we scope and define bundles of benefits for certain areas of society by using these profile definitions. Thanks.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Thank you. Anyone else want to comment on that? Up to you. Mike from Kiwibank.

MIKE HENDRIKSEN: Mike Hendriksen, Kiwibank. Didn't want to monopolise the voice of Kiwibank, but unfortunately our colleague who can speak with more gravitas on this is ill so couldn't attend today. I think the points that Kiwibank would make is we're very supportive of open banking, we think it is the way for all Kiwis to be better off, and ultimately they are all our shareholders as well as our customers, and so we're supportive.

The thing that struck me this morning was how we're still quite fractured in our conversations and how the suggestion from Adam and Dean, amongst others, about how you have a more metricated and sensible roadmap, which sort of highlights not only what the industry's doing but also the way in which the regulations will hang together, is worthwhile. We've got, as already been mentioned, authorisation, the retail payments conversation, CDR, you know, the sooner we get clear on what the plan is the better.

In terms of Kiwibank's readiness for open banking, we have committed to a timeline which we think is reflective of a pretty standard approach overseas where the large banks go first and the other banks follow. So the staggered approach which was agreed with the API Centre is where we're heading. And we thought that if the CDR had been moving quicker the same result would obtain, so we don't think there's anything unorthodox in us not being where we are. We are actively, as part of our overall transformation, getting ready for API banking and not just in the technical sense, in the holistic sense that we've discussed this morning.

So we think as open banking evolves over the next couple of years that will help us, not only be technically ready, but also ready for the, you know, the sort of fully operational, wherever we may land that. So yeah, that's where we're at.

I mean I think the question of proportionality is pretty fundamental to the reasons why we have ended up in stage two. And then obviously the banks with a smaller size than us will follow sometime thereafter, there's no timeframe as yet for them. And we take the

view that if a use case is justifiable for 85% of New Zealand customers then it should stand on its feet, it doesn't need Kiwibank to push it over the line.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Thanks Mike. I might just take us on to the question of sort of roadmap which has been talked about a bit this morning, and just interested in perspectives about how broad that should be, so what it needs to encompass, what needs to be agreed sort of industry-wide, you know, in the concept of that's incorporating all the voices of the different users and customers and so forth as well. So what needs to be agreed industry-wide and what is left to sort of individual commercial arrangements. So I guess how big does that -- how broad does it have to be, yeah.

JODY BULLEN: Thank you. Jody Bullen, ANZ. I think I was one that kept forgetting to say my name. In terms of the roadmap I think we made the point earlier on it needs to be customer-centric, there's already a process in place with industry around prioritisation that's led through community members of the API Centre. So I think there's certainly an opportunity to think about how do we bring a stronger customer view to that roadmap, and I think there also needs to be the NZ Inc regulatory lens on that view as well, so what are we really chasing, because there are different views across many individual parties about what we should and shouldn't be doing. And the reality is we don't have a finite amount of resource to work with, so we need to make prioritisation call. So I think that's the first thing, how do we bring the customer advocacy stronger to that, how do we make sure all views are represented and how do we prioritise. And that should set us up well for making sure that the industry is working together to deliver that, and therefore everything else sort of falls behind that, as well as the outcomes.

I think the other part that we need to be conscious of is getting too far ahead of ourselves. What we've seen in the industry is it's very easy to pull together a technical standard. It's really easy to work out how we're going to interchange data. And to be clear, ANZ has never questioned the security of those standards. But the reality is, is that security and customer protections are quite different, so there's a technical security aspect and then there's the what do we actually have to do to protect customers that are using those services. And often I think it was talked about the authorisation fraud is actually, in most cases, where these types of things happen, less about compromise of system.

So the view is, is that we need to take a very conscious view about what's required to set this up for success, what are the foundations that we really need. And I think ANZ's view, we would be better off spending time working out what are those really key

foundations that need to be in place, and one of those would be digital identity fully integrated into the open banking standards, things around fraud protections and all those things that we need, and making sure what we are releasing to consumers is going to sustain for the long run.

There is a counter view that we rush ahead and build standards that are potentially beyond jurisdictional that have been implemented overseas, that great, they're going to enable a whole load of innovation, but that's time we have to spend thinking about what the risk implications of those and potentially building on foundations that haven't really cured and hardened may not be the best thing for consumers.

So I think the roadmap needs to balance, in summary, the consumer aspect, but also how do we set this up for success and making sure that it's set up as a service and that customers understand and are protected. Thank you.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Any other perspectives on that question about how broad the roadmap needs to -- yeah, Catherine. Thanks.

CATHERINE McGRATH: I guess my view -- sorry, Catherine McGrath from Westpac. I think it's hard to determine what are the exact characteristics, but setting up a process with the right group around the table to agree what that looks like would feel like a sensible path forward. The characteristics that were described that said we need to be very clear about what the service standards are. It is a mindset shift for a bank to look at TPPs as an intrinsic part of a customer relationship as well. And whilst we may have -- others may have understood that, certainly for the UK banks that was quite a big movement in change. So being clear for each constituent part what are the foundations that need to be built in what order I think would be a good thing for a clear group to resolve rather than for the Commission to try and work that out in isolation.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Yeah, understand that. Can I just follow-up. So, you know, there is an industry group already, centred around the API Centre and Payments NZ, which already has elements of this and I'm certainly not wishing to, picking up your point earlier Jody, not wishing to undermine what's been achieved and has been done or to discount that; but obviously people are wanting something more. So, you know, what's stopping the industry -- do you need something from government or the regulators, what is it that we need to -- because industry could set up, could have included more customer voice themselves, you know, there's a lot of these things within your own gift. Do you want to comment on that?

1 **CATHERINE McGRATH:** Yeah, so Catherine McGrath, Westpac. 2 **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** Sorry Catherine. **CATHERINE McGRATH:** My reflection, as someone coming into the market, is it hasn't had 3 the degree of focus on it for understandable reasons because of all the other things that were 4 happening over the last two years. 5 6 BRYAN CHAPPLE: Right, okay, yeah. **CATHERINE McGRATH:** And I think the heart of something that's good, and to the point that 7 8 says New Zealand's actually made progress without regulation is good. BRYAN CHAPPLE: Yeah. 9 10 **CATHERINE McGRATH:** I also think it's fair to say, was the pace fast enough?, but I think what you've seen is once the banks agreed to a date, the banks are working to that date and 11 didn't require regulation to say we're working towards that date. 12 **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** Yes. 13 **CATHERINE McGRATH:** So I think it's a useful opportunity to say how do we make the 14 components that we've got even more effective. I think there is stuff that's happening in the 15 wrong order; the CDR is a really important part of it, and the industry can only go so far 16 and then there's something else that's going to come in. So there's a sequencing that is not 17 straightforward. 18 **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** Not optimal, yeah. 19 20 **CATHERINE McGRATH:** And not optimal. I think the other thing that's interesting is that we are choosing the data that people would be most bothered about to get them to adopt to 21 move it first. And I understand why we're doing that, but I think there's also a question that 22 says what are some of the easier things to help drive adoption before you get to some of the 23 more sensitive and more risky data to check. 24 So I think it is within our gift and you're right to say that, and I think it 25 needs probably a bit more focus from all of us and making sure -- because I did read some 26 of the submissions that TPPs don't feel that they are in a conflicted position and that they 27 can't speak up loudly because they're worried about a consequence in terms of an 28 engagement with the bank. And that's why my suggestion was having -- you can't do 29 something with 20 or 30 people in the room, you can make a lot of progress with a smaller 30

number in the room, and you need a representative from a consumer perspective, you need

a representative from a TPP with respected voices and relationships to help that boat go

31

32

33

faster.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Okay, that is helpful thank you. Jody did you want to?

