



SWIFT Standards

Standards MT November 2009

Revised SR 2009 High-Level Information

At its December 2008 meeting, the Board approved the proposal to limit the Standards Release 2009 (SR 2009) to categories 1, 2 and 9 and to technical changes, which includes the new MT 597. This document is an extract from the Final High-Level Information document that was published on www.swift.com on 12 November 2008 and contains only those changes that will be implemented in SR 2009.

15 December 2008

Legal Notices

Copyright

Copyright © S.W.I.F.T. SCRL (“SWIFT”), avenue Adèle 1, B-1310 La Hulpe, Belgium, or its licensors, 2008. All rights reserved.

You may copy this publication within your organisation. Any such copy must include these legal notices.

Confidentiality

This publication may contain SWIFT or third-party confidential information. Do not disclose this publication outside your organisation without the prior written consent of SWIFT.

Disclaimer

This publication constitutes advance information only and is not to be considered the final and complete documentation for the subject matter published herein. The information in this publication may change from time to time. You must always refer to the latest available version.

SWIFTStandards Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Policy – End-User License Agreement

SWIFTStandards are licensed subject to the terms and conditions of the *SWIFTStandards IPR Policy – End-User License Agreement* available at www.swift.com > Standards > More information.

Translations

The English version of SWIFT documentation is the only official and binding version.

Trademarks

SWIFT is the trade name of S.W.I.F.T. SCRL. The following are registered trademarks of SWIFT: SWIFT, S.W.I.F.T., the SWIFT logo, Sibos, SWIFTNet, SWIFTReady, and Accord. Other product, service, or company names in this publication are trade names, trademarks, or registered trademarks of their respective owners.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Schedule for SR 2009	5
3	Impact levels of the change requests	6
4	Evaluation of the impact on interfaces and applications	7
5	Overview of changes accepted for SR 2009 per category	8
5.1	Technical changes	8
5.2	Impact on category 1 Customer Payments and Cheques	9
5.3	Impact on category 2 Financial Institution Transfers	9
5.4	Impact on category 9 Cash Management and Customer Status.....	10

1 Introduction

This document describes the changes for Standards Release 2009 (SR 2009), which were ratified by the SWIFT Board at its December 2008 meeting. To ease the burden of a full Standards Release for 2009, the SWIFT Board approved a proposal to limit the changes for Standards Release 2009 (SR 2009) to categories 1, 2 and 9 and to technical changes, which includes the new MT 597.

Changes to categories 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and n which were voted on and accepted during the annual country voting cycle in September and October 2008, are held over for implementation in Standards Release 2010. During 2009, all categories of messages will pass through the normal maintenance cycle and additional changes will be added to these accepted changes. Details of the changes to be held over for implementation in 2010 can be found on www.swift.com

As a guide for implementers, a note is added to each change request to indicate whether a change is mandatory or optional. Each institution must assess its own applications and business needs when implementing these changes.

The sole purpose of this document is to help technical implementers and operational users of the SWIFT messages to evaluate the impact of changes on interfaces and applications. Consequently, implementers and users can plan resources and budget allocations for the SR 2009 implementation.

The Standards Release Guide 2009, which SWIFT will publish in December 2008, will fully describe the SR 2009. Approved changes will be effective as of 21 November 2009, the release date on FIN.

Note: This publication is supplied for information purposes only, and shall not be binding nor shall it be construed as constituting any obligation, representation or warranty on the part of SWIFT. The information in this publication is the latest available at the date of its production, and may change.

2 Schedule for SR 2009

Note the following change to the SR 2009 schedule:

- 04 December 2008 - The SWIFT Board approved a proposal to limit the changes for Standards Release 2009 to categories 1, 2 and 9 and to technical changes, which includes the new MT 597.

