



# ADVP – Association of Document Validation Professionals

## Meeting Minutes 11/09/2019

### Attendees

Name	Organisation	Role
Tony Machin	TrustID	Chairman
Stefan Sosnowski	Ucomply	Treasurer
Rob Allinson	Security Watchdog	Secretary
Adrian Black	NorthRow	
Julie Dawson	Yoti	
Ken Hanslip	NSL	
Ian Westwood	Passport Proven	
Ayal Zirlin	Au10tix	
Penny Blake	RTW Checker	
Phil Blasdale	Experian	
Jonathan Jensen	GB Group	
Alan Gooden	ADVP Liaison Officer	

### Apologies

Name	Organisation	Role
Mark Sugden *	GBG	Vice-Chair
Nick Harness	TIO	
Nick Mothershaw	Experian	

\*to be removed moving forward



## Meeting Minutes

Item	Information
<b>Minutes of last Meeting</b>	Minutes accepted
<b>Membership and financial update</b>	<p>SS still a few payments outstanding Account balance £12511.30</p> <p>Everyone aside from Jumio acknowledge that there is something to pay £14,000 outstanding PBL asked how overdue? JJ asked if GBG have paid SS advised not LexisNexis going through supplier setup TM asked if anyone on comm has contacts at Jumio AB confirmed he does TM asked for contact details SW still to pay - TM confirms Creadas, Mitec and Rightcheck/KPMG conversations TM asked for any other industry providers we are not yet engaging with</p>
<b>Liaison Officer Update</b>	<p>AG was due to attend Amberhill meeting, was cancelled on day, has been rearranged for 2<sup>nd</sup> October -will then provide update of partnership strategy ADVP part of consortium headed up by TriLateral – we applied and were accepted as part of stakeholder group – started 1<sup>st</sup> September – updates at future meetings – will ask for input from committee New ID unit as part of GDS – is looking at having meeting with Alistair Trahern - work on digital identity strategy NDFU – test intel sharing pilot – will prob become main Gov dept for partnering with private sector will downscaling of Amberhill Need to be convinced of value of what we can offer – need to understand what current intel sharing model looks like Call on 3<sup>rd</sup> October to evaluate sharing and form next steps TM advised Gov cannot task private company so limited feedback – have made full access to system available Further definition of way forward at meeting 3<sup>rd</sup> October AG is aware, looking at it from Gov perspective only attribute ADVP has is the intel AG normally goes to TrustID for intel, moving forward need to scope out how to utilise other members Maintaining intel feed vital to ongoing relationship Need to consider how valuable the relationship with law enforcement is and establish how this can give clear benefits for members in exchange for the intel KH suggested problem is world of Home Office differs from any other dept After EU settlement scheme ends in 2021 online check for EU citizens, but anyone else will still have BRP Home Office have no real interest in enabling private sector ID/RTW check providers TM cited examples in last couple of years where sharing of intel has changed opinion on the use of private sector Agrees we need to extend the breadth of intel shared TM raised previous request for number of checks that was largely not provided KH raised concerns about who will see data and where it is going TM cited that this is what the ISA is designed to protect AG confirmed he now has his indemnity policy in place AG reinforced the need to share from more members What are our priorities for next 12 months? Need to maintain understanding value of ADVP to government JD suggested asking for clarity in respect of online checking highlighting where we are, where we want to be and the value to us TM stated we're hampered by Brexit uncertainty Need evidence on what we do – both immigration and FS AZ stated it is important for us to define what we can provide in way of intel</p>