JODY BULLEN: Yes, Jody Bullen, ANZ. I think part of it is that if you talked about what can the Commission do, I think we've talked heavily about the need for collaboration.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Yes.

JODY BULLEN: And I say the ease, the ease to generate a technical standard versus the complexity of implementing the technical standard, building an operating model around it and then actually enabling third parties to use it are quite different. So we have been challenged around not being able to really engage in those deep conversations as an industry, and so therefore, you know, that means going off and sort of doing that in silo and therefore we're now in the bilateral model. So I think our ask is the industry has reached out and asked for an authorisation to enable those conversations.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Yeah.

JODY BULLEN: And going back to the point around foundations, there is a lot of foundational work that has to be done and we kind of need to get everybody up to the same level, and then potentially those next round of increments can happen a lot quicker.

The last point, I guess, is just around the priority. Yes, there is a mechanism in place, you know, there is something there that could be leveraged. And because of that lag obviously decisions that we're seeing turning up now were actually priority decisions made many years ago. And so the idea that the environment has changed, how do we build flex into that, and that's going to be a challenge for anybody to balance how do we provide certainty but also flexibility to actually learn and change.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Yeah, okay. I understand the point about, you know, obviously there's an authorisation process underway. As John said we can't talk about that because it's in process. But I think would make a more generic point, that if there are areas where you think it would be sensible for industry to collaborate and you are concerned that we may have a problem with that, then you should reach out proactively because we're wanting to help get the right thing rather than be an obstacle.

So often the issues that people raise are not ones that have concern to us and we can allay those concerns easily, or else help people find a way through that's bread and butter. Yeah, over at the back and then I'm going to go online to a question online.

JASON ROBERTS: Thank you. Jason Roberts from FintechNZ. Firstly thank you for your efforts bringing this to the sector. What I'd like to address, I think, is the fact that from an industry perspective there are needs for more assistance. So in the context of FintechNZ,

which is a neutral body and contains many of the banks and fintechs and so on within the room, our goal really is to enable the voice of our members to come through in terms of what open banking looks like in practice.

Now, with respect to the likes of Payments NZ, who are fundamentally paid for and managed by the banks -- sorry, not managed by the banks, but supported by the banks, and the openness, if you like, to the third-party providers for coming in and being a part of the API Centre is excellent, no question on that. However, I do feel that the sector is lacking from a broader picture of clarity of regulation, about investment and support for the likes of fintechs and others to come through that can be enabled to have a voice to compete and actually have more impact on the sector.

The broader picture that we've been looking at as an industry is around collaboration. But, dare I say it, the likes of FintechNZ do actually suffer from being an industry-only group. We don't have any funding and support other than from our members, and therefore we can never have a strong voice or really have deeper impact at whatever level it might need to be.

So I think my bigger message is, help maybe an open banking group be set up that includes the likes of FintechNZ, and other groups, Digital Identity and so on, to be more empowered to support the wide industry goal around better customer outcome, more competition and so on. So it's a broader picture, I know, but that would be our message, Chair, thank you.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Thank you. I'm just going to go online to Dean Rea from Banzpay. Hi Dean.

DEAN REA: Thanks very much. Look I wanted to make a couple of observations here. I agree with the comments that have been made about the sequencing being suboptimal. It's been very unhelpful to have CDR on again off again, on again off again and not really clear as to how that fits into the overall framework. But it is what it is, so we just have to work with the hand that we're dealt there.

In terms of thinking about a roadmap, I think you can think about that roadmap at three levels. One is a short-term roadmap that gets you from where we are today to 30 June, or whatever date in June is going to be decided as when we should be fully operational with open banking. And if you look at the Payments NZ paper that was released on open banking in, I think it was November last year, that paper at various points cries out in different ways for regulatory top cover. We're not going to get very far with

this unless there is an empowered regulator who can step in to sort out roadblocks when they arise. And that's not to say that there's any nefarious behaviour on the part of industry, but there are things that do need to be sorted and as we come up against them we need to be able to turn to a regulator who can act.

There's also a longer term roadmap that needs to be taken into consideration because, as Adam pointed out this morning, this is just the first step in a much longer journey that takes you towards open finance and ultimately towards open data.

And I think the final observation I'd make about roadmaps is we need all of this to be put in the context of an overarching payments modernisation plan for the whole system. Payments NZ delivered that plan in 2020, it was less a plan and more sort of a statement of aspiration. But that drastic -- that is in dire need of updating and it needs to be connected with what we're doing now on open banking and the other elements that need to come together to make this ecosystem really fire.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Thank you. Yes.

SHANE MARSH: Shane Marsh, Dosh. Just wanted to further some of the comments made by Jason from FintechNZ. Dosh is a leader in digital banking innovation and it's our view that open banking in and of itself is unlikely to have any material impact on competition in the personal banking market.

If you look at the factors that drove successive open banking in the UK, those factors are very different than the situation here in New Zealand. So firstly, in the UK open banking and PSD2 came out of the GFC in a view by the UK and European regulators to improve competition in the market; and so open banking was driven together with a lowering of the barriers to entry into the banking market. And I mentioned in my discussion yesterday that the capital required to start a bank is £1 million in the UK versus NZ\$30 million New Zealand. So lowering the barriers of entry to enable competition is critical to go alongside open banking.

Also capital and funding. So when open banking was rolling out in the UK, there was a great focus on fintech investment globally, 1 in every \$4 of investment went into fintech. That market's substantially cooled and in New Zealand last year the total funding that went into fintechs in New Zealand was NZ\$20 million for the entire industry. So realistically if we think what impact new entrants, and Adam talked about the importance of new entrants in terms of lifting the bar is going to have, being backed with \$20 million across the entire industry will make no impact.

The third difference is in the UK it was regulator-led, government-led. We've talked about this a little bit here today that in New Zealand it's been industry-led and that has led to a governance issue. And I know that we won't talk about it because the authorisation is under review, but the reality is that we have an industry body in Payments NZ owned by the banks where the banks on their directors approving recommendations from the API Centre and approving members to the API Council; and I don't understand how that could be not deemed a conflict of interest, or in the best position to enable a fair and equitable open banking regime going forward.

So those are the three big differences that, unless they are solved, I don't believe open banking's going to make any difference to competition in New Zealand. Thank you **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** Thanks for that perspective. Akahu.

JOSH DANIEL: Josh Daniel, Akahu. Just wanted to pick up a point around centralised accreditation. First of all it was really heartening to hear the consistent voice supporting centralised accreditation. That is different to how we perceived that a year or two ago where we felt there was more resistance to regulation. And we do think it will make a massive impact having centralised accreditation.

