

Minutes

EIPP MSG 016-19
Version 1.0
12 June 2019

Public



Approved

Minutes of the meeting

EPC Multi-Stakeholder Group on EIPP (EIPP MSG)

Distribution: EIPP MSG

Meeting Date: 21 May 2019

Venue: EPC premises in Brussels

1 Introduction, presentation of the agenda

This was the 5th meeting of the EIPP MSG in 2019, held in the EPC premises in Brussels. The attendance to this meeting can be found in the Annex 1 at the end of these minutes. P. Spittler attended in the afternoon via Skype for Business.

Regarding the agenda, J. Vanhautère proposed to add an item after the item 2 (as it has impact on other agenda items), namely the EIPP scope extension and to start it with sharing the presentation explaining the areas for extension: activation at the initiative of the Payee and the enrolment of the Payers from the B2B segment.

M. Battistella reacted and proposed to focus on what the Group already has “on the table” so moving to the approval of the previous meeting minutes. His opinion was that the scope extension could be tackled, but after reaching the current target. It needs a strong analysis and survey among the solution providers to enforce this analysis. He considered that after the public consultation on the current scope, the topics proposed for extension could be requested. The position of other actors than PSPs, such as E-invoicing Solution Providers (EISP) is relevant.

He concluded that the agenda should be kept as is, to close the design of ISO 20022 messages and start the public consultation to fulfil the mandate from the ERPB. Starting the analysis of the scope extension now would take a lot of time and needs market involvement via a survey, but this is too early without a prior analysis and is in conflict with what was already agreed. He proposed to start working on the scope extension, after finishing the current steps, so after the public consultation which should start as soon as possible. After finalising the draft report for the current scope, the new topics can be included so that they can be part of the final report to the ERPB. Furthermore, he considered that in the new model, as the activation by the Payee can rely on the RTP message, the RTP MSG should be involved. RTP MSG couldn't be involved last year as it didn't exist but now this topic is in its scope.

J. Vanhautère was of a different opinion and explained that his counterproposal comes after the call with the ERPB Secretariat end of April organized by EPC secretariat with the 2 Co-chairs as



12 June 2019

agreed during the previous meeting. The outcome of this call was that the ERPB secretariat favours a pragmatic approach. We shouldn't limit the scope and if there is real need new topics could be pursued in parallel to the ongoing MSG work provided they do not delay the finalisation of the deliverables originally envisaged for the November 2019 ERPB meeting. It is up to the MSG to agree on how this should be achieved. J. Vanhautère considered that the public consultation is an opportunity to evaluate such new topics with the answers from the market. In terms of the analysis he explained that: i) for the activation by the Payees there is no need to update the messages as reusing a value from the current codelists for pain.013 or to add a new one via a CR would be sufficient; and ii) for the enrolment of B2B Payers it would be sufficient to add a field to distinguish in which role a party is doing the enrolment: as a Payee, Payer or both. This approach would allow implementations of type "click a box to enrol as ...". He suggested to tackle these new topics now and have advices from SWIFT. For the RTP message, he insisted on the fact that this message is first of all an ISO message, and any organisation may use it if relevant and the EIPP MSG can propose any modification to ISO as previously done. By adding them now in scope we could include them in the public consultation. The outcome will give guidance if there is a business need.

M. Battistella commented that during the last years work the elements proposed never emerged. Deep analysis was done only on the elements currently in scope. If after public consultation we will observe that a different model is needed we can further evaluate it, as it may have important impact. He evidenced that this is not a technical issue but a question on the business model, that should be fully analysed. This could take time and need to tackle complex cases such as B2B. He suggested to finish in this meeting the two working documents and add a question in the public consultation regarding the new potential need. If the responses to this question will be positive, then the Group can start working on this topic.

J. Vanhautère responded that the business need for the activation by the Payees results from the function related to "visibility" of Payees after enrolment, otherwise the activation wouldn't be possible. It was an agreement that this function is to be included. He re-stated that the ERPB Secretariat was informed and didn't have objections on the scope extension if new needs appear.

M. Battistella reiterated his opinion that we didn't do enough analysis and a market (providers) consultation is needed like it was done for the current scope. The design should come after such consultation

J. Vanhautère reminded that the topic of "servicing messages" was studied only in 2018 at the end of the works of the previous EIPP MSG and the new needs were discovered at that time (Cf, NB of page 11 of the 2018 report) and reassess now.

M. Battistella pointed out that at his memory the report did not mentioned new needs asked the Group Secretary to read the note in the 2018 report, where there is only stated "other models (*of activation, n.d.r.*) should not be excluded, such as activation initiated by the Payees and the possibility to use the RTPs without a previous activation. However, in such models, the Payer should communicate its identity and give its consent **through other channels than the EIPP ecosystem.**"



12 June 2019

M. Battistella re-proposed to add a question to the public consultation and in case of positive responses the topics can be analysed.

