## 4 Oct 2023 at 3PM CET Webinar          Minutes of the Meeting

### Attendees

| | |
|---|---|
| Mario Reichel | CGI-MP Non-FI Co-Convener, PPI |
| Mike Pawlisz | CGI-MP FI Co-Convener, J.P. Morgan |
| Kerstin Schoenwitz | WG1 Facilitator, Deutsche Bank |
| William Porto | WG2 Facilitator, J.P. Morgan |
| Peter Noonan | WG3 Facilitator, Electrolux |
| Bridget Meyer | WG5 Facilitator, Redbridge |
| Dominik Vogel | UBS, Payments Market Practice Group |
| Kiyono Hasaka | SWIFT |
| Adriana Tomeva-Gaudin | Société Générale |
| Alexander Ruf | BASF |
| Anett Rau | TIS |
| Ankush Gupta | ING Bank |
| Anshul Tripathi | Payments Canada |
| Annemarie Bona | ION Group |
| Carsten Pedersen | Nordea |
| Chandan Kandula | Lloyds Bank |
| Christian Schwinghammer | Etisswiss |
| Christian Intfeld | DZ Bank |
| Clayton Royal | HCL |
| Dave Hardingham | First National Bank |
| Davide Signoretti | Pay.UK |
| Deepu Nair | Barclays |
| Dr Thomas Baumann | ZVEXPERT |
| Eliane Eysackers | Zanders |
| François Lemaire | Biotos |
| Fred Fuller | Endava |
| Giorgia BOVOLENTA | HSBC |
| Harri Rantanen | SEB |
| Hein Wagenaar | Oracle |
| Hubert Gogniat | Finastra |
| Isak Penttila | Payments Canada |
| Jakob Erlei | Deutsche-Boerse |
| Jain Achintya | Standard Chartered Bank |
| Jatinder Virdee | ION Group |
| Jiyeon KIM | Swift |
| Johann Lee | Merck Group |
| Justinas Vegys | SEB |
| Kevin ONEIL | Swift |
| Kamalraj KOTIAN | HSBC |
| Koen SCHELLINCK | BNP Paribas Fortis |
| Lisa Hays | Bank of New York Mellon |
| Laurent BAUDIER | Société Générale |
| Laurence BONNAFOUX | Société Générale |
| Lotfi AMADDOUNE | Société Générale |
| Macer Skeels | Financekey |
| Mariya Sanders | Citi |
| Mark Sutton | Zanders |
| Mark Tiggas | Accredited Standards Committee X9 |
| Martin Walder | SIX Interbank Clearing |
| Matthias Riegel | SAP |
| Michael LEWIS | Swift |
| Michael VANDER ELST | BNP Paribas Fortis |
| Mieko Morioka | Swift |
| Moya Correia Francisco Manuel | Grupo Santander |
| Nasreen Quibria | Visa |
| Petra Kessner | Bank of America |
| Pierre Bouleau | CM CIC |
| Rama Krishna Donakonda | Microsoft |
| Robert John | Endava |
| Sally KHOURY | Société Générale |
| Sandrine LE GOFF | BNP Paribas |
| Santhosh-A Sridharan | Deutsche Bank |
| Sean Mouton | ABSA |
| Sebastian Ahlburg | DZ Bank |
| Stephane Battinelli | Finastra |
| Tanja Munz | DZ Bank |

| Tony CLARK | Swift |
|---|---|
| Torcuato Battaglia | Grupo Santander |
| Ville Saukko | Xmldation |
| Volker Heinze | UNIFITS |
| Volker Oppermann | UniCredit |
| Yoko Tokumoto | NTT DATA Luweave Corporation |
| Unknown | 2 UK numbers and 1 US number |

## Agenda

**1. Welcome Address**

**2. Working Group Updates**

**3. PMPG Update: Structured Postal Address**

**4. Q&A**

**5. CGI-MP Members Update**

**6. API Discussion Update**

**7. Closing of the Plenary**

### 1. Welcome Address by Mike Pawlisz, FI Co-Convener, JPM

*Mike opened the 38th Plenary and welcomed CGI-MP work group leaders and members to the plenary session.He expressed sincere appreciation to the distinguished speaker, PMPG for presenting a beneficial result from continued collaboration in the interest of consistent market practice and welcomed insightful and open discussions around the latest ISO 20022 implementation topics (73 attendees in total).*

### 2. Working Group Updates

### 2.1 WG 1 Credit Transfer and Payment Status Report

*The WG 1 facilitator Kerstin Schoenwitz shared the key achievements in the last quarter 2023:*

