



SPAA MSG 010-21

Version 1.0

Date issued: 3 December 2021

Public

Approved

Minutes of the third meeting of the SEPA Payment Account Access Multi-Stakeholder Group (SPAA MSG)

Venue: Microsoft Teams meeting

Distribution: SPAA MSG

Meeting Date: 8 November 2021 (13.00-15:00 CET)

1 Welcome and introduction

The co-chairs A. González Mac Dowell and C. Schäfer, welcomed the members to the third meeting of the SEPA Payment Account Access Multi-Stakeholder Group (SPAA MSG) and informed that the objective is to finalise the review of the customer journeys and business requirements overview document. They also thanked the members for sending their additional comments on the latest version of this document.

Please see Annex I for the list of attendees.

2 Approval of the agenda (SPAA MSG 007-21)

The agenda was approved unchanged.

3 Status update on latest developments

The co-chairs informed that a follow-up meeting had been scheduled with DG FISMA to progress the discussion on the topic of 'beyond payments'. Following a question it was clarified that these discussions are to be seen in the context of their previous role as co-chairs of the ERPB Working Group (WG) on a SEPA API Access Scheme, in particular in relation to the recommendation included in the June 2021 ERPB WG report on the need to "explore the implementation for financial asset classes beyond payments and frame the ecosystem for asset classes beyond finance" and to find a host "to avoid losing momentum in delivering financial asset classes beyond payment and asset classed beyond finance ultimately". The co-chairs furthermore reiterated that DG FISMA is in charge of the Expert Group on the European financial data space and that the aim is hence to find out whether this group (or a subgroup) could potentially become an appropriate host to cover the 'beyond payments' topic and if so to ensure alignment and to maximise synergies with the work that is carried out in the SPAA MSG. Moreover they clarified that ultimately this group would then be expected to perform preparatory 'beyond payment' scheme work (similar to what was done by the aforementioned ERPB WG). They also highlighted that the focus of the SPAA MSG will not go beyond payments.



As requested, a SPAA scheme status update report for the 25 November 2021 meeting of the ERPB had been submitted to the ERPB secretariat and a copy was sent for information to the SPAA MSG.

4 Clarification of the scope and key requirements of the SPAA Scheme (SPAA MSG 002-21)

The SPAA MSG continued its review of an updated version of the customer journeys and business requirements overview document, based on the comments that were received via email from SPAA MSG members by 5 November 2021. These comments were reviewed one by one (the majority originated from the French banking community), and the document was updated ‘on screen’. The following main discussion topics were noted:

- Item 1 - “Future dated payments”: Some of the described functionalities are already covered by some PSD2 API standardisation initiatives. Moreover, two variants of future dated payments are to be distinguished i.e. with or without reservation of funds. The relevance of these two variants was confirmed by the merchant representatives. As an example, in case of a high value purchase that will be delivered in 30 days, the funds should ideally not be blocked as it is possible that at the time of purchase the necessary funds are not yet available but as a salary payment is foreseen the funds will be available at a later date (before delivery). On the other hand, a reservation of funds could apply to the use of a minibar in a hotel room. In case of reservation of funds, a SCA will need to be performed by the PSU (as the PSU needs to be aware that a reservation of funds has taken place). In case of no reservation of funds, the asset broker can check the availability of funds right before the payment execution and trigger a payment with a payment execution guarantee. It is however to be taken into account that not all asset holders are in a position to provide a payment guarantee and that there is a need for a clear description of the mechanism in order to be able to clearly distinguish between payment guarantee and funds reservation. Also, a maximum execution date will need to be specified for future dated payments with event dependent execution dates.
H. Robache moreover commented that in case of a payment with an unknown final amount, a maximum amount will need to be agreed by the PSU and that it should be specified when and how the final amount will be known by the Payer’s PSP in order to execute the credit transfer (and also regarding what needs to be done in case the amount is higher than what was approved by the PSU e.g. new SCA required).
- Item 2 - “Payments to multiple counterparties”: It was agreed to remove the scenario related to the so-called ‘chained payments’ and that there is a need to further clarify and define the concept of parallel versus ‘bulk’ payments (related to several payments made to multiple counterparties via one single transaction).
- Item 3 - “Recurring payments”: The topic of recurring payments with a same amount is already covered by some PSD2 API standardisation initiatives (it is covered under PSD2 but only if this service is offered by the asset holder via an online channel). With regard to recurring payments with a variable amount there is a need to further specify the conditions in relation to the final amount (e.g. extra SCA required in case it is above a maximum amount?).
- Item 4 - “PFM automated transfers”: To be further assessed in case two PSPs are involved, whether the funds can be directly transferred from a payment account to a savings account (or whether the funds first need to be transferred to a payments account). It will also need to be evaluated whether the automatization could be done by the asset holder as well as by the asset broker. In this context it was noted that in some communities it is not possible to transfer money from a payment account to a savings account between two different PSPs.
- Item 5a - “Pay-by-link”: The SPAA MSG is still to confirm whether this specific customer journey is in scope of the future SPAA scheme. Some members were of the view that this is not



