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1. **Introduction, presentation of the agenda**

This was the 1st meeting of the extension of the EIPP MSG mandate for a new period until November 2019. The meeting was held in the EPC premises in Brussels.

The Group’s composition and the participation at this meeting can be found in Annex 1 at the end of these minutes.

V. Vlad provided an introduction from the Secretariat. He presented the changes in the Group’s composition. 3 seats allocated to the EPC are now vacant: 1st previously assigned to the representant of the Polish Banking Association, who withdrawn from the Group in September 2018, the 2nd previously assigned to BdB whose representant withdrawn from the new mandate of the Group and the 3rd, the previous co-chair, Pirjo Ilola who also withdrawn due to job change. Nominations are ongoing and the new members from the EPC, including the elected new co-chair will join the Group as soon as possible.

V. Vlad also communicated the changes at the level of the observers (Eurosystem will have only one principal observer - Bernard Darrius - and 2 alternates, Rainer Olt and Daniel McLean) and the withdrawal of the representant of BEUC from the Group.

Vincent Kuntz from SWIFT who replaced D. Forceville in this meeting, and Bernard Darrius who joined the EIPP MSG for the 1st time, were welcomed by the other participants.

The participants presented themselves in a brief “tour de table”, including the members joining remotely by conference-call: C. Bryant, S. Elfstrand, P. Spittler, J. Vanhautère

The agenda was approved after a modification required by P. Spittler that the Terms of Reference of the newly created Multi-stakeholder Group on Request-to-Pay are also discussed.

1. **Review the ERPB November 2018 statement**

The ERPB statement was projected on screen and the discussion started about the EIPP part of it.

M. Battistella pointed out that the ERPB recognised the result of the EIPP work in 2018. He interpreted the conclusions as the invitation to continue the work on EIPP for servicing messages but also that for the EIPP governance it is not yet the right time for the EIPP MSG to work on.

He highlighted the additional point added by the ERPB: “analysing and preparing the concrete and rapid exploitation of the request-to-pay

functionality from a broader perspective”. He expressed his doubts regarding the justification of having 2 separate groups: one for continuing the work on EIPP and one specific for RTP.

V. Vlad provided the context in which the need for specific work on RTP occurred. He explained that the EPC Board assessed 2 options: to include the RTP in the SCT/SCT Inst payment schemes or to create an additional RTP scheme. The EPC Board subsequently decided to allocate a specific task to a Group for working on the RTP from a point of view beyond EIPP but relying on the RTP for EIPP. Attention should be paid to not overlap this scope with the scope of the EIPP MSG and of the MSCT MSG (“Mobile-initiated SCT and SCT Inst”)

J. Vanhautère, in agreement with P. Spittler and M. Battistella expressed the same concern, that it is not clear why there was a need for a 2nd Group dedicated to RTP. He interpreted the 2nd item added by ERPB as still targeting the EIPP.

M. Battistella was of the opinion that the ERPB statement cannot be changed, the decision to have 2 Groups being already taken, each of them with its Terms of Reference (ToRs), and thus we have to find ways of cooperation. He proposed to focus first on the EIPP MSG ToRs and then on the ToRs of the RTP MSG. J. Vanhautère pointed out that the relation between the 2 Groups should be clarified.

1. **Review of the Terms of Reference**

ToRs of the EIPP MSG

M. Battistella stated that the EIPP MSG ToRs are clear. J. Vanhautère agreed and considered that, at the standards level, there should be a link between the new standards for servicing messages (scope of the EIPP MSG) and the previous year work outcome, the submitted CRs updating the RTP for EIPP.

This link should be a principle all along the work for designing and submitting the servicing messages to ISO 20022.

The discussion ensued on the ToRs of the RTP MSG.