- ❖ *Publication of Appendix B (country specifics) for 39 countries on Swift MyStandards – enabling banks & ERP/TMS providers to implement V09*
- ❖ *Postal Address usage review (new hybrid address option in Nov. 2025) with updates of pain.001 UG (internat. & high value payments) and the User Handbook. Both published on Swift MyStandards.*
- ❖ *Published article on TMI to raise V09 awareness in the market.*
- ❖ *Provided feedback on CPMI consultation paper re. internat. payments.*
- ❖ *Discuss clearing-specifics for further countries (Appendix B) (ongoing)*
- ❖ *Capturing UGs in MyStandards for cancellation request camt.055 / camt.029 (ongoing)*

*Over the coming months, her group will continue to work on:*

- ❖ *Document ISO migration requirements for pain.001 V03.*
- ❖ *Work with PMPG on an adoption guideline for structured Regulatory Reporting information.*
- ❖ *Identify best practice for Remittance Information Structured to support market adoption.*
- ❖ *Create and publish further payment type guidelines on MyStandards (instant payments, SEPA, APAC & US local payment types etc.).*

*Weekly webinars facilitated by Kerstin, normally on Wednesdays at 2PM CET; 8PM Singapore. We welcome your active participation.*

### 2.2 WG 2 Cash Management Reporting

*William Porto leads CGI Working Group 2 which focuses on harmonization of account reports to remove ambiguity and streamline the implementation and reporting experience for both the corporates and FIs. Some of his working group achievements in the last quarter are below:*

- ❖ *Consolidated CGI Workgroup-2 guideline*
- ❖ *Revisited Amount Details (Exchange Reporting) use-case*
- ❖ *Entry Level vs Transaction Details level Best-Practice*
- ❖ *Transactions Summary Best-Practice*
- ❖ *Publication to MyStandards*

*Over the coming months, his group will continue to harmonize the camt reporting further:*

- ❖ *Incorporate mapping to other formats, such as EDI and BAI2*
- ❖ *Publish new use-cases including how real time reporting is being expressed and how other settlement types are being recorded*
- ❖ *Publish sample files from the pain to pacs to camt*
- ❖ *Publish pacs to camt guideline showing straight linear progression of the settlement on how the receiving agent and the initiating agent would process the transactions, and how they are reported to the debtor and to the creditor.*

*Q. When it comes to the sending statements between one bank to another bank, when will Swift enable camt.053 to be sent?*

*A. Swift enabled camt.053 today for a bank-to-bank interaction based on the CBPRplus guidelines. CGI has been in dialogue with Swift to develop standard and on implementing a CGI flavor/Rulebook for the multibank relay or the concentrator model. There are some challenges in that model and there had been talk about leveraging an API model.*

**Action: CGI-MP members to join working group 2 facilitated by William. His group always has very lively discussions as the members bring examples of reporting agent variances to seek new suggestions and harmonization.**

**Weekly webinars facilitated by William Porto, normally on Thursdays at 9AM New York; 3PM CET; 9PM Singapore. We welcome your active participation.**

### 2.3 WG 3 Direct Debit and Mandates

*The WG 3 led by Peter Noonan provided a brief update on his group activities on the CGI standards for direct debits which are commonly used within Europe and in the domestic markets.*
*He observed a number of changes made to the CGI pain.001 guidelines be equally applicable to the pain.008. The main areas are the structured name and postal address of the Debtor and the Creditor.*

*Q. Is there any cross-border direct debit system?*
*A. DD and mandate typically work in the local context and x-border use case is welcome for discussion*

**Action: CGI-MP members to join the WG 3 calls facilitated by Peter and discuss direct debit and mandate requirements and Request-to-Pay use cases.**

### 2.4 WG 5 Bank Services Billing update by Bridget Meyer

*The WG 5 led by Bridget Meyer focuses on best practices for a camt.086 (bank services billing) which is used by a number of banks globally. She provided an update on her working group activities below:*

- ❖ *Completed and published*
  - o *WG5 provided recommendations for an update to the 2018 version of the AFP Global Service Codes used in the camt.086 to identify charges in an industry standard way. AFP has accepted these changes and will publish the new version on their website for purchase this October along with an overview of the changes.*

*The taskforce was created to update the AFP codes and provide suggestions to the AFP on how to make these codes more relevant to the global billing. Compared to the ISO 20022 Bank Transaction Codes, the AFP codes are very detailed allowing the corporates and the banks to perform more detailed spend analytics on the billing report. For instance, in the cash management domain, there are over 1,100 AFP codes exist. Those banks who provide a BSB file, should plan to update the code set within their billing system in the next year. By the end of 2024, all banks will be using the latest 2023 versions of these code sets.*

