



European
Payments Council

SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook 2020 Change Request Public Consultation

EPC002-20 / Version 1.0 / Date issued: 12 March 2020

Public Consultation 2020 Change Requests for SCT Inst Rulebook

EPC002-20
Version 1.0
Date issued: 12 March 2020



**European
Payments Council**

European Payments Council AISBL
Cours Saint-Michel, 30 - B - 1040 Brussels
T +32 2 733 35 33
Entreprise N°0873.268.927
secretariat@epc-cep.eu

The Single Euro Payments Area (SEPA) payment schemes, as set out in the SEPA Credit Transfer (SCT), the SEPA Instant Credit Transfer (SCT Inst), the SEPA Direct Debit Core (SDD Core) and the SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business (SDD B2B) rulebooks, evolve based on a transparent change management process adhered to by the European Payments Council (EPC). For details on the principles governing the EPC scheme change management process, we refer to sections 5, 6 and 7 in this document and the sources listed at the end of this page.

This SCT Inst 2020 Change Request Public Consultation Document (document EPC002-20) details change requests for possible modifications to be introduced into the next version of the SCT Inst rulebook. This public consultation document builds on change requests submitted by stakeholder representatives, banking communities and by EPC Working and Support Groups. The SCT Inst 2020 Change Request Public Consultation Document offers the analyses and recommendations of the EPC Scheme Evolution and Maintenance Working Group (SEMWG) on the way forward regarding individual change requests. A summary overview of the change requests and related recommendations by the SEMWG are provided in section 1 of this Change Request Public Consultation Document.

The EPC submits the SCT Inst 2020 Change Request Public Consultation Document for public consultation. The public consultation takes place between 12 March and 09 June 2020.

All scheme participants and stakeholders are encouraged to provide feedback on the possible changes to be introduced into the next version of the SCT Inst rulebook by completing the response template EPC006-20 and send it to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu by 09 June 2020 at 17h00 CET at the latest. The EPC will not consider any feedback received after this deadline.

Proposed changes detailed in this SCT Inst 2020 Change Request Public Consultation Document, which are broadly accepted by all scheme participants and stakeholders, and that are technically and legally feasible, will be taken forward, after approval by the Scheme Management Board (the EPC decision-making body in charge of the schemes' administration and evolution). Others will not be retained. The updated version of the SCT Inst rulebook will be published in November 2020 for implementation in November 2021. In accordance with industry best practice, payment service providers and their suppliers have a one-year lead time to address rulebook updates prior to such updates taking effect.

More information about the maintenance and the evolution of the SCT Inst scheme is available in Chapter 4 of the [Scheme Management Internal Rules \(The Internal Rules\)](#) being a binding Annex to the current applicable SCT Inst rulebook.

It should be noted that the EPC is under the legal obligation to ensure compliance of the SCT Inst rulebook with existing EU legislations or to any new EU legislation impacting the SCT Inst rulebook.



Therefore, the EPC reserves the right to make necessary changes to the SCT Inst rulebook at all times in order to ensure that the SCT Inst rulebook does comply with changes to existing EU legislation or with the entry into force of any new EU legislation.

Please refer to Annex 1 for the original detailed change requests. This document contains only a summary of each individual change request.



Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary: Major Change Requests to the SCT Inst Rulebook	9
1.1	EPC Approach	9
1.2	Overview of Change Requests and Proposed Way Forward for Consideration by Respondents to the Public Consultation	11
1.3	Overview of Changes to Align the Next Version of the SCT Inst Rulebook with any Existing EU Legislation and with the Entry into Force of New EU Legislation	14
2	Detailed Analysis of Major Change Requests to the SCT Inst Rulebook	15
2.1	# 8: Change request has been withdrawn.....	15
2.1.1	Description	15
2.2	# 9: Reference to separate EPC guidance document on SCT Inst r-transaction reason codes..	16
2.2.1	Description	16
2.2.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation.....	16
2.2.3	Rulebook impact	16
2.3	# 10: Alignment of the Recall and RFRO datasets within the SCT Inst rulebook, and between both SCT rulebooks.....	17
2.3.1	Description	17
2.3.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation.....	17
2.3.3	Rulebook impact	17
2.4	# 11: Use of 'Fraud' reason code up to 13 months under the Recall procedure	18
2.4.1	Description	18
2.4.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation.....	18
2.4.3	Rulebook impact	18
2.5	# 12: Clarification on the definition of Banking Business Day.....	19
2.5.1	Description	19
2.5.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation.....	19
2.5.3	Rulebook impact	19
2.6	# 16: Alignment of all attribute numbers across all EPC SEPA payment scheme rulebooks	20
2.6.1	Description	20
2.6.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation.....	20
2.6.3	Rulebook impact	20
2.7	# 18: Introduction of a credit notification message.....	21
2.7.1	Description	21



2.7.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation.....	21
2.7.3	Rulebook impact	21
2.8	# 19: Possibility to provide a future execution date and time for SCT Inst instructions.....	22
2.8.1	Description	22
2.8.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation.....	22
2.8.3	Rulebook impact	22
2.9	# 20: Migration to the 2019 version of the ISO 20022 messaging standard	23
2.9.1	Description	23
2.9.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation.....	24
2.9.3	Rulebook impact	24
2.10	# 21: Introduction of a credit notification message for the Beneficiary.....	25
2.10.1	Description.....	25
2.10.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	25
2.10.3	Rulebook impact.....	25
2.11	# 22: Change request has been withdrawn.....	26
2.11.1	Description.....	26
2.12	# 23: Inclusion of flowcharts for the RFRO procedure.....	27
2.12.1	Description.....	27
2.12.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	27
2.12.3	Rulebook impact.....	27
2.13	# 27: Linking an SCT Inst transaction with a preceding Request-To-Pay message	28
2.13.1	Description.....	28
2.13.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	28
2.13.3	Rulebook impact.....	28
2.14	# 29: New obligation under transaction status investigation procedure	29
2.14.1	Description.....	29
2.14.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	29
2.14.3	Rulebook impact.....	29
2.15	# 30: Reduction of target maximum execution time and time-out deadline	30
2.15.1	Description.....	30
2.15.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	30
2.15.3	Rulebook impact.....	30
2.16	# 31: Optional fraud indication marker in SCT Inst transaction	31
2.16.1	Description.....	31



2.16.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	31
2.16.3	Rulebook impact	31
2.17# 32:	Allow the transfer back of a lower amount as a positive response to a Recall due to fraud	32
2.17.1	Description	32
2.17.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	32
2.17.3	Rulebook impact	32
2.18# 33:	Possibility to credit a technical account following a positive response to a Recall	33
2.18.1	Description	33
2.18.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	33
2.18.3	Rulebook impact	33
2.19# 34:	Extension of the period to submit a Recall	34
2.19.1	Description	34
2.19.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	34
2.19.3	Rulebook impact	34
2.20# 35:	Align the rulebook with the Funds Transfer Regulation	35
2.20.1	Description	35
2.20.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	35
2.20.3	Rulebook impact	35
2.21# 36:	New service 'Initial payment with unknown final amount'	36
2.21.1	Description	36
2.21.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	36
2.21.3	Rulebook impact	36
2.22# 37:	New service 'instalment payment'	37
2.22.1	Description	37
2.22.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	37
2.22.3	Rulebook impact	37
2.23# 38:	New service 'instant customer refund'	38
2.23.1	Description	38
2.23.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	38
2.23.3	Rulebook impact	38
2.24# 39:	Transmission of alias or proxy details about Originator and Beneficiary	39
2.24.1	Description	39
2.24.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	39