V. Vlad started to read the ToRs and the scope of work has been discussed. With regard to the ISO 20022 existing messages for RTP, T. Zerkti considered important that the ACHs (from EACHA and EBA Clearing) were invited as they own the infrastructures so that their opinions are taken into account with regard to the use of the RTP messages. V. Kuntz explained that currently the concerned messages (pain.013/014) are not widely used but there are initiatives which consider them.

P. Spittler, about the possible changes impacting these messages, stated that both scopes (EIPP and retail payments) may propose changes but coordination is important. M. Battistella’s view was rather that the changes proposed shouldn’t prevent other usages and keep the standard open, instead of narrowing the changes with specific proposals. The same principle should apply to servicing messages, for the moment required by EIPP only.

J. Vanhautère reminded that the EIPP MSG performed an analyse last year and concluded that there is no impact of the changes in the RTP messages on the payment schemes.

T. Zerkti pointed out that it could be an impact if the RTP is included in the SEPA schemes. Indeed, in this case the use of the version of the schemes is mandatory for the PSPs adhering to the schemes, so that there is an impact on the EIPP which is not in the schemes but uses the ISO RTP.

M. Battistella concluded that these issues clearly justify the need for collaboration between the 2 Groups. P. Spittler agreed and summarised the consequences of including the RTP in the payment schemes: it results that a subset will be for the payment but in the ISO standards another subset is for EIPP. Moreover, for EIPP the RTP will transport e-invoices attached but for payments it is not clear what the RTP will transport. M. Battistella pointed out that the scope of the RTP MSG is not the definition of schemes or inclusion of RTP in the schemes but the definition of use-cases and other type of areas.

J. Vanhautère considers there should be 1 unique type of RTP for both domains, so that the 2 Groups should work with the same standard for RTP. The coordination is then very important between the 3 Groups (existing EIPP, MSCT Groups and new RTP MSG).

P. Spittler pointed out that the scope of the MSCT MSG is not the RTP but the Mobile retail payment.

However, the risk of divergences at the level of the RTP still exists. V. Kuntz pointed out that it is of the role of SWIFT as Registration authority to take care of coherence of the changes to avoid conflicts in developing new versions.

M. Battistella invited EPC to address potential conflicts between the work performed by the 3 Groups.

With regard to the 4th bullet point of the scope, he sees a link with servicing messages as a way to integrate in the eco-system institutions others than actors from payment industry. For J. Vanhautère this point is not clear, as for EIPP the RTP was required to be exchanged in a very secured way, but other actors don’t use the same level of security. He observed that even if ERPB didn’t agree to continue the work toward an EIPP framework (which would have tackled the inclusion of new actors), here in this part of the RTP MSG scope it seems to start a work “from scratch” on how to include new actors.

It was an agreement that the role of the EPC is to resolve potential conflicts.

C. Bryant expressed his opinion that the creation of the RTP MSG is an important step and in general the RTP concept is extremely useful for many actors. We shouldn’t ignore the potential of the RTP, and the coordination is very important. He acknowledged the fact that ERPB, by not working on the EIPP framework and in the same time starting the work on broad RTP, has opened a “pandora box” which should be managed very carefully. This position may also reflect a certain scepticism with regard to the pan-European EIPP framework.

Discussion returning to the ToRs of the EIPP MSG

V. Vlad summarised the 2 servicing messages identified in 2018: enrolment and activation. The question for V. Kuntz was whether similar messages already exist in ISO 20022 and can be reused.

V. Kuntz mentioned the messages for e-mandates. They certainly will not be reused “as is” (scope is very different) but will be analysed to check whether some blocks of elements might be reused.

V. Kuntz briefly presented the cycle of development for new messages in ISO. Questioned by J. Vanhautère he explained that reusing a message takes more time than redefining a new one. This brings the advantage to be in control when the PaySEG analyses the proposals, otherwise all communities may have objections, requests, etc.

With regard to other needs applicable to servicing messages such as for P2P, RTP, retail commerce (P. Spittler), M. Battistella reminded that the scope is EIPP, but the design shouldn’t prevent other uses.