*Bridget and her WG will continue to work on the following:*
- ❖ *Work on correlation between the BTC and AFP Codes.*
- ❖ *Vendor and bank surveys considered.*
- ❖ *Discussion of reporting negative and positive interest.*
- ❖ *ISO compensation/balance reporting codes not being used consistently by all*

*After the CGI Plenary, Bridget confirmed that the AFP Global Codes are live now as published by the AFP on Oct 6th 2023.*

**Action: CGI-MP members to join the WG 5 calls facilitated by Bridget and discuss billing enhancement through standards harmonization**

### 3. PMPG: Structured Postal Address

*Dominik shared the aligned decisions for the usage of structured postal address after discussing with the Payments Standard Maintenance Group and High Value Payment System Group in June 2023. During the CGI Plenary in Sep 2022, the group discussed the corporates' challenge in investing into providing all the ISO structured elements. PMPG took away this challenge whilst recognizing the fact that commingling of information into the structured elements is not an option and truncation should be avoided. Therefore, with reasonable efforts, a Hybrid address data option is proposed to fulfill the needs of compliance as well as the concerned parties in the payment value chains.*

*He shared 3 address data options; fully structured (preferred), fully unstructured (to be decommissioned by Nov 2026) and hybrid data option to go-live in Nov 2025 – refer to the PMPG slides.*

*The Hybrid data model means a combination of structured address elements and up to 2 lines of 70 characters of unstructured "Address Line" where at least the Town Name and the Country are the minimal required information. Structured elements must not be repeated in the Address Line elements.*

*As of Nov 2025, the Hybrid data option will be introduced in x-border payments and local clearings. Corporates may check with their CGI-MP bank, if a mixed (hybrid) address is supported between corporates and bank already today.*

*Q. Are you also in discussion with EPC/SEPA community as it is important to be aligned with SEPA where we have the unstructured Address Line including the County Code which does not really match these 3 options; structured, unstructured and hybrid. In fact, we had voting at EPC technical meeting and had a mixed result; some went for the hybrid address and others said no. Currently EPC sticked to the plan with the structured address but if PMPG raises a CR, the majority may vote for the hybrid address for SEPA.*
*A. PMPG is not directly engaging with the SEPA scheme evaluation board/EPC because SEPA is not considered as a system that has a lot of interoperability when it comes to x-border payments and Swift and they are not based on HVPS+. The current plan is that as of Nov 2025, only fully structured address elements are allowed but it maybe worthwhile to reconsider that to align with the hybrid data model that other MIs maybe allowed from Nov 2025 onwards.*

*Q. Are you not planning to reject files that will be transmitted thru FileAct or any plan to validate the content of the file as we need to update our systems?*
*A. What the rejection is covering here on the unstructured side as of Nov 2026 is in the interbank space, i.e. Swift MX and local RTGS legs of a x-border payment. Also the channel used for the x-border payment is important to enforce or validate the structure of the message, such as Swift FINplus.*

*Q. What point in the timeline will the Swift MT 103/202 messages disappear? The biggest problem I have in my corporate point of view is that currently we go from the ISO structured name and address but it is flicked into MT message and then it goes on to the beneficiary bank, the name of the beneficiary gets truncated as it gets into the address line of the MT message and gets mixed up. What point in the timeline when the banks just take the MX message and forward to the beneficiary?*
*A. MT 103/202 messages used interbank will be decommissioned at the end of the coexistence period in Nov 2025*

*Q. How long does it take to test these flows and implement the hybrid address data? When do I have to go out to the banks and at what point can I start testing this hybrid postal address? The PMPG slide says preparation for hybrid, so cheering this period 2024 and the go live day of Nov 2025 for me is too late as I want to start using it as early as possible in Jan 2025 so for me timeline is not good enough.*
*A. It depends on your bank and depends on the client-to-bank standard.*

*Q. Is it a pain.001 or a file upload or digital banking platform that the bank is offering? Why do we wait until Nov 2025? Why don't we introduce the new hybrid option even in 2024?*

*A. Although we were quite on time for the change request cycle for 2024, we cannot do something in isolation from Swift because x-border payments maybe transported into a local clearing infrastructure and none of the local systems supports hybrid. But the intermediary bank would end up with the unsuccessful forwarding of a payment. Therefore, we need to align the go live of hybrid between Swift in MX and local RTGS systems because of the changes that are still happening until late into 2025. Due to the fact that most RTGS systems based on HVPS+ will only implement hybrid as of Nov 2025, it is just simply not possible to do so anything before that date and of that scale for the testing window it really depends on validation platforms that provide FIs in order to bring you to the hybrid option. But I also need to say that the hybrid option is somehow the unstructured address with at least Town Name and Country Code, so it is not absolute.*