2.24.3	Rulebook impact	39
2.25# 41:	Allow Beneficiary Bank to let its CSM conduct status investigation procedures.....	40
2.25.1	Description.....	40
2.25.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	40
2.25.3	Rulebook impact.....	40
2.26# 42:	Reformulate rulebook section on maximum execution time	41
2.26.1	Description.....	41
2.26.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	41
2.26.3	Rulebook impact.....	41
2.27# 43:	Replacement of the term Bank with PSP and updated Customer definition	42
2.27.1	Description.....	42
2.27.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	42
2.27.3	Rulebook impact.....	42
2.28# 44:	Changes to Recall and Request For Recall by the Originator (RFRO) procedures	43
2.28.1	Description.....	43
2.28.2	SEMWG analysis and recommendation	43
2.28.3	Rulebook impact.....	43
2.29# 46:	Change request has been withdrawn.....	44
2.29.1	Description.....	44
2.30# 47:	Change request has been withdrawn.....	45
2.30.1	Description.....	45
3	Changes Pertaining to the Impact of the SEPA Regulation or any Other EU Legislation	46
4	Detailed Analysis of Minor Changes to the SCT Inst Rulebook	49
4.1	Change Requests	49
5	Principles Governing the Change Management Cycle.....	51
5.1	Change Request Public Consultation Document.....	51
5.2	Structure of the Change Request Public Consultation Document	51
6	Change Management Cycle in respect of Major Change Requests	52
6.1	Consideration of Change Requests	52
6.2	Change Request Public Consultation Document.....	52
6.3	SEMWG Recommendations	52
6.4	Public Consultation on the Change Requests.....	52
6.5	Next Steps.....	52
6.6	Further Information.....	53



7	Change Management Cycle in respect of Minor Change Requests	54
7.1	Publication of List of Minor Change Requests	54
7.2	Comments on the Minor Change Requests	54
7.3	Submission of the List of Minor Change Requests to the SMB.....	54
	Annex 1 - Original Change Requests.....	55



1 Executive Summary: Major Change Requests to the SCT Inst Rulebook

1.1 EPC Approach

The principles governing the evolution of the Single Euro Payments Area (SEPA) payment schemes as set out in the SEPA Credit Transfer (SCT) and SEPA Direct Debit (SDD) rulebooks are detailed in the 'SEPA Scheme Management Internal Rules' (the Internal Rules). These Internal Rules are available for download on the European Payments Council ([EPC Website](#)). Sections 5, 6 and 7 in this SCT Inst 2020 Change Request Public Consultation Document detail the application of the Internal Rules in the EPC scheme change management process.

The Internal Rules make a difference between so called major and minor changes to the EPC rulebooks. A major change is a change that affects or proposes to alter the substance of the rulebooks and the schemes. Any change to chapters 5 and 6 of the rulebooks is always considered a major change. A minor change is a change of an uncontroversial and usually technical nature that facilitates the comprehension and use of the rulebooks.

This executive summary of the SCT Inst 2020 Change Request Public Consultation Document highlights change requests for major changes to the SCT Inst rulebook received in this scheme change management cycle. Change requests for minor changes to the SCT Inst rulebook are set out in section 4 of this Change Request Public Consultation Document. All change requests to the SCT Inst rulebook are submitted for public consultation between 12 March and 09 June 2020. Information on how to share feedback with the EPC is included on the cover page of this Change Request Public Consultation Document.

The EPC received **30** change requests for major changes to be introduced into the SCT Inst rulebook. The change requests submitted to the EPC are included in Annex 1 to this document.

A first change request is to migrate all ISO 20022 XML-based messages under the rulebook to the 2019 version of the ISO 20022 messaging standard in November 2022. Another change request suggests aligning all attribute numbers across all four EPC SEPA payment scheme rulebooks in November 2022.

Several change requests propose new services under the SCT Inst scheme:

- A credit notification message for the Beneficiary: a message based on the ISO 20022 standard for a successfully executed SCT Inst transaction in the bank-to-customer space;
- Initial payment with unknown final amount: it enables the identification of an initial instant payment transaction as a kind of pre-authorisation/ service transaction and the subsequent (final) payment as the payment completion;
- Instalment payment: supporting SCT Inst-driven instalment payments to customers for goods or services at the Point of Interaction (PoI). It allows the payer to split the payment of a single purchase of goods or services into a finite number of periodic transactions, with a specified end date;
- Instant customer refund: a service at the PoI to reimburse customers instantly.

One other proposal is the possibility to submit SCT Inst instructions with a future execution date and time. Another contribution suggests the introduction of an optional fraud indication marker in SCT Inst transactions to facilitate SCT Inst fraud prevention or detection. One change request proposes features that can link an SCT Inst transaction with a preceding Request-To-Pay (RTP) message.



Several proposals have been made to change the r-transaction procedures Recall and Request For Recall by the Originator (RFRO). These proposals are among others:

- New r-transaction reasons;
- Inclusion of extra procedure diagrams;
- The extension of the period to submit such r-transaction procedures;
- The alignment of the Recall and RFRO datasets within the SCT Inst rulebook and between the SCT Inst and SCT rulebooks;
- A formal rulebook reference to a separate EPC guidance document on SCT Inst r-transaction reason codes;
- Allow the transfer back of a lower amount as a positive response to a Recall due to fraud;
- Possibility to credit a technical account following a positive response to a Recall.

Other suggestions are the introduction of new obligations for the interbank SCT Inst transaction status investigation procedure and to allow the Beneficiary Bank to let its CSM conduct such status investigation procedure.

A few change requests suggest a review or a reduction of the current target maximum execution time and time-out deadline. A further contribution is the inclusion of two optional attributes to transmit alias or proxy details about the Originator and the Beneficiary through the interbank space.

Several change requests propose terminology changes in the rulebook: an updated definition of the term 'Banking Business Day', the replacement of the term 'Bank' with 'PSP' and an updated definition of the term 'Customer'. Another change request points out that there is a need to align the rulebook with the EU Funds Transfer Regulation.

All change requests to the SCT Inst rulebook received were reviewed by the EPC Scheme Evolution and Maintenance Working Group (SEMWG). These change requests include the recommendation of the SEMWG regarding each of these change requests unless the SEMWG is not able to provide a recommendation for the public consultation. Each recommendation reflects one of the options detailed in items a) through f) below:

- a) The change request is **already provided for** in the scheme: no action is necessary for the EPC.
- b) The change request **should be incorporated into the scheme**: the change request would become part of the scheme and the rulebook would be amended accordingly.
- c) The change request should be included in the scheme as an **optional feature**:
 - The new feature is optional and the rulebook would be amended accordingly;
 - Each scheme participant¹ may decide to offer the feature to its customers, or not.
- d) The change request is **not considered fit for SEPA wide use** and could be handled as an additional optional service (AOS) by interested communities:
 - The proposed new feature would not be included in the rulebook or in the implementation guidelines released by the EPC with regard to the rulebook;
 - The development of AOS is out of scope of the EPC. The EPC does however publish declared AOS arrangements on its website for information;
 - The EPC may consider the inclusion of AOS arrangements, if supported by enough communities, in a future version of the rulebook.
- e) The change request **cannot** be part of the existing scheme for one of the following reasons:

¹ A scheme participant is a payment service provider which has formally adhered to an EPC SEPA payment scheme.



- It is technically impossible;
 - It is not feasible (explained on a case by case basis);
 - It is out of scope of the EPC;
 - It does not comply with the SEPA Regulation² or any other relevant EU legislation.
- f) The change request may be considered for the development of a **new scheme**:
- The change request reflects major changes which cannot be integrated into an existing scheme;
 - To develop the change request further, i.e. to develop a new scheme, the following requirements must be met:
 - The benefits of the new scheme for payment end users are demonstrated prior to the launch of the development phase;
 - It is demonstrated that enough stakeholders will make use of the new scheme;
 - A cost-benefit analysis is provided;
 - It complies with the SEPA Regulation or any other relevant Regulation.

1.2 Overview of Change Requests and Proposed Way Forward for Consideration by Respondents to the Public Consultation

The below table lists all the received change requests which are submitted for public consultation. The SEMWG has issued a recommendation on the way forward about each change request. The reasons underlying each recommendation are detailed in section 2. The final decision whether a change request will be incorporated into the rulebook is however subject to the outcome of the public consultation.

The contributors to this public consultation are requested to indicate whether they agree with the recommendation of the SEMWG on the way forward.

In case the contributors do not agree with the SEMWG recommendation, they are requested to indicate in the comments section of the response template EPC006-20 their preferred way forward (e.g., support of the original change request, selecting another option).

