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1. **Introduction, presentation of the agenda and approval of previous minutes**

The meeting was held in the EPC premises in Brusselsand a Skype for Business session was available for the members attending remotely.

The list of participants can be found in Annex 1 at the end of these minutes.

The agenda was approved after switching the items 5 and 6 (report structure first, followed by the brainstorming session).

The minutes of the previous Group meeting have been presented. Some modifications were required by Jacques Vanhautère and Massimo Battistella.The minutes were updated during the review and final version approved.

1. **Status on the ISO CRs on Request-to-pay**

Valentin Vlad gave a status on the 2 CRs presented in the ISO PaySEG online meetings of 25/06 and 2/07. He detailed the objections raised during the 1st meeting on the 1st CR (adding an EnclosedFile element to the pain.013/14 messages). This CR was postponed for further clarifications until 2 July. Several exchanges took place between the 2 meetings and finally in the meeting of 2 July the CR was validated. The 2nd CR was scheduled for discussion for 9 July meeting. As Valentin Vlad will be out of the office on that date, Pirjo Ilola and Jacques Vanhautère will present it.

The Group discussed the reasons that led to objections against the 1st CR. The general opinion was that local implementations shouldn’t block the evolution of a standard. Larger consultation before submission of CRs is recommended but the EPC MSG couldn’t do this as it couldn’t know the global impacts that a CR may have on other communities and other usages. An alternative was proposed in PaySEG to create a variant “002” of the messages (pain.013.002.xxx). Evelyne Piron’s opinion was this is not recommended by SWIFT. Pascal Spittler mentioned the possible problems for IT systems (e.g. “parsers”) to process the variants.

Massimo Battistella highlighted the advantage that the attachment to the RTP may bring to real-time payments, e.g. for transporting e-receipts.

Jacques Vanhautère mentioned that the objection was related to the risk to not meet the real-time payments SLA due to the inclusion of big size attachments. However, he insists that the attachment is optional, and additional data are already possible, so the argument of the SLA couldn’t be retained.

Rainer Olt recognised the fact that the RTP can be used in both E-invoices and real-time payments (e.g. payment at POS) but the latter is not impacted by allowing attachments to the RTP.

In general, the opinion was that the process for the 1st CR was correctly followed, and the business justification is strong. The Group expressed its satisfaction that this CR was validated. Evelyne Piron (SWIFT) explained that as from now, normally it shouldn’t be any problem regarding the implementation. SWIFT will take over the work and probably will ask CBI (initial submitter of the messages) to work on the implementation of the new version.

Albrecht Wallraf suggested that the Group should acknowledge that objections raised can be also tackled with answers in the future work. Rainer Olt agreed and added that it is important to explain what we are doing vs. other use-cases.

Jacques Vanhautère too, considered that the previous discussions with PaySEG are useful and can be seen as lessons for the future.

Pascal Spittler asked Evelyne Piron if for the implementation phase, the Group should provider more details. She answered no, SWIFT and probably CBI will take over the work.

1. **Status on the consultation for servicing messages**

Prior to the status on the consultation, several general questions about servicing messages were raised:

* Pirjo Ilola asked which business area of ISO 20022 is the most appropriate to include the future servicing messages. On the same topic, Jacques Vanhautère asked if a new set of messages will be created or an existing one will be reused. Evelyne Piron responded that the Registration Authority (SWIFT in this case) will make an analysis and will advise on this choice. In case of reuse, it is important that the new use cases not lead to a misuse of the existing set of messages.
* Albrecht Wallraf asked if the MSG could recommend a business area. The answer was yes, ISO is open to recommendations and suggestions, but the decision will be of SWIFT responsibility.
* Pascal Spittler’s opinion was that only “Payments” or “Trade” categories could include such messages
* Massimo Battistella pointed out the only similarity he can find is with the E-mandates related messages.
* Massimo Battistella and Jacques Vanhautère stressed the importance of making a standard for servicing message in order to achieve interoperability. Whilst for E-invoices and RTPs standards exist, for servicing message such a standard doesn’t exist yet.

Valentin Vlad provided a status on the consultation launched on 22 June. Massimo Battistella explained that after the deadline, Valentin Vlad will consolidate the answers and the result will be communicated to the Group for the preparation of the Group’s position and refinement of the proposal that will be included in the final report.

The next meeting – or a part of it - will be dedicated to the analysis of answers.

It was discussed why this consultation was not public. Massimo Battistella highlighted the goal of this action was to help the Group to make a proposal based on providers’ input. A public consultation could be needed in the further stages of development of the framework..

1. **Structure of the final report**

Valentin Vlad displayed the statement of the ERPB released after their meeting of end November 2017, to remind the expectations of the ERPB.

Reading attentively the part of the statement concerning the EIPP work for 2018, Kari Kemppainen pointed out that concerning the two main deliverables: the RTP the work has been done and the work on servicing messages almost done. Accordingly, there could remain an additional topic to be looked at:

“*…In addition, it could be considered whether request-to-pay messages could also be used in a framework-agnostic manner, allowing the payment of invoices under different models.*”

Rainer Olt noticed that, in the light of the further expectations, the Group shouldn’t focus this year on the EIPP framework or scheme:

*“After completion of the first step […], the ERPB would consider a common EIPP framework consisting of a minimum set of rules, to support integration of existing EIPP solutions and provide guidance on emerging EIPP solutions for delivering harmonised EIPP services”*

Therefore, this year the focus should be to explain how to make the 2 elements (RTP, servicing messages) working together, which completes the work already done.