V. Vlad reminded that the Group should perform a public consultation on the proposed servicing messages.

V. Kuntz explained that technical building blocks may exist in other messages but the most important at this stage is the Business justification. He presented briefly the ISO template for the Business justification and explained that it should contain what we want to achieve, some metrics (expected volume of messages, number of users, etc.)

He indicated the needs for presenting the business flows in the use cases and the activities of each actors.

Regarding the timeline, he indicated that the shortest duration for creating new messages from the Business justification to the publication was 8 months. For new messages the submission time is not limited to the 1st of June every year, as in case of maintenance process, but can be at any moment. In our case we could target November as submission time, possibly with the approval of the PaySEG at that time.

He suggested to start on the ISO Business justification as soon as possible and in parallel, until June the Group can work on data elements. The produced material could be object for the public consultation.

1. **Workplan and meetings calendar**

M. Battistella proposed the following timeline:

* 2 full days (next 2 meetings) : workshops for the preparation of the Business Justification
* Until end May: work on MDR (Message Definition Report), part 1 and 2 using SWIFT standard tool and production of the document for public consultation
* June: public consultation
* Until end August: updates following the feed-backs during the consultation
* September: prepare and submit to ISO the set of message
* September-October: work on the report for ERPB
* Begining of November : submit the report to ERPB to present the work done. The report itself could be short, as the main deliverables should be the documents for ISO.

lunch break

M. Battistella resumed the planning of meetings as follows:

* The February meeting will be allocated to the definition of elements for the Business Justification and of elements of ISO messages
* The March meeting will be allocated to the finalisation of the Business Justification dcument and to start working on the document(s) for the public consultation
* The public consultation material should be ready by end of May

Depending on the progress of work, 1 or 2 meetings may be cancelled or replaced with conference-calls. Another option is to have the meetings 1 and 3 as physical meetings and 2 and 4, conference-calls.

1. **Review the EIPP MSG scope (from the previous report)**

V. Vlad presented the chapter 4 (“Harmonisation of the EIPP servicing messages”) and the annexes D (“Structure of EIPP servicing messages”) and E (“Technical message flows for EIPP servicing messages”) of the report of the EIPP MSG published in 2018. These parts of the previous year work represent the basis for the Group’s work in 2019.

V. Kuntz had the remark that it is good that the report presents the information flows of the servicing messages, but however the actors’ activities are missing. This is important to be included in the documents for the submission to ISO.

On the structure of the messages he pointed out that now the messages have more standardised Business application headers, instead of the proposed structure (example: Bank Account Management). He suggested that some categories from the proposed structures are reused from other messages already standardised.

M. Battistella agreed that the identification of actors’ activities should be the first priority and then the definition of data elements should be addressed.

With regard to the terminology, V. Kuntz suggested to decide on the Payee/Payer pair vs. Creditor/Debtor. On the difference between Legal name and Display name he noticed that until now this difference didn’t exist but can be included if it is justified. P. Spittler linked these names with Merchant name, element used in PSD2 directive to define a type of exemption from the SCA (Strong customer authentication). V. Kuntz observed that the Activation message doesn’t contain an end date. This is an interesting improvement and could be implemented if there is a market need.

1. **Workplan and meetings calendar (cont)**

M. Battistella proposed the following items for the 2nd meeting:

* Define the “activities” by actors
* Define the proposed information in the message’ datasets
* Check if similar structures of information are already available in other type of ISO 20022 messages and start working and analysing if these could be reused
* If there will be time left, start working on the Business justification document

The Group agreed on the following meeting dates:

20 February, 20 March, 10 April, 21 May, 29 August, 11 September and 17 October.

All meetings are physical, but some could be transformed in conference-calls after approval of the Group’s members.

V. Vlad will send provisional Outlook invitations for these dates. Formal invitations including meeting rooms will be sent by EPC assistants as usual, 2 weeks in advance.

The meeting ended at 15:30.
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