I wanted to comment on what will be achieved if the authorisation application is granted, because I just wanted to make it clear that that will not get us to centralised accreditation. It will be a step towards it, we'll be able to discuss things within the scope of the authorisation application, but even if that work is successful, which will take a lot of time and is uncertain, there will still need to be terms in bilateral contracts with every bank. So we don't get to centralised accreditation through an authorisation application that is granted. So we'll still have the issues, we believe, that exist at the moment. Just pause there to make sure that that was clear?

- **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** I understood what you said.
- JOSH DANIEL: Great, thank you.

- **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** We can't comment on the authorisation process, that would be inappropriate, but I heard what you said.
 - **JOSH DANIEL:** Yes, just making sure that I was articulating that clearly. So then coming back to your prompt about the roadmap. So in our view there needs to be a trade-off between taking inspiration from the use cases that are in market where we can see consumer demand and therefore we should enable API functionality that meets that demand. But we should also not be overly prescriptive; because like with any new technology, like the internet, like

open banking, these APIs will spur innovation that we can't predict at the moment. So we shouldn't be overly prescriptive saying here are the services that we are going to offer, it should be enabling.

And that's kind of a non-answer because it sounds like you're looking for details around what that roadmap should look like. But I guess the point that we would make is that's the balance that you're trying to get, is taking inspiration from what is clearly demand at the moment and enabling innovation.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Thank you. Look I don't think -- maybe to echo Catherine's point, I don't think we necessarily want to be writing the roadmap ourselves, or trying to come up with all that detail, I think we understand the limitations of that. I think what we are trying to do, we see some benefits from open banking, notwithstanding there's a range of perspectives on how successful that will be, and what can we do through this process to help advance it in a way that helps take the industry forward. Acknowledging there's some progress being made, but, you know, more could be done, can we help do that in a way that is sensible. So that's what we're about.

So I think what we're trying to understand here is, what are the dimensions of that, are there some specific things that it's helpful for us to put down as stakes in the ground, or things that government and others can react to in this report.

So there's been some good points made around thinking about the process and the way in which you get people together to take it forward. We're also interested in the scope of what needs to be covered, how broad do we need to go, or how much do we just leave that to the sector to work out. So yeah, Jody.

JODY BULLEN: Jody Bullen, ANZ. I just wanted to touch on the point around it's about the collaboration again, to come back to. If you sort of take the view that we can only solve this together, then the mechanism is really just the next question of how, right? And so, you know, that firmly is a question to answer and people will have different views on it. But the collaboration needs to occur. And I think it was made online, I can't remember the person that made it, but if you take that view, then that needs to inform a right size regulation at the right time.

And so I mean at the moment we can't collaborate in a way we need to; that's the current state. And if we don't move forward then it's going to be bilaterals. So how do we move, you know, I guess the question is how do we enable collaboration and that's, you

know, the thing, regardless of the mechanism. And then when is the right time for 1 2 regulators to step in with that support when the industry cannot solve the problem. BRYAN CHAPPLE: Yeah. 3 **ANTONIA WATSON:** I'd just reiterate, I agree, it's a recommendation on how to enable 4 collaboration and probably a sheriff, if that makes sense. 5 6 BRYAN CHAPPLE: Yeah. **ANTONIA WATSON:** You know, in terms of regulator or whoever that is, who's going to be a 7 sheriff involved in that. 8 **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** Yeah, okay. Can I ask how far the parameters of that need to go? So one 9 10 of the things that people have commented on today is the importance of getting pricing working in a way that supports innovation but also has commercials that are kind of 11 workable for all the different parties, right? So it needs to be kind of something that 12 end-users are going to want to use and the different parties have to be able to make a 13 reasonable return on it. How does that get solved in this -- is that a bilateral process, is that 14 also something that people need to come together on? 15 **JOSH DANIEL:** At the moment it is bilateral, and that is the only future that we can see so far 16 until a regulator steps in and sets a framework for fees. So that is one of the major 17 components where we think a regulator does need to step in. And, you know, obviously 18 payments, for example, are cross-subsidised by banks currently. So, you know, banks 19 20 charge little or no fees for a consumer to go into the app and make a payment and they'll make the money through deposits, or some other service. 21 So we would encourage a regulator to look at the broader business rather than just 22 23 the business of open banking APIs, because if that's priced on a cost recovery basis then the use cases will never be viable. So it needs to be looked at in a holistic sense, we think, to 24 come up with feasible pricing that is enabling. 25 **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** Other perspectives? Catherine, then Jody, then Martin. 26 **CATHERINE McGRATH:** Catherine McGrath, Westpac. My only observation is to continue to 27 reiterate that for things to grow and thrive they need to be commercially viable, and then it 28 29 should start to get its own lease of life. If that doesn't happen, then there'll be stagnation and it won't drive the innovation that's being looked for. 30 **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** Okay, thank you. Were you going to say something? 31 JODY BULLEN: I think --32

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Okay, Martin, then I'll go online after Jody.

33

MARTIN TAYLOR: Thank you very much. Martin Taylor from Positive Money. I think this is a really important conversation to have. I think the thing to bear in mind is, quite rightly, the banks and other players in this have made the point that for collaboration to work there needs to be a viable return to the collaborators, right? Which is essentially, you know, some money needs to flow through the P&L that's representative of the, you know, the money they've invested and the risk they've taken.

I think the other side we need to be thinking about is that a lot of the benefits can reside outside of the P&Ls, because we're talking infrastructure, right? So a lot of the benefits reside outside of the P&Ls of the players. And I think we really need to have a serious conversation about some public money being applied in areas which you can really drive the public benefits and acknowledging that a public benefit, you know, can have a public cost, but which the industry can benefit from, you know, they can take their own risks, they can spend their own money, they can make a return.

So I know in our submission one of the things we put forward was the notion of having like a shared banking service that we've spoken about. Someone like Kiwibank, instead of spending billions on increasing capital, spending millions on supporting an industry initiative to provide, for example, common technology services and banking maybe regulatory help, opening bank accounts. There were some very simple things that came through in the responses from small banks, for example. How can we afford to develop an app and keep developing it so that it's competitive all by ourselves with, you know, tidy customer use.

But of course these are very shareable, you know, technology industry is a wholesale industry. Most people don't see that, but there's vast amounts of the technology industry that is a wholesale business. So a technology shared services hub, a hub that fintechs can tap into, a hub where local players can have a way of developing their products, particularly the business to business, not business to consumer market so much. But these are all things that could have enormous benefits to, not just fintechs, but bricks and mortar banks, small banks, the ones that we need to come and see more of.

And I believe should be funded, at least in the initial stages, with public money, like R&D effectively, or, you know, the public goes in, creates a market, derisks it so the private market can go in and expand it and accelerate it and so on. And that concept could well work here and I think public money used wisely, not as a corporate subsidy but used wisely, is perhaps part of a solution here.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Thank you. I'm going to go online first, there's a couple of people have been waiting. Sorry, Jody, I was going to go to you and then I'll go online.

