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

The meeting was held in the EPC premises in Brussels.

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

The agenda was approved without modifications.

The minutes of the previous Group meeting have been presented, updated with changes required by Kari Kemppainen. Some other modifications were required by Jacques Vanhautère and Massimo Battistella. The minutes were updated during the review and the final version was approved.

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

Dominique Forceville presented a status on the 2 CRs submitted to the ISO 20022. The 2nd CR (“Payment Conditions”) was analysed by the PaymentSEG. in its meeting of 9 July. EPC as submitting organisation was represented by Pirjo Ilola and Jacques Vanhautère.

Dominique Forceville informed the Group that now both CRs were accepted and passed in the status Considered for implementation. He mentioned that initially some concerns were raised by ISO 20022 RTPG on the 1st CR (“Enclosed File”), which are now resolved.

The CRs are now in a new phase, where the PaymentSEG will analyse how these will be implemented, during a series of calls in September.

Jacques Vanhautère highlighted that it is important the CRs were considered and informed the Group about the ongoing collaboration with SWIFT on the definition of the new form the CRs, which is now MCRs (Maintenance Change Requests). Once approved, the CRs will be part of the next version of the pain.013 and pain.014 scheduled for publication in Q1 2019. The MDR (Message Definition Report) of the 2 messages will be updated accordingly.

Massimo Battistella asked if there are still risks of rejection of the CRs. Dominique Forceville responded that there is a very small possibility so that it is very unlikely the CRs are rejected.

Jacques Vanhautère pointed out that after the concerns from the RTPG, it was expected that RTPG requests clarifications from the EPC, but until now, no such request was received.

Valentin Vlad informed the Group about the useful involvement of the CBI (original submitter and owner of the messages) in the analyse. Massimo Battistella suggested that this collaboration is maintained during the next phases.

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

Valentin Vlad provided a status on the consultation of the providers, launched on 22 June. He summarised the content and the timeline of it.

He informed the Group that a number of PSPs responded, by giving feed-back through the EPC Taskforce on EIPP, but no formal answer was received from EESPA. He invited Michel Gillis to react on this. He conveyed the message from Charles Bryant who confirmed the interest of EESPA for standardisation of servicing messages.

Michel Gillis explained that the usual procedure within EESPA was well followed and a conference-call was held with EESPA members operating also in payments industry. He believes that the lack of answers was due to the fact that the providers don’t currently use “servicing messages”.

Massimo Battistella asked how in this case the enrolment and activation are performed. Michel Gillis responded that these processes are performed by other means, e.g. by one-time configuration and the 3-corner model could explain why the servicing messages are not needed.

Massimo Battistella had the remark that these providers might have even a higher interest in the development of a standardised set of servicing messages, as they don’t need to create them “from scratch” when needed.

Other members also were surprised by the lack of responses from EESPA members, although this consultation was proposed mainly to EESPA members The summer period could also be a factor.

**Feed-backs from the PSPs:**

* Croatian banking association

This input refers to the elements “Template Identification” and e”-Invoice Limited Presentment” and states that their use could suggest that PSPs can negotiate an e-invoice template bilaterally, which can lead to a lot of various standards. This would be in conflict with the already defined standards for e-Invoice at EU level.

Rainer Olt pointed out that the EU standards are not impacted by the proposed servicing messages for EIPP

With regard to the EIPP ongoing work, Jacques Vanhautère reminded that the EnclosedFile optional field can transport any type of E-invoice.

Albrecht Wallraf suggested to mention in the report that in the market, the B2B sector has more freedom than the B2C in agreeing bilaterally on the format (individual customers cannot negotiate the format in which their suppliers send the e-Invoices).

Massimo Battistella proposed the 2 fields (“Template Identification” and e”-Invoice Limited Presentment”) remain in the proposal for servicing messages as they are optional and don’t have impact on the E-invoice standards.

Jacques Vanhautère, Rainer Olt, Albrecht Wallraf agreed on this. Albrecht Wallraf gave the possible usage in Germany where 2 standards exist (ZUGFeRD and Factur-X).

The Group agreed to keep these elements in the proposal for enrolment message.

Pascal Spittler suggested to provide a clarification to the Croatian community about the 2 elements.