	<p>Suggested 3 different levels of data we can supply – cites changes to their system that may allow greater levels of data</p> <p>TM reminded committee that we've asked several times for number of checks carried out</p> <p>AG darkweb intel – went back to the company who raised the concern and reengaged – they have blanked AG so little further that can be done – no further action possible</p> <p>Ascor – no responses to previous request, but heavily engaged with Ascor to look at how intel can be shared effectively – looking at developing guidance</p> <p>TM highlighted Ascor is mainly Gov</p> <p>Main interest immigration intel – followed up with call to discuss how collaboration may work to develop</p> <p>Meeting 26<sup>th</sup> September – need to find an ADVP representative – AB offered to attend as TM/AG unable to attend</p> <p>AB confirms he knows Keith Rosser</p>
<b>ADVP Intelligence Sharing</b>	<p>TM advised we did commit to have credible position on intel by AGM in December</p> <p>JJ advised ISA bogged down in GBG legal</p> <p>AG advised is now worded in very general terms – only metadata and AG will not put anything out there that can undermine company supplying data</p> <p>AZ advised we have already agreed not to reopen agreement and sharing does not commit to providing anything</p> <p>JJ will revisit ISA with GBG legal</p>
<b>OIX/tech UK working group update</b>	<p>TM advised NM is chair so heavily involved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Interoperability and standards</li> </ul> <p>JJ confirmed he is on this committee</p> <p>TM advised is at such a high level and no funds or resource available – no framework – very narrow verification of digital ID scope – has spent many hours without seeing any real movement – cannot commit time required at present without seeing any real way forward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Inclusion</li> </ul> <p>SS attended call – no real benefit for ADVP – structure lacking</p> <p>TM struggling to see how we can contribute</p> <p>JJ all theoretical no real practical developments</p> <p>TM thinks we should take a step back at present</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Liability and trust models</li> </ul> <p>TM asked if comm agrees that we do not commit to anything further to OIX/tech UK until further clarity provided</p> <p>JD to provide paragraph clarifying what is of most interest to ADVP to be submitted</p>
<b>Government DCS Trial</b>	<p>TM provided details of DCMS ID pilot</p> <p>Cited security requirements</p> <p>Pilot is designed as first steps in wider checks</p> <p>No guarantee that this will continue after pilot</p> <p>AG asks what will be returned</p> <p>TM confirmed yes/no response to name/DOB/PP number</p>
<b>Government on-line BRP checking service API</b>	<p>Covered above – parked</p> <p>AB asked for relative expectation of API</p> <p>TM advised this has changed from certain to unclear response from Home Office</p> <p>JD suggested one of the things that made this happen is the white paper circulated last year</p> <p>TM highlighted need to make it clear what we want – 1 pager on API</p> <p>SS thinks there is a best of breed scope that will then be used to build gov service offering</p> <p>SS highlighted concern</p> <p>RA agreed that public sector is resistant to commercialising of ID/RTW checking</p> <p>KH suggested identifying an MP to champion our cause and arguments for gov collaboration with private sector</p> <p>TM asked is comm agrees that a subsection of comm get together to discuss way forward</p> <p>Comm agrees</p>



<b>Website Development Update</b>	<p>PB advised only Nick Harness and Acuant still to be added to website          Requested ideas of what we would like to see on website -          TM advised AG sent a number of documents to be added – 5 in total incl GPG45          Asked that AG send these to PBI          PBI advised need to buy some stock images to site          TM asked that we promote AGM through website          TM idea – we all do blogs – share these on ADVP website          AG suggests using images (google) that would link back into ADVP website          TM cautioned that this should not be a marketing tool          PB asked if it would be worth having membership badge for member website –          hyperlink badge for members websites          Proud member of ADVP</p>
<b>Industry standards and code of practice</b>	<p>TM asked who polices our activities?          AZ raised concern of competition – potential that one company approaches another to          gain information          AG suggested this would be unethical behaviour          TM highlighted this would be covered by code of conduct – first step would be          communication between two companies to resolve – if not possible then          Cautioned against trade body becoming ‘referee’          Do we really want to be involved in commercial rivalry?          TM highlighted code of conduct does have dispute resolution process          KH highlighted that code of conduct was primarily designed for client complaint          Can only really kick member of if they have brought ADVP into disrepute          KH advised need for all members to agree and sign code of conduct by AGM          Needs to be element of trust amongst members          SS highlights main point has to be if brings ADVP into disrepute          TM asked comm to agree that we accept code of conduct rules on this          Comm agrees          RA asked if code of conduct is on the website          PB advised not yet          KH suggests due diligence on new members          RA to develop DD process for next meeting          TM confirmed he has interviewed new members in past          KH suggested chair is second level – secretary should be first point          Does comm agree?          Comm agrees          Az suggests mandatory ISA and code of conduct agreement and payment received          SS asked if we have an enrolment form?          RA asked that membership application details to be added to website          JD advised they have one-pager on competitive intel sharing</p>
<b>Board Membership – Vice Chairman</b>	<p>Current articles of ass state vice chair succeeds chairman in January          TM asked comm to submit themselves for vice chair to RA          RA to comm this out to members</p>
<b>AGM Planning</b>	<p>TM need date and venue          TM suggests 4<sup>th</sup> December – comm agrees IW confirms not available          TM wants more members to attend AGM – has asked AG to work on this          Asked if Northrow room available          AB to confirm          RA to look at voting requirements</p>
<b>AOB</b>	<p>RA to arrange call with CRTB call – AG.TM          RGA comms – are all receiving? Committee confirmed yes – PB to check spam folder          AG do we agree that members could have minutes sent out with liaison officer update?          TM cautioned this may not be a benefit          SS stated that we should not completely</p>
<b>Date of next meeting</b>	<p>15<sup>th</sup> October</p>