JODY BULLEN: Thank you, I'll just be very quick. Jody Bullen, ANZ. I probably sound like a broken record, but again, pricing, just like every aspect of open banking, is actually a really complicated topic. You know, I have experience of working with third parties and we've collaborated for our open banking journey, is that different use cases, different third parties, different views. So it is one of those areas that, you know, you need to consider a use case approach and we've talked about customers transferring money between their own accounts versus maybe paying a person, or paying a business maybe for a coffee. But what if it was a \$5,000 flights versus a \$40,000 investment, or a \$100,000 car purchase.

So again, it is a complicated topic and the collaboration aspects does include pricing structures, and the authorisation doesn't include pricing, but again it's a step forward to get us closer to where we are today.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Thank you. Alright, I might just go to Adrian Smith online and then to Lisa Ibarra.

ADRIAN SMITH: Kia ora koutou, Adrian Smith, BlinkPay. This is going to be a little bit soapbox ranty so I apologise in advance. But the assumed best practice, I would love it if we could do that, that would be great. Because I can tell you from personal bitter experience that when everyone's trying to figure it out for themselves, you have to have the same conversations every time. And everything that's won, every inch of ground it's inch by bloody inch and it's hard. You know, when banks can't come to a common view of insurances, that's kind of irritating. Same with pricing models.

So, you know, like at the risk of calling out my mates at the yellow and black bank, they managed to do the whole shooting match with us, on-boarding, due diligence, commercial negotiation, legal negotiation in 25 working days. That's a pretty bloody good template I would argue. Why can't we start there? Sorry Mac. But that's kind of my view. I would love it if we could share best practice across industry.

Second point around pricing models. I wouldn't advocate for setting fees, but I would advocate for at least having a common model. Because when you're having to negotiate on various price models, and some of the models, I'll be honest with you, it's like death by 1,000 cuts. We have to set up macro-enabled Excel spreadsheets to figure out how much it's going to cost you. It's really hard to figure out what's going on in those scenarios.

So we tend to gravitate towards the JROC principles out of the UK where they sort of said look, philosophically here's five principles we think make sense when you're trying to price up commercial APIs, especially when it's something's this nascent and new. As the value is built and developed over time, then you start to think about actually do we then start to add in premium pricing for the value that's created, right? When I think of something that's analogous like card schemes, what gets charged by card schemes today is not what they started with in the 60s. But as time and capability and features are built into those schemes then the value of what was being created and shared was accretive. So that would be whakaaro, thank you.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Kia ora, thanks Adrian. Lisa.

LISA IBARRA: Kia ora, Lisa Ibarra from Payments NZ's API Centre. I want to take us back quickly to conversations on the roadmap. I think the conversation here has been incredibly helpful. Primarily it's highlighted just how complex prioritisation of the open banking roadmap actually is and the passion behind the voices. In Payments NZ we've always been market-led in this sense, and for these first five years we have been consulting with our community contributors, third parties and banks to inform that roadmap.

Following the Commission's letter of expectation that we received a month, two months ago, I wanted to note here for the Commission that the API Council has agreed in the last week to expand our consultation into the market further afield, consult wider on inputs into the roadmap, and essentially we maintain that position that we should be market-led, speaking very clearly in support of those that want to see high value use cases rolled out in New Zealand as a priority. Appreciate some of the comments here around how that roadmap should look, particularly in regards to fraud, digital identity, and that is something that in the API Centre we are certainly incorporating into that thinking around the future roadmap. Thank you.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Thanks Lisa. Julia and then -- yeah.

JULIA NICOL: Thank you, Julia from Worldline. I think one of the big gaps is in-store payments. So the open banking API standards don't contemplate in-store payments at all. I mean you can do like a sort of an e-com in-store, if you like. So you can use your phone to make an online payment, via open banking. But in order for a retailer to be able to accept an open banking payment without having sort of an e-Commerce gateway, it's near on impossible and it's not contemplated in the API Centre standards. Moreover, the kind of

messaging we need to provide sort of safe in-store open banking payments is a long way away. And I don't even think it's on the future roadmap.

So if we are talking about having competition, for us, you know, we don't want just a few people using these products and services, we actually want to be a viable competitive constraint on Visa and Mastercard, and in order for that to happen there needs to be some real change. I mean if you look at our gateways, Online EFTPOS is 2.5% of overall scheme transactions and in-store scheme is about 76% of the transactions. EFTPOS is dying, yeah.

- **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** So what's -- I assume you're part of the API Centre?
- JULIA NICOL: Yes, we're on the working group and business groups.
- BRYAN CHAPPLE: So what's stopping those things being progressed through that process?
- JULIA NICOL: Well, I think it's an appetite to broaden the scope. So that scope is largely
 determined, I think, by the banks and obviously they make lots of money from scheme
 transactions. PNZ holds the rules for EFTPOS, they've not been modernised since the
 1980s substantially. So there's been kind of no focus in-store, if you like, and we've sort of
 gone let's try and do some online stuff. But I think if you want real competition in
 payments, and I understand that's only a small portion of open banking, then something
- JOHN SMALL: So you mention there, Julia, the fact that you see a future where these sort of payments compete with Visa and Mastercard. So that's a competitive threat to those --
- 21 **JULIA NICOL:** Well, that's very generous of you.

needs to be done about in-store.

- JOHN SMALL: Well, you're aspiring to threaten that commerce.
- 23 **JULIA NICOL:** Yeah, we're aspiring.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

18

32

33

- JOHN SMALL: Does it have any bearing at all on progress inside the API Centre?
- JULIA NICOL: Well, I mean I think that, you know, banks are commercially rational, and at the
 moment they've got perfectly good payments products that bring them a great return. So
 why you would invest in alternatives which might not bring the same return, you know, it's
 not a decision banks normally make. So we've been working on an in-store open banking
 payment product and that's going to cost money and the returns might not be as much as
 scheme products. So to get investment for that, people need to consider, I guess, the public
 benefit, which I think my colleague over there was talking about.
 - So, you know, EFTPOS is at, I don't know, 20% of overall transactions at the moment on our switch. There's some other products that go that same way, but they could

quickly move to the other side. So it's just kind of what are we doing, there's no collective acknowledgment that that competitive constraint will go. And we'd like the industry to make a decision about whether it's important to have an alternative payment product or not.

JOHN SMALL: Thank you.

SHAUN FORGIE: Hi, Shaun Forgie from Bill Rush. I'm starting to think that the ability for an individual in New Zealand to initiate a payment and to access their information is a human right. If it's a fundamental human right, it would seem that we need to have the standards managed by government on behalf of every individual in New Zealand. And if we start to think about open banking and the ability to initiate a payment and to access account information as a human right, then it would make sense for us to really start dealing with that with public funding and to have those standards owned and managed by the general public to interact with the banks and to understand the relationship that an individual can have with a financial service provider.

So I think fundamentally I'm sort of forming the opinion that it's actually a set of standards that need to be managed by New Zealanders for New Zealanders and to bring banks along. I don't think we can ask the banks to make changes to their core systems today without them understanding their relationship in the context of what it means to be a New Zealander and our rights to access our bank account information and to transact between ourselves. Banks are likely to come in and support those initiatives, but I think fundamentally the responsibility is on us.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Thanks Shaun. Any other comments on that? Yeah, Kent.