* French banking community (multiple answers)

Jacques Vanhautère stressed the points submitted by French community especially on the possible conflicts between the fields in the servicing messages and those in the RTP. Example: the expected payment dates in the enrolment might be in conflict with Requested execution date and Early Payment Allowed.

The French community commonly pointed out that the servicing messages shouldn’t be redundant but complementary to RTP and must contain only the elements strictly needed for enrolment or activation.

It was agreed by the Group to explicitly mention in the report that in case of conflicts, the values of the RTP prevail over those of the servicing messages.

* Erste Bank Croatia

A proposal was discussed to include an element to identify all related messages belonging to a “transaction” by using a separate identifier. Dominique Forceville reminded that this is typically a technical proposal for the implementation. He explained that anyway, this type of identifier is often included in ISO 20022 messages at the implementation phase so that there is no need to include it now.

Lunch break

* CBI (Italy)

Valentin Vlad presented the remarks received from the CBI. He highlighted their observation on the directory model for EIPP. CBI considers that the “broadcasting” model where Payee enrolment is sent to all Payer PSP cannot be extended to pan-European level. They proposed for analysis a centralised model or semi-centralised (per country).

Jacques Vanhautère considered that from an industrial point of view, a central directory is better than fully distributed models and it is up to the participants to retrieve the information in a “pull” mode.

Massimo Battistella developed this topic:

* A difference needs to be done between the design of servicing messages and the directory model
* There are similarities with the design of e-Mandates delivered some years ago
* The basic idea is the Creditor needs to reach the Debtor PSP, so that if a fully distributed (broadcasting model) is not feasible, there is a need for intermediate Agents, through which the Creditor identity is sent. This identity can be based on the existing Creditor ID used for SDD.
* Two entry points might be needed: for PSP (the BIC) and for EIPP provider (to be defined).
* The structure of the messages should allow the transmission of these 2 identifiers and directories should store the link between them.

Michel Gillis briefly presented the possibility of using the EC CEF infrastructure eDelivery which is more and more promoted and used among E-invoicing solution providers. It allows the delivery of any type of document/message and provide routing mechanisms by the discovery of the receiver’s provider within a network of enrolled providers.

The discussion continued with a debate on the need for Directories for Payers. It has been agreed that there is no such a need as the Payers are already securely stored as customers of Payer PSPs.

Massimo Battistella considers that nevertheless the use case “Activation by the Payee” is needed. It consists of sending Activation messages from the Payees to the Payer PSPs asking the Payer to accept to receive RTPs. This will be obviously done only after Payer’s consent (positive response to the Activation request).

Pascal Spittler and Pirjo Ilola agreed and pointed out that this case can be used often with one-off invoices, where the Activation by the Payer could be more difficult.

* BBVA (Spain)

The suggested changes were accepted: “Initiating Party's Id” mandatory if the previous field is filled, “Debtor legal name”, “Debtor Identification“ and a new element “Creditor legal name” should be mandatory but cannot be tested for validity.

The Group started to brainstorm the need for the servicing message to be submitted to a standardization body.

1. **Presentation and discussion on the draft report**

It has been agreed that the full content of the Excel files for servicing messages shouldn’t be part of the report, but to keep only high-level info in this section (listing the types of information that the messages contain) .

Kari Kemppainen stressed that ERPB pays attention to the report form so that it should be well drafted, with balanced level of details, and clearly addressing the topics in the mandate. The previous report was well appreciated and this new delivery should have the same quality.

Rainer Olt pointed out that this year ERPB will decide its work-plan for 2 years so that the way forward should be very clear. The introduction should be shortened and not reminding all the history of the EIPP work. Kari Kemppainen suggested that the start point can be the last year report. Rainer Olt proposed that the main sub-topics are visible and well structured: i) introduction, ii) the 2 deliverables (on RTP and on Servicing messages) and iii) the need for harmonization (for the way forward).

Valentin Vlad will deliver a new version of the draft before the next meeting on 25 September. It will take into account the points discussed in this meeting, and other feed-backs already received by email or that the members will send in the coming days.

1. **AOB and next steps**

* Valentin Vlad continues the work on the report draft on the basis of this meeting outcome.
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