Furthermore, any additional comments are welcome in the comments section.

Change Request item	Topic	Contributor	Recommendation of the SEMWG on the proposed way forward. The final decision is subject to the outcome of the public consultation.
8	Change request has been withdrawn	EPC SEMWG	Withdrawn
9	Reference to separate EPC guidance document on SCT r-transaction reason codes	EPC SEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b

² Regulation (EU) No 260/2012 establishing technical and business requirements for credit transfers and direct debits in euro and amending Regulation (EC) No 924/2009



Change Request item	Topic	Contributor	Recommendation of the SEMWG on the proposed way forward. The final decision is subject to the outcome of the public consultation.
10	Alignment of the Recall and RFRO datasets within the SCT rulebook, and between both SCT rulebooks	EPC SEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
11	Use of 'Fraud' reason code up to 13 months under the Recall procedure	EPC SEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
12	Clarification on the definition of Banking Business Day	EPC SEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
16	Alignment of all attribute numbers across all EPC SEPA payment scheme rulebooks	EPC SEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme as of November 2022 - option b
18	Introduction of a credit notification message	Westhafen-Expertendialog Instant Payments	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b - see change request # 21
19	Possibility to provide a future execution date and time for SCT Inst instructions	EPC SEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
20	Migration to the 2019 version of the ISO 20022 messaging standard	EPC SEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme as of November 2022 - option b
21	Introduction of a credit notification message for the Beneficiary	EPC SEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
22	Change request has been withdrawn	EPC SEMWG	Withdrawn
23	Inclusion of flowcharts for the RFRO procedure	EPC SEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
27	Linking an SCT Inst transaction with a preceding Request-To-Pay message	EPC RTP MSG	No SEMWG recommendation defined
29	New obligation under transaction status investigation procedure	Dutch Payments Association	Cannot be part of the existing scheme – option e
30	Reduction of Target maximum execution time and Time-out deadline	Dutch Payments Association	Cannot be part of the existing scheme – option e



Change Request item	Topic	Contributor	Recommendation of the SEMWG on the proposed way forward. The final decision is subject to the outcome of the public consultation.
31	Optional Fraud Indication Marker in SCT Inst transaction	Dutch Payments Association	Cannot be part of the existing scheme – option e
32	Allow the transfer back of a lower amount as a positive response to a Recall due to fraud	French Banking Federation	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
33	Possibility to credit a technical account following a positive response to a Recall	French Banking Federation	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
34	Extension of the period to submit a Recall	French Banking Federation	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
35	Align the rulebook with the Funds Transfer Regulation	Banking & Payments Federation Ireland	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
36	New service 'Initial payment with unknown final amount'	EuroCommerce	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
37	New service 'instalment payment'	EuroCommerce	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
38	New service 'instant customer refund'	EuroCommerce	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
39	Transmission of alias or proxy details about Originator and Beneficiary	Nordic Payments Council	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
41	Allow Beneficiary Bank to let its CSM conduct status investigation procedures	Nordic Payments Council	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
42	Reformulate rulebook section on maximum execution time	Nordic Payments Council	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
43	Replacement of the term Bank with PSP and updated Customer definition	EPC LSG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
44	Changes to Recall and SCT Inquiry procedures	BITS	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
46	Change request has been withdrawn	EPC legal adviser	Withdrawn



Change Request item	Topic	Contributor	Recommendation of the SEMWG on the proposed way forward. The final decision is subject to the outcome of the public consultation.
47	Change request has been withdrawn	EPC legal adviser	Withdrawn

1.3 Overview of Changes to Align the Next Version of the SCT Inst Rulebook with any Existing EU Legislation and with the Entry into Force of New EU Legislation

The contributors to this public consultation are welcome to comment on these changes.

Ref.	Topic	Contributor	Way forward
01	Re-arrangement of the list of non-EEA SEPA authorisation references in the rulebooks	EPC LSG	See chapter 3 of this document.



2 Detailed Analysis of Major Change Requests to the SCT Inst Rulebook

2.1 # 8: Change request has been withdrawn

2.1.1 Description

This change request has been withdrawn.



2.2 # 9: Reference to separate EPC guidance document on SCT Inst r-transaction reason codes

2.2.1 Description

This change request was made by the SEMWG.

Since 2018, the SCT Inst scheme related document 'Guidance on reason codes for SEPA Instant Credit Transfer R-transactions (EPC 059-18)' is published on the EPC website.

Various SCT Inst scheme participants highlight the usefulness of this document. It eases the correct use of the various SCT Inst R-transaction reason codes. The suggestion is that:

- The SCT Inst rulebook formally refers to the document EPC 059-18;
- The SCT Inst scheme participants better monitor the correct use of the SCT Inst r-transaction reason codes as described in this document and adjust, where necessary, their internal processes.

The SEMWG points out that such a reference to a similar document is included in the two SDD scheme rulebooks since November 2017.

2.2.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2021**.

2.2.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will only impact the rulebook.



2.3 # 10: Alignment of the Recall and RFRO datasets within the SCT Inst rulebook, and between both SCT rulebooks

2.3.1 Description

This change request was made by the SEMWG.

A comparison has been done of the contents between the following datasets within the SCT Inst rulebook and between the two SCT rulebooks:

- The 'Recall' datasets (DS-05 in both rulebooks)
- The 'Answer to Recall' datasets (DS-06 in both rulebooks)
- The 'Request for Recall by the Originator' (RFRO) datasets (DS-07 in the SCT rulebook and DS-08 in the SCT Inst rulebook respectively)
- The 'Response to the RFRO' datasets (DS-08 in the SCT rulebook and DS-09 in the SCT Inst rulebook respectively)
- The 'Recall' and the 'RFRO' datasets within each SCT rulebook
- The 'Answer to Recall' and the 'Response to the RFRO' datasets within each SCT rulebook

The aim of this change request is to harmonise as much as possible the attributes in the datasets for the Recall and the RFRO processes within the SCT Inst rulebook and between the two SCT rulebooks.

Furthermore, the change request proposes an additional business rule in the SCT Inst rulebook attribute AT-59 reflecting the PSD2 principle that PSPs must assist their customers when the latter want to take further actions to recover their funds in case of the reason code 'wrong unique identifier of the Beneficiary account'. However, the attribute will remain technically 'optional'.

2.3.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2021**.

2.3.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.4 # 11: Use of 'Fraud' reason code up to 13 months under the Recall procedure

2.4.1 Description

This change request was made by the SEMWG.

The SCT Inst rulebook prescribes that the Originator Bank can initiate the SCT Inst Recall procedure in case of a fraudulent originated SCT Inst instruction.

However, the use of the SCT Inst Recall procedure has a limited timespan i.e. the Originator Bank must send out the SCT Inst Recall within the period of ten Banking Business Days following the execution date of the initial SCT Inst transaction subject to the SCT Inst Recall. It may well happen that the Originator only detects a fraudulent SCT Inst instruction and/or escalates this fraud to the Originator Bank after this first period of ten days has passed.

The suggestion is that a Recall request can be done up to 13 months following the execution date of the initial SCT Inst transaction. The extension of this timeline for a Recall request applies only for the reason code 'Fraud', the current ten Banking Business Days continue to apply for the reasons 'Technical reason' and 'Duplicate'.

2.4.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2021**.

2.4.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.5 # 12: Clarification on the definition of Banking Business Day

2.5.1 Description

This change request was made by the SEMWG.

The two SCT rulebooks apply somewhat different definitions for ‘Banking Business Day’.

Although the two SCT scheme rulebooks represent two stand-alone schemes, the suggestion is to align such definitions as best as possible.

2.5.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2021**.

2.5.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will only impact the rulebook.



2.6 # 16: Alignment of all attribute numbers across all EPC SEPA payment scheme rulebooks

2.6.1 Description

This change request was made by the SEMWG.

Each SEPA payment scheme rulebook describes a range of attributes (ATs) which compose a dataset to be used to execute a certain rulebook process. Under each rulebook, each AT has a unique sequence number. However, many AT descriptions are identical or similar in all four rulebooks but they all bear a different unique sequence number in each rulebook.