KENT DUSTON: Just an observation, Kent Duston, Banking Reform Coalition. Just an observation coming from having spent a bit of my career in the technology business, is that most innovators understand, most of the new rivals into any technology segment understand that their technology investment, the platform that they're putting in place is kind of a sunk cost in the sense that it's like the table stake in Poker, it's the minimum necessary to play the game. But the actual outcome of the game depends on a whole bunch of other factors that have nothing to do with the table stake. So it's what typically a new innovator coming into a market will understand.

Now that's as true of the incumbent banks as it is for any new innovator coming to market. So we need the incumbents to also recognise that their investments in open banking are the equivalent of the table stake, and that you don't necessarily make any money off the table stake, that's just what's necessary to play the game.

1	We know from the Commission's report that there has been very significant
2	under-investment in the IT systems in the banking sector, and that some of the core systems
3	are now depreciated down to zero book value, so those do require reinvestment. And in
4	that context I don't think it's reasonable for the incumbents to be saying we wish to make a
5	return off the reinvestment in our own core systems. Exactly the same as any of the
6	fintechs coming to market, they understand that that's the table stake, and that the actual
7	outcome will then depend on, because remember allegedly the data sitting on those systems
8	is our data as customers, it doesn't belong to the bank. But there's the expectation, it almost
9	seems, that the banks may wish to monetise that. And I think that that would be an obstacle
10	to the industry developing well and that the expectation around reinvestment should be
11	there on the incumbents as much as it is on the innovators that are coming to market.
12	BRYAN CHAPPLE: Okay, thank you. That's been helpful. I think what we might do is sort of
13	move to just get a bit more specific around some of the things that we've heard of that are
14	barriers to making progress here from the submissions and other discussions we've had. So
15	we might just move to that now and then we'll see where that leads us.
16	TRISTAN GILBERTSON: Maybe picking up on the technology theme, as you say, the report
17	talks about the importance of technology and systems as an enabler of competition. One of
18	the responses we got back from the banks quite clearly was a view that their core systems
19	don't limit, or aren't limiting progress, the progress of fintechs in particular. And we were
20	quite keen in this forum to get a view back from the fintechs on how they see it from their
21	side of the fence. Do you see it that way, or not? If not why not? Is somebody prepared to
22	speak to that?
23	JOHN SMALL: Probably best if it's somebody who's already got a partnering deal. Maybe
24	Adrian if he's online, or who's over here?
25	RAJESH SINGH: Hi, my name is Rajesh, I'm from 3Plus. But the perspective I want to bring is
26	actually I used to work for Standard Chartered Bank in Singapore and Hong Kong for about
27	12 years. I think Singapore and Hong Kong are actually not very different from
28	New Zealand in terms of if you look at the size of the market and as a developed economy.
29	And also the banking structure; there are like four or five banks which are large and then

What really changed, and there was similar demand for we need to have more innovation in the market. And what really changed was when regulators actually did decide to take a stab at actually inviting for digital banking licence. So I do think if we

you don't really have a long tail behind it.

really want to drive innovation, which is for betterment of the customers, then we have to touch upon how do you increase competition, and one of the ways to do it will be to introduce new digital bank licensing which will also address. And the reason I wanted to pick on this theme is because it allows you to build something from scratch and you can actually move on from the legacy systems and platform.

So in Standard Chartered we rolled out two new digital banks, Mox in Hong Kong and Trust in Singapore, and both of them actually use new core banking platform rather than depending on the legacy platform that we had. So I think Dosh, Shane, you mentioned about competition. I do feel that's a very key element of why we're not talking about introducing new digital banking licences, especially given there are fintechs who are relatively well progressed in terms of the capabilities and banking products they already provide.

JOHN SMALL: Thank you. That's a helpful contribution. We're also interested in the access point and the ability of fintechs to interact in a practical sense with the major banks, let's say, through the APIs. And so I believe Adrian is online and so I just extend this question to you, Adrian, since you've got an agreement already, as you've told us. So does the state, or age, or condition of your partner's core banking infrastructure impede your ability to connect and provide services?

ADRIAN SMITH: Short answer, Dr Small, is yes. Some of the infrastructure of the major banks has got some systemic weaknesses which means that some parts of the API swaggers can't be honoured. And so you then have to find ways to work around them, which then have flow-through effects to any other parties you may wish to on-board to have access to your payment gateway.

So that is a big part of the challenge. And I think it's fair to say that potentially we haven't invested in our core infrastructure as heavily as we might have. But that is part of it, but it's not true of all. Does that help?

JOHN SMALL: Yeah, it does, it helps in a way that's a little disappointing, but it moves the conversation forward. Were you going to say something Antonia?

ADRIAN SMITH: Sorry, Dr Small, we try to work around those to the best of our abilities (inaudible) to the systems. But there are some things that you can't really overcome even though the APIs and swaggers allow for it. So if you can imagine, a lot of the API technology's been bolted on to the side of legacy infrastructure. So whilst you have a beautiful connection point, some of the things that sit beneath it aren't quite up to snuff or

where they need to be. So that means that you can't fully meet all of the parts of the standard as you would like to.

JOHN SMALL: Right, that was certainly the impression we got when we were doing the Draft Report, which is why we made this suggestion. But it sounds like it's kind of partial, not complete. So maybe there's a question about whether things are adequate to get by. I mean obviously you've got a work around now, even though it's perhaps not giving you the full functionality. I think Antonia wants to --

ANTONIA WATSON: Antonia from ANZ. I'm desperate to respond. I completely understand, I mean everything that Adrian says resonates. We have absolutely been able to meet all the API standards but we are bolting it on to legacy technology. Give us a chance to upgrade our technology. I think I'm probably speaking, and obviously these are competitors and we don't talk about our competitiveness of our systems, but, you know, there's major work under way in the industry. But don't forget, we had five, six years of implementing BS11; it costs of hundreds of millions of dollars.

If you're a start-up, if you're a Revolut, you get to start from the very beginning with cloud-enabled API technology, all those kinds of good things. We still need to, in a very complex world, replace all those core systems. It takes years and hundreds of millions of dollars. It's not easy. We don't get to start with one simple customer, we get to start with a plethora of customers from individuals to trusts, to large institutions, to, you know, you name it. And we still have to be able to operate safely for all those customers.

So it takes time. We'd love to have -- I'm sure I could speak for Kiwibank in terms of their delay in some of the API standards. But, you know, I think for ANZ we're working on this stuff, but it's not as easy as it is if you're a start-up, it really isn't, and it will take us years and a lot of money. And we're working on it. We would love to have started early, but we've had very, very large regulatory programmes that have taken all our capacity and all our ability to keep our underlying core systems safe in the meantime.

JOHN SMALL: Thanks. I'll just leave you there, Adrian, in case you want to comment later, but I've got Shaun and Shane actually, both got their hands up. Shane first.