B. Darrius informed that the outcome of a call with ECB representatives was that it is important to not miss the “core” use-cases and that we don’t know how the market will evolve so that the use-cases included in the scope extension could become the main ones. M. Battistella pointed out that these were not discovered during the previous work and market consultation.

J. Vanhautère proposed to listen the opinions of other members. I.Gargiulo proposed to begin the work planned for the meeting trying to have a look at the possible implications deriving from the scope extension, so as not to delay the start of the consultation. S. Dosen was of the same opinion. T. Zerkti abstained from having an opinion. For B. Darrius these new use-cases look natural.

M. Battistella commented that the time already spent on these topics shows that they are not an easy subject.

J. Vanhautère proposed to work on the changes in the ISO 20022 standard for the scope extension as there is not very much to change, keep it aside waiting for public consultation results which should contain the question on the business need. M. Battistella disagreed as we should present final ISO 20022 documents for public consultation. B. Darrius asked whether the members in the MSG cannot analyse themselves instead of doing a larger analysis. M. Battistella was of the opinion that it isn’t sufficient. He mentioned that the last report refers to the “activation by the payee” as a topic that shouldn’t be excluded but this doesn’t mean a deep analysis was done. B. Darrius asked whether from SWIFT point of view the changes are complicated. V. Kuntz responded negatively.

M. Battistella pointed out that even though technically this might not be complicated, conceptually the models are different. Whilst activation by the Payees could be easier to analyse, the enrolment of B2B Payers is more complicated.

J. Vanhautère responded that the analysis was already done in the EPC mirroring task-force on EIPP and the scope extension was validated by the task-force.

To try to solve this gridlock situation J. Vanhautère asked the secretariat if a vote can be organised as stated in the TOR of the EIPP MSG on the scope extension. However, the number of voting Members present was not sufficient to reach the voting quorum (2/3 of voting members).

J. Vanhautère proposed so to consult the whole MSG via a voting procedure and the Group members agreed.

V. Vlad proposed that he will draft a text on scope extension for voting by email to be agreed with the co-chairs by the end of the week. The question will then be sent to the Group members for voting with a deadline Friday 31 May.

The agenda was not changed.



12 June 2019

2 Review and approval of the previous meeting's minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting (10 April 2019), reviewed by the co-chairs before the meeting were approved without updates.

3 Review the 2nd version of the Business Justification document

V. Vlad displayed on screen the draft of the new version of Business Justification (BJ) document

Small changes were applied in the sections up to the "Adoption scenario". The version with tracked changes is available for further checks: "EIPP MSG 009-19 Business justification - servicing messages v0.3.docx"

lunch break

Changes in "Adoption scenario" section:

V. Kuntz explained the purpose of this section. It was completely rewritten on screen. The version with tracked changes "EIPP MSG 009-19 Business justification - servicing messages v0.3.docx" contains the exact changes and the old content which was removed.

Discussion on "volumes" section

It has been agreed that V. Vlad proposes a content and a rough estimation based on the E-invoicing volumes available in the last Billentis report. The rough estimation will be based on the assumption that about ½ of the overall number of companies (27 milion) would potentially enrol in an EIPP eco-system and about ½ of the active EU population (200 milion) could use EIPP services for receiving and paying e-invoices.

4 Review the MDR draft

Two corrections were made in the Excel file detailing the structure of the messages (DRAFT2reda.066.001.01.xlsx) in the fields Visibility->End Date and GlobalVisibility (replace "third parties" with debtors" in the field description). The updated version is available for further use. Due to lack of time, all the MDR draft was not reviewed and the MSG members are invited to send their remarks to the secretariat.

M. Battistella commented on the field "ServiceActivationAllowed". The meaning of this field was clarified ("true"= the Payee accepts normal activations via servicing messages being defined, through the EIPP scheme; "false"= the Payee accepts only activations through other channels, outside of the EIPP scheme). No update was made on this field.

5 Prepare the public consultation

This agenda item was not discussed during the meeting.

An additional conference-call was scheduled for 12 June from 10 to 12. V. Vlad will send the invitation.



The meeting ended at 16:30.

ANNEX I: ATTENDANCE LIST

Name	Institution	Attendance
Chairs		
Massimo Battistella	EACT (Telecom Italia)	Yes
Jacques Vanhautere	EPC (SEPAmail.eu)	Yes
Members		
Sarah Elfstrand	EPC (Swedbank AB)	Apologies
Carlota Sustacha	EPC (BBVA)	Apologies
Ivana Gargiulo	EPC (Consorzio CBI)	Yes
Slavenka Došen	EPC (Zagrebačka banka)	Yes
Daniel Berger	EPC (SIX Banking Services)	Apologies
Tarik Zerkti	ECommerceEurope	Yes
Michel Gillis	EESPA	Apologies
Charles Bryant	EESPA	Apologies
Pascal Spittler	EuroCommerce	Yes, p.m. – via Skype
Observers		
Vincent Kuntz	SWIFT	Yes
Bernard Darrius	Banque de France	Yes
Roxanne Romme	EC/DG FISMA	Apologies
Secretariat		
Valentin Vlad	EPC	Yes