14 July 2008	<p>High-Level Information on Standards MT Release 2009</p> <p>Summary of (not approved) change requests received for SR 2009</p> <p>Advance information on MT 202 COV and MT 205 COV</p> <p>This change is already approved by country vote and ratified by the SWIFT Board. Some proposed changes to Standards MT Release 2009 may impact these two messages.</p>
12 November 2008	<p>Final High-Level Information on Standards MT Release 2009</p> <p>Summary of approved change requests received for SR 2009</p> <p>Updated Advance Information on MT 202 COV and MT 205 COV</p> <p>For resource and budget allocation purposes only</p>
04 December 2008	<p>Board approves limited Standards MT Release 2009</p> <p>To ease the burden of a full SR 2009, the SWIFT Board approved a proposal to limit the changes for SR 2009 to categories 1, 2 and 9 and to technical changes, which includes the new MT 597.</p> <p>Changes to categories 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 (Common Group), which were voted on and accepted during the annual country voting in October 2008, are held over for implementation in Standards Release 2010.</p> <p>To clearly identify the changes to be implemented in each of the releases, two new high-level information documents are available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised SR 2009 High-Level Information Preliminary SR 2010 High-Level Information
19 December 2008	<p>Standards MT Release Guide 2009</p> <p>Message Format Validation Rules 2009</p> <p>Describes the changes to SWIFT Standards messages effective as of 21 November 2009</p>
20 February 2009	<p>Erratum for Standards MT Release Guide 2009</p> <p>Erratum for Message Format Validation Rules 2009</p> <p>Updates to Standards MT Release Guide 2009 and Message Format Validation Rules 2009 published on 19 December 2008</p>
02 May 2009	<p>Vendor Test System</p>
25 July 2009	<p>Test & Training System</p> <p>If necessary, updates to Message Format Validation Rules 2009</p> <p>UHB online</p>
21 November 2009	<p>Standards MT Release 2009 Live</p>

3 Impact levels of the change requests

Level 0	Revision of a message that does not affect the message format: the change is not related to the format of the message. Example: definition of the message scope. This kind of revision is mentioned in this document since it may have an impact on some automated applications.
Level 1	Revision of a message that does not affect the message layout or the FIN validation: the change relates to the usage of the message format. Example: change of a definition or of a usage rule.
Level 1+	Deletion of an existing message type.
Level 2-	Revision of a message that slightly affects the message layout and the FIN validation. Example: addition or deletion of field formats, additions or deletion of qualifiers or codes.
Level 2+	Revision of a message that seriously affects the message layout and the FIN validation. Example: addition or deletion of fields, addition or deletion of sequences.
Level 3-	Creation of a new message type in a Message User Group (MUG). Change of an existing message type from a MUG to general use.
Level 3	Creation of a new message type for general use.

4 Evaluation of the impact on interfaces and applications

Interfaces

All changes can have a direct impact on interfaces. This also applies to level 0 and level 1 changes, which may require an update to input screens or help screens or both.

Applications

Level 0 changes should have no to minimum impact on applications.

Higher level changes will normally have an impact on applications, although the impact may be different for applications sending the message than for applications receiving the message.

Some changes apply to message types (to be) implemented in a Message User Group (MUG). In case of non-registration to the MUG, users can not send or receive messages of this type. The impact on any application depends directly on the need or desire to support these message types.

5 Overview of changes accepted for SR 2009 per category

There are no changes to categories 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and n (Common Group). The MT 597 is a technical change and is documented in section 5.1 Technical Changes.

All changes in this section have been validated by a Maintenance Working Group, accepted by Country User Group votes and ratified by the SWIFT Board for implementation in November 2009.

When a change description is not clear without further explanation, a brief business context (in grey) is sometimes provided to help the readers better understand the reasoning behind the change.

A blue font is used for changes that are implemented differently from the original request.