*Q. I don't want to make the change from a corporate point of view. We don't see any difference between domestic payment and x-border payments, it's the same structure, we don't care. We are not going to introduce one structure for a domestic and another structure for international, it'll be just the same.*
*A. Absolutely that what we are getting from our customers, we don't want to have too much guessing of where could the payments end up. There should be 1 format and that's also the banks in the various communities to agree on the implementation guidelines that are in line with this overall proposal.*

*Q. Regarding the local RTGS, I would like to understand the approach of hybrid address considering almost all the clearing houses which are non-HVPS+, e.g., China CIPS. When we have x-border payments right now, CIPS adopted ISO message format which is proprietary in nature. When we go for a x-border from China to outside China, banks and when we landed into CBPR+ space, there is no concept of structured address in China CIPS. So how are we going to address or would there be guidelines published for the intermediary or correspondent banks in the payment chain? How to handle such situations where one side we do not have any structured info supported by local MIs whereas CBPR+ would mandate the structured information?*
*A. When we talk about ISO harmonization, we start with ISO structured data end to end. For CIPS, it is not starting with ISO standard, so it is hard to say that we really try to harmonize different MIs and user communities respect the standard and use ISO from the start till the end. There would be any guidelines for the intermediary banks, how they can handle such traffic or what would be their best practices and such situations because we cannot upfront start rejecting the payments which are working all along and now we switched over to the new format.*

*Q. One of the biggest problems we always have as the corporate when we are doing regression testing is that the test environments of the bank you are dealing with are not updated to the same standard as production, missing bank accounts, missing names, structures. Also the payment stays within the test environment; you can test 80% of it but you cannot test the final 20% because the payment will not leave the test environment so you are only validating the structure of the payment flow, nothing else.*
*More of a statement to add to Peter's question around testing of a hybrid address. If we make the testing components available a lot sooner prior to the Nov date, we are looking at it from a holistic perspective and giving parties the additional time because of the way this change has been introduced to enable testing before the end of the coexistence period.*

**Action: CGI-MP Members to refer to the User Handbook produced by Kerstin's WG 1 which reflects PMPG proposal for the usage of structured postal address and implementation timelines.**

## 5. CGI-MP Members Update

*Kiyono updated the CGI-MP members as of Oct 2023, in total 154 institutions are the CGI-MP members; 49 Financial Institution members and 105 Non-Financial Institution members. She welcomed the new and additional members to the CGI-MP including BNP Paribas Fortis, Citi, DZ Bank, ING Bank, Microsoft, UTSIT. She welcomed corporate logo updates from Biotos, EFis and Pay.UK and DZ.*

*Action: CGI-MP Members to email* CGI.Support@swift.com *if you wish to publish your company name and logo on to the CGI-MP marketing materials.*

## 6. API Discussion Update

*Mario shared that API discussion has two dimensions; 1. business use cases of APIs such as reporting, Swift Instant Treasury pilot, eBAM where APIs as a useful means of communication. 2. technology, the means of authorization, boarding, certificates and security in the channel of communication.*

*In the context of Open Banking where they try to agree on API and one standard. Open banking is discussed in the area where you have a three-corner-model; Third party provider, accessing the data which is hosted by the banks and with the consent of the owner of the account. Such a three-party-model in practice is not that much used in the corporate world. The corporates rather using the information by themselves and in terms of European harmonization or regulation, they rather go for direct APIs. If you have any API standardization-related questions, come and join our CGI API subgroup.*

*Action: CGI-MP Members to email Mario if you wish to join the APIs discussion in May 2023*

## 7. Closing of the Plenary

*The 38th CGI-MP Plenary was closed by Mario Reichel, our Co-Convener for Non-Financial Institutions. He shared his SIBOS experience in Toronto where he represented CGI-MP to join Corporate Panel entitled Boosting value for corporates: How standards can help. He also highlighted the importance of better alignment with the future CBPR+, HVPS+ guidelines. CGI-MP standards are used at the start and at the end of a long payment chain in cross border payments. With the global shift to ISO 20022 in payments there is no need for conversion anymore. The future challenge is alignment of different variants of ISO 20022 UGs.*

*Mario thanked Hubert for his leadership and support for the eBAM market practice work and called for Candidate of Working Group 4 Facilitator:*

- *Collaborate with the group on fostering broad adoption and enhancing the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of eBAM standards and processes around the world*
- *Lead the conduct of the work group meetings and coordinate the production of the deliverables*
- *Distribute calendar meeting planner for meetings, including web meeting capabilities*
- *Distribute updates to working documents*

*If any CGI-MP members wish to join as a WG4 facilitator, please email CGI.Support@swift.com.*

Next CGI-MP Plenary date/time will be advised accordingly.