Valentin Vlad displayed the slide 9 of the presentation EIPP MSG 008-18 scope definition-v0.3.pptx, produced in March when the Group agreed on the scope of the work for this year.

Massimo Battistella supported Rainer’s position and added that we should address the topics for the future, so to give clear advice for the way forward to ERPB. Jacques Vanhautère also agreed that – at a minimum - the focus should be on how make the messages working together.

Pascal Spittler pointed out that the security related aspects should be addressed.

Albrecht Wallraf proposed to go further, for example by asking an entity to develop an EIPP scheme.

He started to draft a schema on the white board containing the topics that the report should contain.

1. **“Brainstorming” session on the way forward**

Massimo Battistella continued the drafting in a “mind-mapping” form.

He used the slides “EIPP MODEL 09\_04\_2018.pptx” during the brainstorming time.

Lunch break

Some items identified first (not necessarily in this order):

* use-cases including E-receipts
* Concerns raised during the PaySEG analysis meeting
* Implementation guidelines – especially on the content that should be harmonised. In this respect the guidelines for the RTP are more urgent as the updated version of the pain.013/014 ISO messages will be created soon, so an entity interested in the implementation should have the guidelines in a timely manner

Jacques Vanhautère asked whether the registers of participants should be addressed. Massimo Battistella answered that in this phase maybe not, as the 1st focus is the ISO RTP message and the guidelines. Even without a common framework, bilateral agreement could make possible the use of the RTP, but however we should give indications about the interoperability.

Looking at the slide 12 of the presentation, a discussion ensued on which of the 5 scenarios are eligible when it comes to the interoperability. Rainer Olt gave the example of Estonia where the solution implements the 5th scenario (only E-invoice sent and RTP created from it at Payer’s PSP side), but for interoperability a move to the 4th scenario (only RTP is sent with E-invoice attached) should be foreseen.

It was an agreement that the 4th scenario best enables the interoperability as being the RTP-based scenario. The scenario 1 (both RTP and E-invoices are sent) also uses RTP but it is decorrelated from the E-invoice, which is a drawback compared to the 4th. Nevertheless, if 95% of the EIPP volume is domestic and 5% only cross-border requiring interoperability, the existing solutions can still work for the 95%, but the model 4 is needed for the 5%. The model 4 doesn’t prevent the use of other models, especially the model 1 - also based on the RTP.

List of items identified and transcribed in the mind-mapping schema:

* RTP -> what we have done, implementation guidelines, use-cases, PaySEG concerns, E-receipts
* Servicing messages -> what we have done, consultation, analysis, recommendations, functional model, implementation guidelines for interoperability
* How to proceed -> short term, long term
* Infrastructures/networks -> Registers/directories, connectivity, security/trust
* Future developments -> EIPP network governance, agreements for interoperability, service providers enrolment, participants identification, development of ISO servicing messages

(not all items are listed above, image of the full schema will be distributed to the members)

Remarks raised about the items identified:

* ISO standards once developed need implementation guidelines/rules. This currently applies to the RTP as the development is on the roadmap, so we should already prepare the guidelines. Servicing messages are not yet in the phase of standard’s development, so they should be presented at a higher level.
* RTP needs rules because it is close to the SCT/SCT Inst schemes (Albrecht Wallraf)
* RTP needs rules because the ISO standard is larger than the context of European EIPP context so for EIPP the rules aim to restrict and explain the standard (Massimo Battistella)
* “Infrastructures” topic should cover the aspects on how the messages will be exchanged (Rainer Olt). A better term is “network” (Jacques Vanhautère). Example of EBA Clearing and other ACHs, they are elements of a network. A governing body is needed at least to manage the participants adherence to the framework. Other reason: to manage the evolution of the framework.
* For servicing messages, we need a “functional model”. It is justified by the reason to have servicing messages which is the achievement of pan-European interoperability.
* Several models for registers/directories were mentioned: centralised, decentralized per country, distributed/fully decentralised.

Rainer Olt proposed a structure of the report, that he will share with Valentin Vlad.

He stressed the point of attention that the report should not challenge the step by step approach of the ERPB.

With regard to the servicing messages, Massimo Battistella suggested that the Group can propose to the ERPB to extend its mandate for 6 months for the submission to ISO the proposal for new messages. Rainer Olt pointed out that the reason of such a request would be to complete the 2nd point of the mandate. Other opinions were that this point will be finalised by presenting the data structures (semantic model) as only the RTP was mentioned for explicit submission to ISO. Another option can be that EPC gives a pre-agreement to continue the work after end-November with the submission to ISO by the same Group. This can help to win time and not to wait a new decision from ERPB and approval from EPC. Valentin Vlad will check with the EPC management if this option is feasible.

1. **AOB and next steps**

* Valentin Vlad informed the Group that an information on the work done, especially on the RTP will be given to the EPC SEM WG. He will keep the contact with the chairs on this point
* Valentin Vlad will collect the answers to the consultation until 31 July
* As of 1st of August he will consolidate the answers and distribute the result to the Group
* He will continue the work on the report draft on the basis of the mind-mapping and proposed structure
* Conference-calls can be scheduled with the co-chairs to help for the work progress and clarify all the points
* In the meeting of 11 September the Group will analyse the answers to the consultation
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