

PAPDIS Governance Sub-Committee

Notes from Conference Call, 14-Apr-2015

Present: Alan Chaplin, Alison Evans, James Markham, Pauline Green, Peter Thompson, Steve Wilkinson

Apologies: Andy Agathangelou

Not Present: Chris Johnston, Ian Macintyre

Agenda for call

1. Methods of working – calls vs face-to-face meetings, use of email vs e.g. Google Groups (open vs closed), use and control of papdis.org website, etc
2. Definition and scope of governance, key objectives, including:
 - how we ensure public ownership/licensing of the standard is guaranteed going forward
 - how change is requested, managed, communicated, controlled
 - how we maintain impartiality/independence from influence of any one person/group
 - how the standard is moved forward and all stakeholders are kept engaged/on-side
 - what the release cycle is for minor and major changes

Methods of Working

1. It was agreed that the group would best manage its work via conference call, with face-to-face meetings from time to time should convenient opportunities present themselves.
2. It was agreed that an open Google Groups forum be established, with public read access and posting access restricted as appropriate to the committee (for governance work in progress) or the wider Pensions BIB for more general matters.
3. The subject of the papdis.org website was briefly discussed. It was noted that several individuals or organisations currently had an ad hoc involvement (e.g., web hosting, domain registration) and this situation was fine for the time being, although these things should be brought under common control/management in due course.

Definition and Scope of Governance

1. Ownership and Licensing of the Standard

The subject of the ownership of PAPDIS was raised. It was suggested that CIPP might be approached as potential copyright holder (although this position was considered further later in the discussion). It was noted that as the standard had grown out of a somewhat ad hoc group of contributors, its ownership was not explicit and there was therefore the danger that someone might later claim copyright and could potentially demand licence fees of organisations using the standard.

The manner in which the FIX Protocol is governed was briefly reviewed. Here the model is that the standard is owned by a company that was set up precisely for that purpose, with some sort of trust structure for maintaining ongoing independence. There was concern about the cost overhead of such a structure, but there was some support for this model as it seems to offer the cleanest and clearest way to establish the independence of the standard and to safeguard it going forward. The idea of consulting CIPP for legal advice in terms of intellectual property management was proposed, although it seems likely that more targeted professional advice on this whole area may be needed.

It was agreed that some form of well-established public licence should be applied to the standard, such as Creative Commons or GNU Public License (GPL), but it was felt that this could not be resolved in the absence of a clear copyright owner.

The fact that the PAPDIS standard is currently controlled by Pensions BIB, but that participation Pensions BIB is by invitation only, was seen as incongruent with an open standards process. The idea that Pensions BIB might “morph” into the PAPDIS standards committee, or that a new independent standards committee be established was considered and it was agreed that these issues should be raised with Pensions BIB at the next meeting.

2. Managing Change to the Standard

The subject of change management was discussed at length. A view was expressed that the standard should start to stabilise now after so much work had already been completed, but upon further consideration it was noted that there was potentially substantial extra work resulting from the Regulator’s recent work and that a PAPDIS 2.0 was likely to be needed beyond the current 1.1 work.

In terms of change management, the need to manage the frequency of changes, and to precisely define a workable and robust process for requesting, reviewing and implementing changes was clearly identified. The importance of this process being open to all stakeholders, consultative and transparent was stated. The need to set and manage expectations in the industry in terms of how often the standard is revised, with a view to supporting organisations’ planning and development processes, is clearly key, so the committee felt that ideally a well-defined, openly published timetable should be put in place at an appropriate opportunity.