a customer journey for which an API would need to be developed whereas others noted that that it is a very relevant topic and that the key is to find a way to do it in a way that is perceived as secure by the scheme participants.

- Item 5b - “RTP”: More time is needed to decide on how to align with other RTP alternatives without creating ‘redundancies’ or unintended dependencies (vis-à-vis another EPC scheme). In this context, the general EPC principle to be taken into account is that EPC schemes are never cross-mandated and never cover the same topic twice.
- Item 6 - “Premium AIS”: This is related to AIS information other than required by PSD2 and PSU data such as name or address. The reference to age was for the time being removed as seen by some members as too sensitive and not payment related and also in view of the ongoing discussion on e-identity. Other members were however of the view that age is payment account related information. The topic will be revisited once there is further clarity with regard to the legal framework on e-identity. M. Van Berkel will reach out to her community and report back to the SPAA MSG.
- Item 7 - “Refunds”: This customer journey is to be further clarified.
- Item 8 (a1) - “Delegated SCA”: It was commented that a delegated SCA needs a ‘trust space’ where the identity of the payer is unambiguous, the scope of the SCA (e.g. a payment of X amount to a given merchant) is specified and the proof of the SCA can be checked. Moreover, a bilateral agreement between the asset holder and asset broker should be required.
- Item 8 (a2) - “Embedded SCA”: It is to be confirmed that the embedded authentication factor must not be a knowledge (nor an inherence) factor since the communication of this kind of factor to another party implies the loss of trust of this factor. It could potentially be a possession factor (OTP, signature...) but further investigation is needed.
- Item 8 (a3) - “Embedded SCA with signed payment request”: To be confirmed whether the signature of the payment is the embedded authentication factor. Further assessment is however needed.
- Item 8 (a6 & a7) - “Redirection (app2app vs web2web): It was noted that these customer journeys are already covered by some PSD2 API standardisation initiatives. The difference between app2app and web2web needs to be further clarified.
- Item 8b - “SCA mechanisms”: As this topic is quite generic it was labelled as a ‘design principle’.
- Item 8c - “SCA exemptions”: In case an asset broker requests an SCA exemption it implies a liability shift to the asset broker (by the asset holder). R. Ohlhausen reiterated that the idea would be to maximise SCA exemptions (similar to what is done in the cards world).
- Item 8d - “Potential for ABs to ask for an exceptional application of SCA.”: This topic is already covered by some PSD2 API standardisation initiatives.
- Item 9a - “Payer enrolment” vs 9b “Payer identification”: It was clarified that 9a is about the confirmation of identity whereas 9b is related to the provision of the information and optionally about verifying the identity via an SCA.
- Item 10 - “IBAN validation”: This type of service is already operational in some countries (e.g. in France, SEPAmail-DIAMOND).
- Item 11 - “Standardisation of QR codes” and Item 12 “Proxies at a European level for bank identifiers”: As these topics are already being addressed in other EPC groups it was agreed and confirmed that these should be managed as ‘dependencies’ (see above general EPC principle).
- Item 13 - “List of ASPSPs for consumer selection”: Two scenarios can be envisaged i.e. either a list of ASPSPs is provided (e.g. published by scheme manager (no API required) or a list of IBANs is provided by an asset holder to an asset broker (via an API) upon their request.