SHANE MARSH: Shane Marsh, Dosh. Just reflecting on my own kind of personal experiences. I've worked in both a large bank building out technology projects, and also have built a bank from the bottom-up from a fintech perspective. And absolutely agree with what Antonia's saying, they're two very different things. Trying to build on legacy infrastructure and trying to innovate on that is extremely difficult. And starting with a blank sheet of

paper and building it up from a cloud perspective is a very different story. The speed at which we've been able to move is I suppose what in some ways the banks would just dream of. We've been able to, in the last six months, release both a savings product and a borrowing product.

And I suppose then you reflect on the need for innovation and competition in the market; for me this just highlights the role that fintech plays and new entrants play in being able to bring new services to the market, and really kind of reinforces, I think, the need for investment and focus into the sector to bring the next generation of services to market. And in a lot of ways there probably will be collaborations between existing banks who struggle in that space and the new entrants in the market.

Just want to touch on one topic. We talked about how hard is it to connect, plug into a bank. I think another topic, and all the fintechs this would resonate with, is actually starting a relationship with a bank is very challenging. And what we see is a vast difference between the banks in terms of how mature they are and deep their understanding is of the fintech sector, their needs and how to engage with them. BNZ's the leader in this space, they've invested in specific components of fintech and understand the business in terms of being able to bring them on, and they have probably the leading market share in terms of fintechs and they're leading innovators in the market.

And at the other end of the scale there's banks who are really just trying to get their heads around even talking to fintechs. So for those who perhaps don't have the banking background that I have, that's been really hard for people trying to get something started in New Zealand, and I think there's a lot to be done to try and raise the overall tide in terms of banks working with fintechs from the best to the work in progress.

JOHN SMALL: Thank you.

SHAUN FORGIE: Yeah hi, Shaun Forgie from Bill Rush. There's a real opportunity for New Zealand to, I guess, improve on open banking. If the government can provide elements of the architectural components that are important for open banking, and identity being one of them, we have the ability to significantly transform how easy open banking is to implement. So what we're doing at the moment is we're getting the banks to work out what they can do, how they can facilitate and support open banking enablement through the two main mechanisms that open banking provides, payment consents and information access consents. Both of those require you to authenticate against the bank's identity system. So the banks own your account identity.

If we can contribute public infrastructure into the open banking architectural framework in the notion of leveraging government-controlled identity; so we already have, you know, we have single sign-on capabilities, RealMe, which is a Government-owned identity. If we're able to start thinking about what elements the government and the public infrastructure can contribute to these standards, we can significantly simplify a lot of the complexity we have today.

So there's a real opportunity for us to think about what components can be contributed into these standards to dramatically simplify this infrastructure and modernise it. So there's low hanging fruit. Yes, there's legacy banking systems that are transactional, but there's areas that we can contribute that the government, the public infrastructure can provide to assist fintechs in this area.

JOHN SMALL: So these, I mean RealMe, you know, your passport, your driver's licence, that sort of thing, they're already out there. You're probably aware about the work that DIA's doing in digital identity where they're conceiving of this in quite a different way, as a world in which there'll be a number of digital ID providers and they'll all be accredited -- that might not be the right word -- as providing a digital ID. So is this an opportunity for the banks to be players in that field, and so maybe throw that to the banks; do you see yourselves as getting into that framework?

ANTONIA WATSON: Antonia Watson, ANZ. I see ourselves being part of it. I don't see five, six, seven individual banks creating our own digital IDs as being the solution. I feel like as a country it's a New Zealand Inc issue that should be driven centrally as a country, but I think, I probably speak for my colleagues in the room, that we'd love, love to be part of something like that.

JOHN SMALL: Yeah, right.

SHAUN FORGIE: We have a birth certificate, you know, you have your passport, you have elements of your identify today that are issued and managed by the government --

JOHN SMALL: Yeah, that's right.

SHAUN FORGIE: -- as part of who we are as Kiwis. And so that can be leveraged into the open banking debate to dramatically simplify and streamline a lot of the technical issues.

JOHN SMALL: It is sounding like a little bit of a challenge to the way DIA's going to me, but anyway.

JODY BULLEN: Jody Bullen, ANZ. I'm going to just pull it back to the roadmap. All of these things take time, effort and head space to work on, so what's important? And I think we've

heard quite clearly that digital identity is -- it's not currently part of the open banking framework; we recommend it should be. But that comes at a cost against some of the other things that we'd want to progress, because you can't have everything all at once. So what's the most important things we should be working on and aligned to?

JOHN SMALL: Yeah, good thought. Adrian.

ADRIAN SMITH: Yeah, so I tend to align around the Gates Foundation, Bill and Melinda Gates.

And they have this view that in order to have the digital technology foundations for a country you need to have three things; digital identity is at the core of it, as is the instant transfer of data between systems as well as real-time payments. So for me I see these as all interconnected. Not an original idea obviously, but I totally support the idea around digital identify being a core part of all this ecosystem.

The other point I was going to pick up on is that Shane made around working with banks. A lot of the fintechs I talk to they sort of say, who do you speak to within a bank? And that's part of the challenge, right, because of the large complexity of an organisation it's really hard to know who are the right people to talk to, who are the decision-makers, who are the budget holders etc. And often time folks come in at the wrong level, they're talking to someone who's quite enthusiastic who gets what they're up, but then that ability for that individual to influence up the food chain is greatly diminished.

And as I've given this advice to other banks before, the moment you get all the bankers in a room, there tends to be this view around consensus decision-making, and that's just my perspective based on my time in big banks. It typically defaults to the lowest common denominator, which is typically the risk officer saying "that sounds risky". So the comment I always make is 99 times out of 100, "do nothing" wins. So that's another part of the challenge is how do we have that engagement and that conversation with the right folks in a way that helps move the conversation forward without getting yourself excluded right out the gate.

JOHN SMALL: Yeah, it's quite a soft but very important aspect of the whole puzzle, isn't it. Antonia and then Kent.

ANTONIA WATSON: I was just going to add one thing on the digital identity, which is I think why it's really important that it's New Zealand-led not bank-led; is that, and this speaks to vulnerable customers but it includes a lot of new Kiwis and migrant labourers and all sorts of things. The easiest thing at the moment is to rely on passports and driver's licences, and there is a lot of people out there who need bank accounts who don't have either of the

above. Immigration New Zealand has an enormous amount of information on every single person that comes to New Zealand as an example.

JOHN SMALL: Yeah, good thoughts.

KENT DUSTON: Kent Duston, Banking Reform Coalition. Way back in the mists of time I was the operations manager for the e-government programme, and one of the core components of that was RealMe. So I had something to do with the implementation of RealMe, and to everybody in the room who's ever tried to change their password on RealMe, I apologise profusely. So I'm no expert these days in digital identity, but the federation idea that there is core information held by the government that can then be federated out for commercial use and for other purposes really lay at the centre of what RealMe was intended to do.

I would not trust this process to DIA to be completed in a timely and effective fashion. However, I would completely endorse everything that Antonia's said about the necessity of having banks at the centre of this conversation and building further commercial information around the core information held by the Crown would be a very useful thing. That assumes that there is a central organisation, to Shaun's point probably publicly funded, that allows that to occur.