5.1 Technical changes

Message Types (MT)	Short description of the modification	Impact level	MUG
All authenticated messages	<p>Removal of MAC and PAC trailers from the network</p> <p>Messages containing a MAC or PAC trailer will be NAKed.</p> <p>Mandatory for all users.</p>	2-	No
MT 597	<p>Introduction of MT 597 Securities Settlement Reporting Scheme Envelope Message.</p> <p>Introduces a new securities settlement reporting message that contains multiple securities reporting messages. The MT 597 may include: Statements (MT 535-537), Settlement Confirmations (MT 544-547), Status Advices (MT 548) and/or Allegements (578).</p> <p>Optional. This message can only be used in a Message User Group.</p>	3-	Yes

5.2 Impact on category 1 Customer Payments and Cheques

Message Types (MT)	Short description of the modification	Impact level	MUG
101, 102, 102+, 103, 103+	<p>Field 50a Ordering Customer</p> <p>There were several change requests for field 50K, to comply with requirements as set out by AML regulations and to reduce the number of FATF related enquiries.</p> <p>The decision was to leave field 50K unchanged but to apply stricter validation on field 50F.</p> <p>Field 50F was designed with a structured format to cater for AML and FATF requirements. However the Usage Rules for field 50F are not adhered to and this has resulted in an increase in FATF related queries. It was therefore decided to implement stricter validation on field 50F.</p> <p>Most of the Usage Rules for field 50F will become Network Validated Rules.</p> <p>Mandatory if option F is used in field 50a.</p>	2-	Yes except 103, 103+
106, 121	<p>These messages will be removed from the network as they are no longer used by the community.</p> <p>This change is only mandatory if these messages are implemented in back office applications.</p>	1+	Yes

5.3 Impact on category 2 Financial Institution Transfers

Message Types (MT)	Short description of the modification	Impact level	MUG
202 COV, 205 COV	<p>Addition of MT 202 COV and MT 205 COV messages.</p> <p>To provide the details of parties involved in transactions when the financial institution transfer provides cover for an underlying customer credit transfer.</p> <p>Advance information for these new messages has been updated to include a change to sequence B. It was decided to restrict sequence B to a single occurrence.</p> <p>Please click on this link to access the updated advance information document.</p> <p>Mandatory for payments made with the cover method.</p>	3	No

Message Types (MT)	Short description of the modification	Impact level	MUG
206	<p>This message will be removed from the network as it is no longer used by the community.</p> <p>The change is only mandatory if the message is implemented in back office applications.</p>	1+	Yes
210	<p>Field 50a Ordering Customer</p> <p>There were several change requests for field 50K, to comply with requirements as set out by AML regulations and to reduce the number of FATF related enquiries.</p> <p>The decision was to leave field 50K unchanged but to apply stricter validation on field 50F.</p> <p>Field 50F was designed with a structured format to cater for AML and FATF requirements. However the Usage Rules for field 50F are not adhered to and this has resulted in an increase in FATF related queries. It was therefore decided to implement stricter validation on field 50F.</p> <p>Most of the Usage Rules for field 50F will become Network Validated Rules.</p> <p>Mandatory if option F is used in field 50a.</p>	2-	No

5.4 Impact on category 9 Cash Management and Customer Status

Message Types (MT)	Short description of the modification	Impact level	MUG
910	<p>Field 50a Ordering Customer</p> <p>There were several change requests for field 50K, to comply with requirements as set out by AML regulations and to reduce the number of FATF related enquiries.</p> <p>The decision was to leave field 50K unchanged but to apply stricter validation on field 50F.</p> <p>Field 50F was designed with a structured format to cater for AML and FATF requirements. However the Usage Rules for field 50F are not adhered to and this has resulted in an increase in FATF related queries. It was therefore decided to implement stricter validation on field 50F.</p> <p>Most of the Usage Rules for field 50F will become Network Validated Rules.</p> <p>Mandatory if option F is used in field 50a.</p>	2-	No

Message Types (MT)	Short description of the modification	Impact level	MUG
960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967	<p>Removal of Bilateral Key Exchange (BKE) messages.</p> <p>The migration from BKE to RMA (Relationship Management Application) is complete. The BKE messages are now obsolete.</p> <p>No implementation impact.</p>	1+	N/A

End of document