The proposal is to align the sequence number of these ATs between the four rulebooks. This suggestion also includes the grouping of ATs and their subsequent sequence numbering into different AT sequence number categories. Each such category has its own sequence number structure.

Persons in charge of the implementation and maintenance of the SEPA usage rules in the customer-to-bank (C2B) and interbank systems, will get the same understanding about each AT sequence number in the SEPA usage rules of all C2B and interbank implementation guidelines (IGs). It also helps the EPC in its future management of the AT sequence numbering.

The SEMWG understands that such renumbering can impact individual scheme participants and payment end-users. They can use the current AT numbering in e.g., their technical implementation documentation and in technical and business processes.

As this change concerns a format change but not a change to any functional or business rules, the SEMWG proposes to isolate the implementation of this change from the other accepted changes for the 2021 EPC SEPA payment scheme rulebooks. The SEMWG proposes to implement this change in **November 2022**.

2.6.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2022** at the same time when the migration to the 2019 version of the ISO 20022 messaging standard (# 20) is proposed.

2.6.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the C2B and interbank implementation guidelines.



2.7 # 18: Introduction of a credit notification message

2.7.1 Description

This change request was made by Westhafen-Expertendialog Instant Payments.

The contributor suggests introducing a credit notification message for successfully executed SCT Inst transactions, in the rulebook and the implementation guidelines.

To notify the Beneficiary of an incoming instant credit transfer, no formats or rules of provision are currently provided in the SCT Inst rulebook.

The contributor proposes the cash management message camt.054. The rules for a credit notification for an instant credit transfer should be restricted to the essentials, for performance reasons alone.

The credit notification for SCT Inst transactions must be distinguishable from the one for bulk bookings. The contributor recommends using an indicator within the message (in the Group Header <AddtlInf> is filled with “CRED”).

2.7.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG itself proposes a similar change request under change request item # 21 (see section 2.10) for the standardization of a **recommended** camt. message. When the change request # 21 obtains sufficient support from the public consultation, the aim of this change request will be met.

Therefore, The SEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) as described under change request item # 21 entering into effect as of **November 2021**.

2.7.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the customer-to-bank implementation guidelines.



2.8 # 19: Possibility to provide a future execution date and time for SCT Inst instructions

2.8.1 Description

This change request was made by the SEMWG.

The dataset DS-01 'Customer-to-Bank Credit Transfer Information' of the SCT Inst rulebook gives the Originator the possibility to submit an SCT Inst instruction through a pain.001 message with a future execution date. The attribute AT-07 'The Requested Execution Date of the SCT Inst Instruction' supports this feature in DS-01.

However, the Originator may wish that the Originator Bank executes its SCT Inst instruction not only at a well-defined future date but also at a precise time (hh:mm:ss.sss) during that day. This may be suitable for various reasons.

It is pointed out that the **2009** version of the pain.001 message does not support the combination of Execution Date and Time. This combination is only supported as of the 2019 version of the ISO 20022 messaging standard.

To offer this possibility to interested Originators, the mandatory SCT Inst Customer-to-Bank (C2B) Implementation Guidelines (IGs) would now contain the 2019 version of the pain.001 message. This means that the concerned SCT Inst scheme participants which offer SCT Inst instruction initiation services based on the ISO 20022 messaging standard, would have to implement and support the pain.001 message in the 2019 ISO 20022 version.

Important note: this change request is independent from the change request # 20 in section 2.9 suggesting the migration to the 2019 version of the ISO 20022 messaging standard.

In November 2020 the EPC intends to publish the 2019 version specification of the pain.001 in the existing C2B IGs which are predominantly based on the 2009 version.

2.8.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2021**.

2.8.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the C2B implementation guidelines.



2.9 # 20: Migration to the 2019 version of the ISO 20022 messaging standard

2.9.1 Description

This change request was made by the SEMWG.

For the launch of the various EPC SEPA payment schemes in January 2008, November 2009 and November 2017, the EPC selected the 2009 version of the ISO 20022 XML-based messaging standard. The EPC notes new payment market developments for which the 2009 version of the ISO standard is not suitable to support.

Furthermore, throughout the years, the EPC SEPA payment schemes cover already a variety of ISO 20022 versions for messages between these payment schemes. If the future rulebooks would include new business procedures or existing procedures could be amended or extended, messages based on a more recent ISO 20022 version may have to be used adding further variety.

The EPC proposes to migrate the four schemes to the 2019 version of the ISO 20022 standard as it is suitable to support new payment features and to align all current rulebook messages on one and the same ISO 20022 version.

The EPC notes the decision by several market infrastructures to migrate to the ISO 20022 standard i.e. Target2 from Eurosystem and EURO1 from EBA Clearing by November 2021 and the global migration of SWIFT from its FIN messages to the ISO 20022 standard starting from November 2021 until November 2025. These infrastructures have decided to use the 2019 version of the ISO 20022 standard.

However, the EPC proposes to migrate the four schemes as of **November 2022** to the 2019 version. This migration date allows the EPC SEPA payment scheme participants to spread the workload. Otherwise, they would have to change three (possibly four) different payment systems or platforms by November 2021.

Subject to a positive public consultation outcome on this change request, the EPC will formally communicate this ISO version migration in November 2020 when publishing the 2021 EPC SEPA payment scheme rulebooks and the related Implementation Guidelines (IGs).

The IGs published in November 2020 will still be predominantly³ based on the 2009 version of ISO 20022 and will be applicable from November 2021 to November 2022. A second set of 2021 IGs will be published latest in the second quarter of 2021. This second cluster of the mandatory C2B and interbank IGs will then be based on the 2019 version of the ISO 20022 standard.

The ISO version migration will be a big-bang migration, i.e. no transitional period will be foreseen. This means that all EPC SEPA payment scheme participants offering ISO 20022 message-based payment services to their customers, must then support the 2019 version as of November 2022.

On the other hand, the (corporate) customers may still use another ISO version to exchange SEPA transactions in an XML format with their PSPs if so bilaterally agreed.

The annex of the change request covers a high-level gap analysis between the 2009 and the 2019 pain., pacs. and camt. messages used in the four EPC SEPA payment scheme rulebooks.

³ Some messages described in the IGs are based on a more recent version of ISO 20022.



2.9.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2022** at the same time when the alignment of all attribute numbers across all rulebooks (# 16) is proposed.

2.9.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the C2B and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.10 # 21: Introduction of a credit notification message for the Beneficiary

2.10.1 Description

This change request was made by the SEMWG.

The rulebook section 1.4 'Conceptual workflow of an SCT Inst' specifies that the Beneficiary Bank may inform the Beneficiary about the Funds Made Available to the Beneficiary. The information itself and the execution time for such information are not within the scope of the scheme (see Step II).

The corporate and merchant SCT Inst end-users point out the need for a standardized way of notifying the Beneficiaries about the availability of the funds on their accounts. They would no longer have to regularly check the account balances or the statements to determine if the funds have been booked on the account before releasing the goods or starting with the services.

The suggestion is to introduce a positive credit notification message based on the ISO 20022 standard for a successfully executed SCT Inst transaction, in the rulebook and in a to be created 'Bank-to-Customer' chapter in the existing SCT Inst scheme Customer-to-Bank implementation Guidelines (C2B IGs). The EPC proposes the camt.054 message for such notification. The EPC intends to foresee technical message specifications to allow positive item-per-item credit notification messages.

The implementation of this positive credit notification message will be **recommended only**. SCT Inst Beneficiaries and their Beneficiary Banks will be free to agree on the use of camt.054 or not.

2.10.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2021**.

2.10.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the C2B implementation guidelines.



2.11 # 22: Change request has been withdrawn

2.11.1 Description

This change request has been withdrawn.



2.12 # 23: Inclusion of flowcharts for the RFRO procedure

2.12.1 Description

This change request was made by the SEMWG.

The suggestion is to add flowcharts to explain in a schematic way the procedural steps to be followed by the Originator Bank and the Beneficiary Bank when they receive a Request for Recall by the Originator (RFRO). This change request does not cover any concrete changes to the procedural steps themselves.

2.12.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2021**.

2.12.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact only the rulebook.