So if there was a recommendation coming out from the Commission about the foundational aspects of digital identity based from the information the Crown held, federated to organisations that can then make use of it in exactly the way that Antonia's suggested, then that would be a very helpful thing indeed and I think would provide the foundational stepping stone for then the regulatory intervention to say what should that organisation look like, how should it function, how should it be governed, all those interesting questions

JOHN SMALL: Excellent thank you. Tex.

TEX EDWARDS: Thanks, Tex Edwards, Monopoly Watch. The question before the conference here is how can we, the ComCom, support great innovation in personal banking. And I urge the Commission in the Final Report to have a break-out section in discussing the imbalance of power we're hearing in this room. In this room there's a serious disease going on. The nice chap from BlinkPay is suffering from it; it's called MTS, monopoly trauma syndrome. And what it is, it's the personal characteristics of somebody who doesn't have the negotiating power of a big bank. And we urge the Commission in the Final Report to take it very seriously, this imbalance of power in negotiation, and use it to catapult forward to where we should be.

Resolut(sic) clearly catalogued how far we are behind the rest of the world. We urge the Commission to understand what tight monetary policy would mean in a quick implementation of open banking. Tight monetary policy means it's easier to break inertia in open banking in a high interest rate environment.

We also urge the Commission to ask specific and detailed questions about what happened to the Kris Faafoi December 2019 letter, which was a very prescriptive ministerial request of getting on with open banking.

And we close off; we think it's important that the Commission catalogue, specifically as they've done such an admirable job in understanding excess profitability in the banks, just articulating possibly in the Final Report what's at stake here in terms of market capitalisation of the incumbent banks. This is not a takeaway bar discussion, this is a banking discussion of 2, 3, 4% of GDP. The difference in valuation to these four big banks when we have open banking is significant. We urge the Commission to just understand that size of incentive to delay this further. Thank you.

JOHN SMALL: Thank you.

ANNE CALLINAN: One of the other roadblocks that we've heard, or potential roadblocks to open banking being rolled out, is how to deal with the risk of scams and we've certainly heard submissions from many parties about that needing to be dealt with appropriately as part of the technical and commercial standards.

But our interest is really in how we progress protecting consumers from scams whilst not unduly delaying open banking, and we see potentially a little bit of a tension there. I wonder if people can comment on that. And also I'm interested in hearing whether, coming back to the sequencing point that's been raised a number of times, whether we need to also be resolving the wider issue of how we're dealing with scams in New Zealand as part of this; again, because that seems to be relevant to some of what we've heard today about getting consumer buy-in and trust in anything we do. So a few questions there, I'd be interested in some comments.

BRYAN CHAPPLE: Catherine.

CATHERINE McGRATH: Catherine McGrath, Westpac. A couple of thoughts on that. I think an accreditation regime where it's very easy for a consumer to know that who they are sending either the payment to or the money to as accredited by someone who is credible, and to make that as easy and simple as possible. Because if that's a known trust marker engagement, it ideally would be broader than financial services actually, because as we go

into the CDR regime it should be other data that's shared, and providing I've got the sign, whatever it is, I should know that from a starter for 10 they have been through some process of authorisation. So I think that's a key component of it.

To your second question about scams more broadly, I recognise that the industry here has started later than industries in other markets. From the start to where we are now, the pace of change and how quickly we are delivering is far faster than anything I saw in the UK in terms of confirmation of payee, as a good example, and some of the other work that's happening.

So my perspective, which I recognise you'll hear through vested interests, but there is a very good clip of work that is happening in terms of the broader scams ecosystem within the financial services industry. I don't think that there is enough progress being made outside the financial services industry and I think that's a critical part that needs to happen next. And then I think the accreditation and a trust mark is really helpful to protect consumers as there are new forms of payments.

DAN HUGGINS: I guess adding to where Catherine was -- sorry, I'm Dan Huggins, BNZ. I think on scams there are a huge number of industry initiatives going on, as Catherine rightfully said. I think if we could go back five or ten years perhaps we would have done some things differently, but things are moving apace now. We do need others other than just the banks involved, and that is, again, we've all said publicly, we need government, telcos, I won't go on, but we do need others involved to protect New Zealand, it is a fight against sophisticated criminals who are looking to harm New Zealanders.

I think the other two areas that are happening here is, one, there is a need for customers to also stop and think. There's a huge amount of activity that we're all undertaking to educate customers to ensure that all of our colleagues in the frontline who are talking to customers every day are aware and are asking the right questions. And then there's a third area here of the things that people will never see, but they are happening behind the scenes in the payments infrastructure to look at every individual transaction and identify that one doesn't look right, let's pull that one out and have a conversation with people. So that work is critically important. It will interact with some of the things we've been talking about today, but it doesn't entirely get dealt with by what we're talking about today.

JODY BULLEN: I'm going to narrow down to the open banking piece. I guess it is going to introduce new fraud vectors that we need to consider, and again, going back to the point

around customer protections. So that doesn't just extend to banks but also the entire ecosystem. So necessary to have these conversations at the use case level and at the collaborative level around what are the risks around the introduction of this type of service? How might it be used by fraudsters, how might it impact fraud and scams?

And you only have to start thinking about some steps that we've collectively made about things like sending links, but are there obligations on third parties not to send links for payments in an open banking world? There's patterns being developed that will cement with customers. So things like should we be promoting patterns that encourage the sharing of banking credentials as part of process, for example; not with third parties. So there's some really interesting -- we're only touching on a few areas. The point is, is that we are changing the landscape in terms of third parties and TPPs being introduced, so we need to think about what that means.

And, you know, as we've said before is that we're very supportive of open banking, but we just need to be careful not to open up too fast and open to exposure of risk. So how do we work through those, what mechanisms do we need to put in place, how does that turn up in accreditation to make sure that these patterns are followed as a whole rather than, you know, it's not all on banks, there's a shared responsibility here for customer duty. Thanks.

JULIA NICOL: I've got one just on resource. I think similar teams at the banks would work on things like open banking products or confirmation of payee. There's not enough resource to do both is kind of what we hear. So yeah, I mean I think that that does impact the progress of open banking when there's only a small team at the bank that can work on this sort of stuff.

TEX EDWARDS: To speed up the process, we urge the Commission in the Final Report to have a five-year ban on flanker brands from incumbent banks. In October this year the boards of the major four banks will be meeting to discuss open banking. They'll have two pages of a board rap sheet on open banking, and they'll have a McKinsey report tucked in the side of their October board reports as you're discussing how to have flanker brands. Flanker brand's a good example because we saw it in the telecommunications industry. And we urge the Commission to have a five-year ban on flanker brands. And that will speed up, because you'll notice that flanker brands will be introduced six months, three months after open banking comes. Thank you.

ANNE CALLINAN: Any other questions on scams? Kent.

KENT DUSTON: Kent Duston, Banking Reform Coalition. Just acknowledging Catherine's comment about the amount of work that's going on and at pace, you know, because obviously having scams within our financial system is in nobody's interest. So it's as much an incentive for the banks to clean this up as anybody else.