2.13 # 27: Linking an SCT Inst transaction with a preceding Request-To-Pay message

2.13.1 Description

This change request was made by the EPC Request-to-Pay Multi-stakeholder Group (RTP MSG).

The change request aims to link an SCT Inst instruction and transaction with a preceding Request-To-Pay (RTP) message.

The intention is to base the RTP message under the RTP scheme on the ISO 20022 message pain.013.001.07 (CreditorPaymentActivationRequest). The Creditor sending party sends the RTP message to the Debtor receiving party. The successful transmission of the RTP message will trigger an SCT Inst instruction from the Debtor (Originator under the SCT Inst scheme) to the Creditor (Beneficiary under the SCT Inst scheme).

The parties that create and further process the SCT Inst instruction need to make a distinction between an SCT Inst instruction resulting from the receipt and acceptance of an RTP message, and other SCT Inst “standalone” instructions:

- The Originator and the Originator Bank need to keep a trace of the preceding RTP message in the SCT Inst instruction to facilitate the retrieval of the commercial/purchase transaction for which the SCT Inst payment is done;
- The Beneficiary and the Beneficiary Bank need to reconcile the RTP message sent with the SCT Inst payment received. They can use a reference to the RTP message in the SCT Inst transaction to distinguish RTP-initiated SCT Inst transactions from other SCT Inst transactions. This would limit the lookup into RTP data stores to the ones already identified as resulting from RTP messages.

The change request introduces a few modifications to the attributes AT-44 ‘The purpose of the SCT Inst Instruction’, AT-41 ‘Originator reference of the SCT Inst instruction’ and AT-45 ‘Category purpose of the SCT Inst Instruction’.

2.13.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The EPC has decided to develop an RTP scheme rulebook for publication on the EPC website by November 2020. This RTP rulebook will consist of a set of rules, practices and standards that makes it possible for PSP and non-PSP entities to join, participate and operate in the RTP scheme. The RTP scheme will be based on the ISO 20022 standard, separate from the EPC SEPA payment schemes, covering a set of basic functions. The RTP scheme rulebook will be subject to a public consultation expected to place in the second quarter of 2020.

In the absence of a formal publicly available EPC RTP scheme rulebook, the SEMWG has **no recommendation** about this change request for the public consultation. Instead, it is eager to know the views from the SCT Inst scheme participants and other SCT Inst stakeholders about this change request.

The SEMWG will consider the outcome from the SCT Inst public consultation about this change request, and the outcome from the public consultation on the RTP scheme rulebook to determine its position to the Scheme Management Board meeting in September 2020.

2.13.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the customer-to-bank and interbank implementation guidelines.



2.14 # 29: New obligation under transaction status investigation procedure

2.14.1 Description

This change request was made by the by the Dutch Payments Association.

SCT Inst scheme participants from this community report that not all SCT Inst compliant CSMs can provide a correct answer in a STP manner to a SCT Inst Transaction status investigation message.

In case a SCT Inst transaction was processed just before the calendar day shift (e.g., close to midnight) and the Originator Bank sends a SCT Inst Transaction status investigation message at D+1 (e.g., just after midnight), it receives an automatic response stating that the original transaction was not found, while in reality the CSM did receive the original transaction, but, due to technical reasons, the CSM is no longer capable of providing the true status update of the SCT Inst transaction in a STP manner.

Consequently, the Originator Bank does not receive the positive or negative confirmation and cannot finalize that SCT Inst transaction in an automated way.

The contributor proposes to add an obligation in the SCT Inst rulebook for all participants to provide a true status update in a fully automated way upon the receipt of a SCT Inst Transaction status investigation message until 48 hours after the timestamp of the original SCT Inst transaction.

2.14.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**).

The SEMWG considers that the described situation is not an issue emanating from the SCT Inst rulebook itself. This issue must be resolved by the CSMs used by the Dutch SCT Inst scheme participants. The SEMWG will nevertheless address this issue at the next meeting of the EPC Scheme Technical Forum (ESTF) in March 2020.

2.14.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.15 # 30: Reduction of target maximum execution time and time-out deadline

2.15.1 Description

This change request was made by the Dutch Payments Association.

It proposes to reduce the following timelines under the SCT Inst rulebook to adapt to market circumstances and customer needs, especially to the (future) use of SCT Inst at the Point of Interaction (POI), both in a physical and online environment:

- Target maximum execution time: reduction from the current 10 seconds to 5 seconds;
- Time-out deadline: reduction from the current 20 seconds to 7 seconds;
- Receipt of the positive or negative confirmation message after the time-out deadline by the Originator Bank: proposal to receive within 2 seconds (instead of 5 seconds) by the 9th second (instead of the 25th second)

The contributor considers that these timelines will give end-users an experience that comes close to the current processing times for payment card-based transactions.

2.15.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**). The SEMWG has concerns that such changes by November 2021 will negatively influence PSPs that are currently considering adhering to the SCT Inst scheme.

2.15.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.16 # 31: Optional fraud indication marker in SCT Inst transaction

2.16.1 Description

This change request was made by the Dutch Payments Association.

The contributor proposes to include an optional 'Fraud Indication Marker' in every SCT Inst transaction to enhance the possibilities of fraud detection for all SCT Inst scheme participants. This marker is proposed as an optional attribute in the interbank payment dataset.

The fraud indication marker allows the Originator Bank to provide the Beneficiary Bank with a fraud score for every outgoing SCT Inst transaction. This can support the Beneficiary Bank in its inbound fraud detection activities and/or its outbound fraud detection activities when the funds received are (quickly) re-used by the Beneficiary for a new outgoing payment, without entailing any liability shift.

2.16.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**). At this point in time, the SEMWG has not received enough input from fraud experts and legal experts to make a full assessment. It is unclear at this stage whether there is a SEPA need for such marker.

If the Originator Bank has a doubt, it should get in touch with the Originator to get more clarification to remove this doubt instead of adding such marker.

It also raises concerns at the Beneficiary Bank with respect to the liability of accepting such transaction. If the Beneficiary Bank receives a transaction with such marker even if that marker is optional, the Beneficiary Bank may not ignore this marker information.

2.16.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.17 # 32: Allow the transfer back of a lower amount as a positive response to a Recall due to fraud

2.17.1 Description

This change request was made by the French Banking Federation.

Under the current rulebook, a Beneficiary Bank wishing to respond positively to a Recall for the reason 'Fraud' will transfer back the amount of the original SCT Inst transaction.

When the funds available on the account of the Beneficiary are lower than the amount to be recalled, the contributor points out that the positive response cannot be sent (reference is made to AT-46). As a result, the legitimate request of the Originator Bank cannot be fulfilled. In such situation and depending on the fraud case at hand, some SCT Inst scheme participants are not satisfied with a negative response.

The contributor suggests allowing the Beneficiary Bank to send a positive response to a Recall for the reason 'Fraud' even though the actual amount it will transfer back is lower than the amount of the initial SCT Inst transaction. In this way the Originator can still recover funds remaining on the account of the Beneficiary within the limit of the initial SCT Inst transaction amount.

The contributor explains that this proposal is driven by the need to act urgently in case of suspicion of fraud by the Beneficiary (i.e. before the expiration of the 15 Banking Business Days period to respond to such Recall).

This proposed rule would apply only for a Recall with the reason code 'Fraud' and will be **optional**. A Beneficiary Bank would still have the possibility to respond negatively in such situation.

2.17.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**).

The general principle for each r-transaction is that the full original amount is always transferred back. This provides full clarity about the processing of the amount transferred back for both the Originator Bank and the Beneficiary Bank. However, to satisfy the need, the Beneficiary Bank is free to send back the available funds in a separate transaction (pacs.008 instead of pacs.004 Return).

2.17.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.18 # 33: Possibility to credit a technical account following a positive response to a Recall

2.18.1 Description

This change request was made by the French Banking Federation.

The contributor points out that when the Beneficiary Bank report a positive answer to a Recall, the Originator Bank cannot credit an account other than the account of the Originator.

The contributor suggests allowing the Originator Bank to credit a technical account of the Originator Bank – instead of the account of the Originator – in case the Originator Bank has already transferred back the recalled amount to the account of the Originator in accordance with PSD2. The contributor alludes to article 73 (1) of PSD2 : “...*In the case of an unauthorised payment transaction, the payer’s payment service provider refunds the payer the amount of the unauthorised payment transaction immediately, and in any event no later by the end of the following business day...*”.

As a result, a double credit of the Originator’s account would be avoided.

2.18.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**).

Each scheme participant can always decide to re-credit a positive response to a Recall another account than the account of the Originator in case the Originator has already been re-credited for that Recall request.

2.18.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.19 # 34: Extension of the period to submit a Recall

2.19.1 Description

This change request was made by the French Banking Federation.

The Originator Bank and the Originator currently have ten Banking Business Days following the execution date of an SCT Inst transaction to initiate a Recall.

The contributor suggests lengthening this period up to 15 Banking Business Days as fraudulent, duplicate or erroneous SCT Inst transactions can take more than ten Banking Business Days to handle.

A longer period is particularly needed in case of fraud. A retail client usually requests to recall a SCT Inst transaction once it has received its monthly statements and noticed a suspicious operation. After the current ten Banking Business Days, the contributor considers that it is not possible to fall back to the Request for Recall by the Originator (RFRO) procedure because the reasons for a Recall cannot be used for such RFRO request.

The period for the Originator Bank to request a Recall, and the period for the Beneficiary Bank to answer to the Recall, would then be the same (15 Banking Business Days).

2.19.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**). The SEMWG suggests another solution for the reported issue via its own change request # 11 (see section 2.4).

2.19.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.20 # 35: Align the rulebook with the Funds Transfer Regulation

2.20.1 Description

This change request was made by Banking & Payments Federation Ireland (BPMI).

The contributor suggests aligning the rulebook with the derogations foreseen in the Regulation 2015/847/EU (Funds Transfer Regulation).

This Regulation allows PSPs some derogations when they process SCT and SDD transactions and more specifically the derogations under Article 6 (2), linked to transactions up to € 1000, and article 8 (1), linked to the use of effective risk-based procedures.

The background for this change request is the recent discussions that the Irish banking and payments industry has undertaken with its National Regulator during the Brexit preparations.

2.20.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**).

The current rules do not cause any new issues for scheme participants (which already include participants from non-EEA countries) and their customers as they are clear to understand. Otherwise, scheme participants would have to explain to their customers in which cases they have to or may not provide the address of the payer.

2.20.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.21 # 36: New service 'Initial payment with unknown final amount'

2.21.1 Description

This change request was made by EuroCommerce.

The contributor suggests introducing a new service supporting the feature of an initial SCT Inst payment with unknown final amount.

The contributor gives examples whereby customers can place an initial order with a merchant without knowing at that point in time the exact final amount to pay. Only when the merchant delivers the goods or service to its customer, is the final amount defined and eventually charged by the merchant to the customer. At that time the customer may no longer be present in the merchant's store and may not be able to authenticate the final confirmed value of the transaction(s). For that purpose, the customer has provided a mandate to the merchant to debit or credit their account.

Such use cases occur in the hospitality sector (hotels), fuel sector, parking space companies, public transport companies and general stores that deliver fresh foods of variable weight or quantities directly to the premises of their customers.

This new type of service enables the identification of an initial instant payment transaction as a kind of pre-authorisation/ service transaction and the subsequent (final) payment as the payment completion. The final amount paid is a variable amount to the initial order which could be higher or lower than the initial payment amount.

The service should be specified in such a way to link both the initial SCT Inst transaction and the final SCT Inst payment completion to ensure the customer pays only once the final amount.

Furthermore, the initial payment (with the unknown final amount) will, if outside of the agreed exceptions, need strong customer authentication from the customer. The final payment completion cannot be authenticated by the customer and would therefore be considered as a Merchant Initiated Transaction.

2.21.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**).

The SCT Inst transaction can only be authenticated with a final and irrevocable amount. A more suitable solution can be the future Request-To-Pay (RTP) scheme in a combination of e.g., a maximum amount or a reservation to support such services.

2.21.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the customer-to-bank and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.22 # 37: New service 'instalment payment'

2.22.1 Description

This change request was made by EuroCommerce.

The contributor suggests introducing a new service supporting the feature of SCT Inst scheme-driven instalment payments to customers for goods or services at the Point of Interaction (PoI).

An instalment payment service allows the payer to split the payment of a single purchase of goods or services into a finite number of periodic transactions, with a specified end date.

A specific identification of the service is required to identify the initial transaction and the subsequent transactions as being an initial or subsequent instalment payment. The definition of an instalment service may use several codes such as the purpose code RINP (Recurring INSTant Payment) for transactions related to a recurring instalment made at regular intervals.

The contributor envisages the service as follows:

1. the customer submits the initial (first) instant payment with a strong customer authentication (SCA) with subsequent transactions on defined terms and conditions until the specified end date;
2. the instalment service may be offered by the merchant or their technical service provider;
3. the instalment needs to support the usage of an IBAN, Proxy of IBAN or IBAN's token;
4. The subsequent transactions are initiated by the merchant without any SCA;
5. The charges and services fees model are clearly defined for both the customer and the merchant upfront for the life cycle of the instalment service.

2.22.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**).

The SCT Inst transaction can only be authenticated with a final and irrevocable amount. A more suitable solution can be the future Request-To-Pay (RTP) scheme in a combination of e.g., a maximum amount or a reservation to support such services.

2.22.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the customer-to-bank and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.23 # 38: New service 'instant customer refund'

2.23.1 Description

This change request was made by EuroCommerce.

The contributor points out that merchants require an instant refund service at the Point of Interaction (PoI) to reimburse customers. It shares a few use cases to illustrate such need.

The SCT Inst scheme rulebook already includes technical specifications to facilitate a Repayment service. The contributor nevertheless explains that the current specifications do not resolve the merchants' needs and have several limitations. The contributor emphasizes the following elements which a refund service under the SCT Inst scheme should resolve or support:

- The customer expects to receive the instant refund notification on its mobile device (almost) immediately and relies on the receipt of a notification message confirming the execution of the refund/repayment;
- Less data for an instant refund is reported through a mobile app compared to the current SCT Inst dataset. Some data elements are not used in mobile payments (e.g., AT-03 the address of the Originator, AT-10 The Originator identification code);
- The refund needs to support the use of an IBAN, a proxy of IBAN or even a token of the routing and the volume of the payment initiation message information (the current rules only allow IBAN);
- The charges and services fees need to be clearly defined for both the customer and the merchant.

2.23.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**).

Such reimbursement is considered as a new SCT Inst transaction and requires a certain set of data. This can already be conducted the current Repayment feature of the SCT Inst scheme. Another alternative would be the future Request-To-Pay (RTP) scheme whereby the consumer submits an RTP message to the merchant triggering a SCT Inst transaction.

2.23.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the customer-to-bank and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.24 # 39: Transmission of alias or proxy details about Originator and Beneficiary

2.24.1 Description

This change request was made by Nordic Payments Council (NPC).

The contributor suggests two new optional attributes “Alias or Proxy of the Originator’s account” and “Alias or Proxy of the Beneficiary’s account” in the datasets DS-01 (Customer-to-Bank SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Information), DS-02 (Interbank Payment) and DS-04 (Bank-to-Customer SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Information).

The submission of proxies or aliases from the accounts of the Originator and of the Beneficiary through the interbank space give opportunities for enhanced services to customers.

2.24.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**).

This change request cannot be implemented in November 2021 as the 2009 ISO version standard does not support alias or proxy details. Adding optional attributes will also require all scheme participants to foresee and transfer these attributes in the C2B and interbank space.

2.24.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the customer-to-bank and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.25 # 41: Allow Beneficiary Bank to let its CSM conduct status investigation procedures

2.25.1 Description

This change request was made by Nordic Payments Council (NPC).

The contributor suggests adding a clarification in the rulebook section 4.4 'Optional SCT Inst Transaction status investigation procedure' stating that the Beneficiary Bank can agree with its CSM to perform status investigation procedures:

“The Beneficiary Bank may also agree with its CSM optional investigation procedures for exceptional situations whereby no agreed confirmation messages have reached the Beneficiary Bank.”