There are a couple of observations there, though. The first is that the banks have been largely reactive about this. They're large organisations, they have a fair degree of inertia. So all of the work that's now occurring could easily have occurred five or ten years earlier if there had been a more proactive approach to this. So banks, and I think there's a lesson here that the incumbents, as they sit, are fairly reactive organisations.

And so that doesn't bode well for new and emerging threats. And some of the assessment of those new and emerging threats might be better placed outside the banks in the very regulatory organisation that we are discussing, because that might be a more appropriate way of addressing them more quickly, which again would also be in the best interests of the banks themselves.

We're also talking about the scams, or we largely think about the scams in terms of a technology problem; that if we have the right platforms with the right algorithms and things, then maybe we can capture some of this and stop it occurring. I'm curious about the intersection, though, of the regulation and the scamming that is occurring. There seems to be a bunch of the scams are coming out of mule accounts. These mule accounts have been set up by people who are fake to some degree. I'm curious as to how AML and CFT, those compliance obligations have been met, but we still have mule accounts arising within our financial system. And I would have thought from the neophyte perspective, and really the expectation of everybody who's had to go through AML compliance in this country, that the whole purpose of that legislation was to stop exactly what is occurring with mule accounts.

Now, if it turns out that AML and CFT are insufficient to prevent people creating mule accounts on our financial system, then perhaps one of the things that the incumbent banks may wish to do is have recommendations carried forward in this report that the regulations are strengthened sufficiently to prevent exactly this at the creation of account level rather than the trying to stop the transaction level.

ANNE CALLINAN: Thank you. I think there's a question behind you.

SHAUN FORGIE: Shaun Forgie from Bill Rush. I think the role of national identity can play an important part in scamming. You, as a consumer or a business, should be aware of whether

you are interacting with an identified entity, or a non-identified entity, in the sense that is 1 2 this payee, do they have a New Zealand certified identity from something like, you know, State Services Commission, or the Department of Internal Affairs. Is this an authenticated 3 New Zealand identifier. You get that with things like X or Twitter where you can see in the 4 post, you can see they've got a badge which indicates their identification status, whether 5 they've been verified or validated. Very much the same infrastructure can be applied. And 6 then we can have basic payment protection plans that are in effect for businesses or for 7 8 consumers where they are paying a known identified party. So I think the role of public infrastructure in this debate is very important to 9 10 understand. So the notion of identity and payments are very closely aligned and I think we need to develop some policies around how that plays out. 11 **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** Could I just follow-up on a related question. I think, Dan, you've talked 12 about, and others have too, about just being clear about liability when data moves. Is that 13 something that you can solve in a collaborative way, you know, potentially with 14 authorisation, or do you need legislation? Is that a regulatory thing? 15 **DAN HUGGINS:** I doubt we need regulation to solve it. I suspect we need permission from you 16 to be able to do that and not fall foul of the Commerce Commission. 17 **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** Contractually? 18 **DAN HUGGINS:** Yeah, contractually. 19 20 **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** Right, that's cool, thank you. Antonia then someone at the back. 21 **ANTONIA WATSON:** I just wonder if this is another example of things you wouldn't want banks to do to themselves. I think open banking, the original thing was "banks you do this 22 23 or we'll do it to you". And we've made it really clear the things that we actually need to be given. I think, I don't know that we've got the ability to say we wouldn't be liable for this. I 24 don't think we'd have the buy-in if there wasn't more of that, a wider body that had, whether 25 it's consumer reps or regulators or someone there helping make that decision. 26 **BRYAN CHAPPLE:** Okay, alright, thank you. I think there's a gentleman down the back. 27

ADEEL ALI: Adeel from APIMatic. I want to catch up on the last question here, what we can

learn from other countries' experience. So I was in New York two weeks ago at the

headquarters of one of the top five banks in the world, I cannot name because of NDA.

And the discussion over there happening was about how, like, they can make their APIs

more consumable, how more and more developers can start using their API, what can be

28

29

30

31

32

33

that technology.

And, like, talking to these kind of banks, like the kind of Paypals and the Stripes of the world, the focus we are seeing is more towards technology that can help APIs more consumable. Because no matter what frameworks we talk about, no matter what standards they implement, that's all part of our investment. And the return on that investment comes only when people start consuming those APIs. And we often overlook here, because we don't consume APIs. If I ask here from the people in this room how many of us have ever tried using the API Centre, or make the first API call; anybody here has tried making first API call using the API Centre? How long did it take?

SHAUN FORGIE: A couple of weeks.

ADEEL ALI: A couple of weeks, making the first API call. I'm sure you're a great developer.

Because, you know, I tried it, it also took me ages to use that. And if we don't talk about that kind of technology then we will stay behind the world, we stay behind the innovation, we stay behind in the adoption. And if you talk about a technology, if you want to listen what I'm talking about, just, like, open the API Centre by Payments NZ and then open the Stripe's APIs, Square's API, and you will see all the different things available, the help available to consume those APIs.

So my recommendation, my plea to the Commission will be to also consider the technology once the open banking is implemented, the adoption of that open banking. What technology should we be thinking and utilising by that time. Thank you.

JOHN SMALL: Thank you. Alright, Adam, final comment?

ADAM BOYD: There's just a couple of points I wouldn't mind making I think are worthy at this point in time. The first one would be if we go back to kind of like what's the overall goal that we're looking to achieve here with open banking, which is really to get buy-in from consumers and get cut-through and really make a difference.

I think with that in mind, yes, there's debates around whether we need the digi ID, whether CDR would help etc; but I guess I'd almost ask the question why wouldn't we lean into those if that genuinely is our goal, because the context has changed rapidly. And when you're rolling out these things in other jurisdictions five years ago, the frauds and scams kind of like dynamic was just different. I think we need to be thinking about the context that we're executing into with that in mind.

The other point that I'd just make, and it sort of goes back to one of the themes of the questions around, you know, are the core systems like a roadblock etc, and you've heard varying perspectives on that. The point I would make is that we are investing hundreds of millions a year into core systems. The challenge that we have faced, and it's been spoken about already, is just the sheer amount of that money that is going in reg change at the moment and has been going into regulatory change, and that does come at an opportunity cost. I think about, like we had to get ready for negative interest rates, we've made substantial changes for CCCFA, we're going to make substantial changes to unwind CCCFA, those are all choices we could have made that come with opportunity cost.

So I think back to my point earlier, us being able to sort of build new core systems quicker and faster; yes, that's going to have the opportunity to unlock sort of, I guess, more potential in open banking. To my earlier point, that might serve 15% of consumers in New Zealand, but it will also unlock value for the other 85% of New Zealanders that are getting their innovation not through open banking.

So I think there really is an opportunity through sort of, I guess, thinking about sensible regulation and impactful regulation to really unlock competition.

JOHN SMALL: Yeah, thanks very much. That's a nice way to wrap it up actually Adam before lunch, I think we all see the idea of too much or too little regulation is not really the point, it's about doing things that help and move things forward.

So look let's break there for lunch for an hour, and when we come back we'll do session 5 which is other enablers and barriers, AML, that kind of stuff. And we'll be, yeah, that should see us through to the end, I think. So lunch is available next door. Thank you.

Lunch adjournment from 12.33 pm to 1.31 pm