2.25.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**).

It is a commercial service from a CSM which a Beneficiary Bank can subscribe to and therefore falls outside the scope of the scheme.

2.25.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.26 # 42: Reformulate rulebook section on maximum execution time

2.26.1 Description

This change request was made by Nordic Payments Council (NPC).

The contributor states that the rulebook section 4.2.3 “Maximum Execution Time” is described at a far more detailed level compared to the rest of the rulebook. It suggests that it is rewritten at a more conceptual level, enabling implementors to use other techniques to meet timeout requirements.

it is of the opinion that the description needs adaptation after the introduction of the pre-validation call to the Beneficiary Bank.

2.26.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**). The change request does not propose concrete text reformulations.

2.26.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.27 # 43: Replacement of the term Bank with PSP and updated Customer definition

2.27.1 Description

This change request was made by the EPC Legal Support Group (LSG).

The suggestion is to replace the term “Bank” with the term “PSP” in all EPC SEPA payment scheme rulebooks to formally reflect the changes introduced by PSD2 to the categories of institutions that can offer payment services, and the variety in PSP categories that are eligible to adhere to the EPC SEPA payment schemes.

This proposal will lead to term changes in the rulebooks, the related Implementation Guidelines and the various rulebook annexes (scheme options, risk management, internal rules). It also covers the inclusion of the definition “PSP” and the amendment of the term “Customer”.

2.27.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2021**.

2.27.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, all rulebook annexes and the customer-to-bank and interbank implementation guidelines.



2.28 # 44: Changes to Recall and Request For Recall by the Originator (RFRO) procedures

2.28.1 Description

This change request was made by the Norwegian Banking Standardisation and Infrastructure Company (BITS).

The first proposal from the contributor is that the time limits for the Recall procedures are set at **three** banking business days, both for the Originator Bank to send a Recall request, and for the Beneficiary Bank to respond to that Recall request. This gives a maximum time of six banking business for the Recall procedure to be completed.

The chance for the funds to be withdrawn from the account of the Beneficiary increases with the current Recall procedure timelines of 10 banking business days (request) and 15 banking business days (response to the request), being a cycle of maximum 25 banking business days.

Secondly, the contributor wishes to include in the attribute AT-48 'The Recall reason code' under the dataset DS-05 'Recall of an SCT Inst' a new reason code 'Requested by customer'.

For the RFRO procedure, the contributor requests the inclusion of a new reason code 'Requested by customer' in the attribute AT-52 'Reason code for the Request For Recall by the Originator' for the dataset DS-08 'Request For Recall by the Originator'.

The second proposed change to the RFRO procedure concerns the attribute AT-58 'Fee for the positive response to a Request for Recall by the Originator'. It appears that this attribute is mandatory in the dataset DS-09 'Response to the Request For Recall by the Originator'. This should be optional since it is up to the Beneficiary Bank to charge a fee or not.

2.28.2 SEMWG analysis and recommendation

The SEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**).

Technical reasons, fraud and duplicates should be resolved by the Originator Bank and the Beneficiary Bank as fast as possible by keeping the existing maximum timelines. Furthermore, the SEMWG suggests another solution for fraud via its own change request # 11 (see section 2.4). In addition, the Beneficiary Banks generally need to obtain first the consent from the Beneficiary which can take up some time.

As for the suggestions to the RFRO procedure, the inclusion of new reason code 'Requested by customer' adds no value as only the Originator can kick off the RFRO procedure. With respect to AT-58, step 4A in section 4.3.2.3 already points out that *"it is the decision of the Beneficiary Bank if it wants to charge a fee to the Originator Bank"*.

2.28.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the interbank implementation guidelines.



2.29 # 46: Change request has been withdrawn

2.29.1 Description

This change request has been withdrawn.



2.30 # 47: Change request has been withdrawn

2.30.1 Description

This change request has been withdrawn.



3 Changes Pertaining to the Impact of the SEPA Regulation or any Other EU Legislation

As the EPC is under the legal obligation to ensure compliance of the rulebooks with the SEPA Regulation or of any other EU legislation, proposed changes to the rulebooks under this section are not subject to public consultation. They are included in this document for information but the contributors to this public consultation can comment on these changes.

This change is qualified as “Change for Regulatory Reasons” within the meaning of Section 4.2.9 of the SMIRs, due to legal amendments that “necessitate the urgent alignment of the Schemes with such rules and regulations”:

Change	Reason for change
<p>This change request leads to the following changes:</p> <p>Reorganisation of Section 5.4 – Eligibility for Participation (All Rulebooks)</p>	<p>The present change aims at updating the EPC SEPA Payment Schemes Rulebooks (along with the Schemes Adherence Guide and the SEPA Schemes Adherence Packages, namely the standard template for the Legal Opinion) with regards to the relevant authorisation and regulatory requirements for PSPs of non-EEA SEPA Countries, to which the geographical scope of the SEPA payment schemes has been extended.</p> <p>This update is triggered by the recent inclusion in the SEPA schemes’ geographical scope of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Andorra (2018), and ii) the Vatican City State/Holy See (2019). <p>For which the following references will be added under Section 5.4:</p> <p><i>8) An undertaking duly incorporated in the Andorran Financial System on December 21st, 1949, according to Andorran laws regulating the financial system, and specifically according to Law 7/2013, of 9 May 2013, on the legal regime of the operative entities of the Andorran financial system and other provisions regulating the exercise of financial activities in the Principality of Andorra, as amended from time to time”</i></p> <p><i>9) An entity incorporated in the Vatican City State and Authorised by the Financial Information Authority in accordance with Regulation 1/2014”</i></p> <p>The exercise shall be repeated in due course also for UK’s PSPs, which will remain entirely subject to PSD2 only until the 31 December 2020 (i.e. for the whole duration of the transition period).</p> <p>Following the expiration of said period, UK will need to provide a suitable reference to the relevant UK legal acts covering the authorisation requirements of its PSPs, in accordance with the principle of the regulatory level playing field amongst SEPA scheme participants.</p> <p>However, it is hereby noted that the current list included under Section 5.4 of the Rulebooks, namely:</p>



Change	Reason for change
	<p>“3) A bank which is authorised in accordance with Article 3 of the Federal Law on Banks and Savings Banks of 8 November 1934 by the Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority (FINMA);</p> <p>4) A bank which is authorised by the Central Bank of San Marino in accordance with Article 7, Part I, Title II, of the Sammarinese Law No. 165 (approved on November 17th, 2005) and with Regulation No. 07 of 2007;</p> <p>5) An undertaking incorporated in Jersey and registered with the Jersey Financial Services Commission to conduct deposit-taking business under the Banking Business (Jersey) Law 1991;</p> <p>6) An undertaking incorporated in Guernsey and registered with the Guernsey Financial Services Commission to conduct deposit-taking business under the Banking Supervision (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law 1994; or</p> <p>7) An undertaking incorporated in the Isle of Man and licensed by the Isle of Man Financial Services Authority to conduct deposit-taking business under the Isle of Man Financial Services Act 2008.”</p> <p>[+ 8) Andorra and 9) Vatican City State]</p> <p>is likely to be subject to more frequent regulatory changes than the rest of the Rulebooks’ sections, being it triggered either by any change in the current authorisation framework for said institutions (as result, for example, of the continuous legal compliance exercise performed by the EPC) or by the inclusion in the SEPA schemes geographical scope of new non-EEA SEPA countries, such as the UK in the future.</p> <p>To this extent, in order to avoid frequent publications of the Rulebooks, which may ultimately generate confusion amongst Participants, and in order to maintain said section regularly updated, also in line with the Overseer requirements, it is hereby proposed a change of structure of Section 5.4, under the Rulebooks, as follows:</p> <p>“Applicants which fall within one of the following categories shall be deemed automatically to be eligible under this section:</p> <p>1) A credit institution which is authorised in accordance with Article 8 (1) of Directive 2013/36/EU by a state which is a member of the European Economic Area;</p> <p>2) The institutions referred to in points (2) to (23) of Article 2 (5) of Directive (EU) 2013/36/EU;</p> <p>3) Institutions/entities/undertakings incorporated in a non-EEA country to which the SEPA schemes geographical scope has been extended, and authorised or licensed by the relevant Authority, in accordance with the provisions enclosed under the document EPC 409-09.</p> <p>By extracting from the Rulebooks the abovementioned current points 3) to 9), and including a new point 3), with the reference to the document EPC409-09 (“EPC list of countries and territories included in</p>



Change	Reason for change
	<p>the SEPA Schemes’ geographical scope”) the EPC would achieve two results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) maintain a complete reference in the Rulebooks to the relevant authorisation requirements, covering both EEA and non-EEA SEPA countries, and ii) optimise the current changes related to the regulatory level playing field of non-EEA SEPA scheme participants, without the need to amend – and publish, intermediary versions of the Rulebooks or wait for each Change Management Cycle to be able to reflect such changes. <p>It is recommended to qualify the present change as “<i>Change for Regulatory Reasons</i>” within the meaning of Section 4.2.9 of the SMIRs, due to legal amendments that “<i>necessitate the urgent alignment of the Schemes with such rules and regulations</i>”.</p>



4 Detailed Analysis of Minor Changes to the SCT Inst Rulebook

The SEMWG recommends supporting the following minor change requests:

4.1 Change Requests

Section	Description	Reason for change	Type of Change
Entire rulebook	<p>Alignment of the annex numbering for each EPC SEPA payment scheme rulebook:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I – Adherence agreement Annex II – SMIR (previously Annex III) Annex III – Risk Management (previously Annex II) Annex IV – RB amendments & changes <p>This will also lead to changes in the Annex numbering references throughout each rulebook.</p>	To apply the same numbering of the generic rulebook annexes across all rulebooks.	CHAN
Entire rulebook	Change ‘answer’ to a Recall or to an RFRO into a ‘ response ’ to a Recall or to an RFRO.	To apply an uniform terminology.	CLAR
1.7	<p>Removal of the bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants which have adhered to the Scheme may participate only through an EEA licensed branch unless they participate through their SEPA head office (which may be located in a SEPA country or territory outside the EEA) 	This bullet point is redundant. The section 3.2.3.1 of the SMIRs and the section 3.5 of the document EPC012-17 Guide to the SEPA Schemes Adherence Process provide the complete adherence information.	CHAN
1.7	<p>Removal of the bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rules ensure that responsibility for risk management is allocated to where the risk lies and that liability falls where the fault lies 	This bullet point is redundant. Chapter 5 of each rulebook clearly specifies aspects with respect to risk management and refers to the Risk Management Annex which is an integral part of the rulebook.	CHAN
2.4	<p>Add a reference to Request for Recall by the Originator in the first paragraph:</p> <p>All transactions are in euro in all process stages, including all exception handling, i.e. Rejects, and Recalls <u>Request for Recall by the Originator (RFRO)</u>.</p>	To ensure that all r-transaction types are pointed out.	CLAR



Section	Description	Reason for change	Type of Change
4.6.1	<p>Addition in attribute AT-R3:</p> <p>The reasons for a Reject by the Originator Bank are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (...)• Amount exceeds the maximum authorised amount for SCT Inst• Operation/transaction code incorrect, invalid <u>file</u> format	<p>The ISO reason code for invalid file format (FF01) is already part of the SCT Inst Customer-to-Bank Implementation Guidelines.</p>	CLAR



5 Principles Governing the Change Management Cycle

5.1 Change Request Public Consultation Document

This Change Request Public Consultation Document is submitted by the SEMWG in accordance with the procedures set out in the Internal Rules in respect of changes to the SCT Inst rulebook.

5.2 Structure of the Change Request Public Consultation Document

Sections 2, 3 and 4 describe the changes to the SCT Inst rulebook which are proposed in this Change Request Public Consultation Document.

These change requests fall into three categories:

- Section 2 covers innovative change requests to technical operations in chapters 3 and 4 of the rulebook and other significant non-technical changes which fall within the definition of a major change;
- Section 3 covers change requests to align the SCT Inst rulebook with the SEPA Regulation and any other EU legislation;
- Section 4 proposes changes to correct typing errors and provide additional clarification to the SCT Inst rulebook. These changes consist of minor changes to the SCT Inst rulebook which are uncontroversial in nature and do not affect technical operations.

Annex 1 contains all received original change requests for the 2020 SCT Inst rulebook change management cycle.



6 Change Management Cycle in respect of Major Change Requests

6.1 Consideration of Change Requests

In accordance with chapter 4.1.4 of the Internal Rules, a number of change requests with respect to the rulebooks have been submitted for consideration to the SEMWG. 30 of these are applicable to the SCT Inst scheme.

Following consideration of these change requests as required under chapter 4.1.6 of the Internal Rules, the SEMWG has determined: (a) that the change requests set out in section 2 and 3 meet the criteria for acceptance into the 2020 SCT Inst rulebook change management cycle; and (b) that the change requests set out in section 4 constitute minor change requests invoking the procedures set out in Chapter 4.3 of the Internal Rules.

6.2 Change Request Public Consultation Document

The SEMWG is responsible for the preparation and development of a Change Request Public Consultation Document in respect of the major change requests referred to in section 2 above, and guiding the change requests through the rulebook change management cycle.

The SEMWG has therefore formulated this Change Request Public Consultation Document under chapter 4.2 of the Internal Rules. This Change Request Public Consultation Document analyses the major changes which have been proposed and contains in Annex 1 the original change requests.

6.3 SEMWG Recommendations

The SEMWG is required under chapter 4.2.1 of the Internal Rules to issue a recommendation on the way forward with regard to each change request. The reasons underlying each recommendation are detailed in section 2. The final decision whether a change request will be incorporated into the SCT Inst rulebook is however subject to the outcome of the public consultation.

The contributors to this public consultation are requested to indicate whether they agree with the recommendation of the SEMWG on the way forward. In case the contributors do not agree with the SEMWG recommendation, they are requested to indicate their preferred way forward.

6.4 Public Consultation on the Change Requests

The EPC encourages all SEPA stakeholders to provide feedback during the public consultation. PSP communities are asked to consult all their members who are involved in the SCT Inst scheme to ensure that the views of the payment services constituency are considered in the public consultation process. The SEMWG encourages the PSP communities to consult as wide a range of stakeholders as possible, including participants, end users and service suppliers. All stakeholders should provide feedback to the EPC on the Change Request Public Consultation Document by **09 June 2020 at 17h00 CET at the latest. The EPC will not consider any feedback received after this deadline.**

6.5 Next Steps

Considering the comments received during the public consultation, the SEMWG will produce a Change Proposal Submission Document to the EPC Scheme Management Board (SMB) for decision-making purposes in accordance with section 4.2.5 of the Internal Rules, and to the EPC Stakeholder Forums (see section 4.4 of the Internal Rules), i.e. the Scheme End-User Forum (SEUF) and the EPC Scheme Technical Forum (ESTF), for their respective positions on the SEMWG Change Proposals.

Approved change requests will be incorporated into the version 1.0 of the 2021 SCT Inst rulebook and published in November 2020 with the intention that they become effective in November 2021.



6.6 Further Information

The above is a summary of the change management process. If you would like further information, please refer to the Internal Rules or contact the EPC Secretariat.



7 Change Management Cycle in respect of Minor Change Requests

7.1 Publication of List of Minor Change Requests

The SEMWG has identified certain minor change requests which they consider necessary for the SCT Inst rulebook.

The SEMWG is required under the Internal Rules to publish a list of minor change requests on the EPC website and to ensure that the list may be viewed by all stakeholders. This obligation shall be met by the publication of this Change Request Public Consultation Document, and in particular through the provision of section 4 noting certain change requests as 'minor'.

7.2 Comments on the Minor Change Requests

All stakeholders may submit comments on the list of minor change requests in this Change Request Public Consultation Document.

7.3 Submission of the List of Minor Change Requests to the SMB

The list of minor change requests shall be submitted to the SMB via the Change Proposal Submission Document in accordance with section 4.2.5 of the Internal Rules.



Annex 1 - Original Change Requests