- Item 14 - “Authorisation rights and mechanisms”: The processing of the workflow of corporate signers by an asset broker will need to be further clarified.
- Item 15 - “Instant payment release notification and confirmation”: It is to be clarified who will be in charge of sending the notification (Payer's PSP or Payee's PSP?).
- Item 16 - “Delays and liability shift rules”: This topic needs to be further clarified in a next phase.
- Item 17 - “General requirement”: Related to the fact that conceptually, the integration of PSD2 vs ‘premium’ related data would need to be seamless. The topic’s title needs to be specified as it is currently too vague. Moreover, this should be labelled as a design principle.

After having finalised the review of the customer journeys and business requirements overview document, the co-chairs asked the members whether they felt comfortable with the fact that the preparatory ‘phase 0’ task (as requested by the Board) had been completed successfully. As no objections were received, a finalised (‘phase 0’) version of the overview document, based on the outcome of today’s meeting will be created as input for the 24 November 2021 meeting of the Board. The co-chairs commented that further work will be required in relation to the pending topics covered in the column “API question/response – Initial considerations at this stage”.

Following a question, E. Goosse clarified that the Board at its 24 November 2021 meeting will be asked to accept the invitation of the ERPB to assume the role of SPAA scheme manager and in order to help the Board in making this decision the Board had indeed asked the SPAA MSG to clarify the scope of the SPAA scheme (taking into account that the scheme scope’s “ceiling” would be payment accounts and its “floor” PSD2). He continued by saying that the customer journeys and business requirements will be listed in the Board decision document and that the overview document itself will be added as an annex. H. Robache however commented that he was not yet completely comfortable with some of the topics included in the overview document which the French Banking community considers as out of scope.

5 Next meetings (SPAA MSG 001-21)

The next (virtual) SPAA MSG meeting is scheduled on 19 November 2021 (09-15 CET).

6 AOB

No other topics were discussed.

7 Closure of meeting

The co-chairs closed the meeting at around 15.10 CET and thanked the members for the constructive input.



Annex I: List of attendees

| Country | Name | Institution | Attendance |
|------------------|------------------------------|---|------------|
| Co-Chairs | | | |
| EU | Arturo González Mac Dowell | Tink | Yes |
| DE | Christian Schaefer | Deutsche Bank (supported by the three ECSAs) | Yes |
| Members | | | |
| AT | Hendrik Muus | PSA | Yes |
| DE | Caroline Jenke | FinTecSystems GmbH | Yes |
| DE | Christian Wenz | PPI AG | Apologies |
| DE | Hartwig Gerhartinger | Paysafe Group | Yes |
| DE | Hermann Fürstenau | Association of German Public Banks (VÖB) (nominated by GBIC) | Yes |
| EU | Alessia Benevelli | ESBG | Yes |
| EU | Anni Mykkänen ¹ | EBF | Yes |
| EU | Jasper De Meyer | BEUC | Yes |
| EU | Krzysztof Korus | EPIF | Yes |
| EU | Marieke Van Berkel | EACB | Yes |
| EU | Massimo Battistella | EACT | Yes |
| EU | Pascal Spittler ² | EuroCommerce | Yes |
| EU | Ralf Ohlhausen | ETPPA | Yes |
| EU | Tarik Zerkti | PRETA S.A.S. | Yes |
| EU | Thaer Sabri | EMA | Yes |
| FI | Suvi Rautakorpi | Finance Finland | Apologies |
| FR | Fanny Rodriguez | Bankin' and Bridge | |
| FR | Gildas Le Louarn | Linxo | Yes |

¹ Alternate to Gijs Boudewijn

² Alternate to Michel Van Mello



| | | | |
|----|------------------------|--|-----|
| FR | Géraldine Debost | Crédit Agricole S.A. (nominated by the French banking community) | Yes |
| FR | Hervé Robache | STET (nominated by the French banking community) | Yes |
| IE | Jack Wilson | TrueLayer | Yes |
| IT | Alessio Castelli | CBI S.c.p.a. | Yes |
| IT | Andrea Coggerino | Intesa Sanpaolo (nominated by ABI) | Yes |
| NL | Daniel Morgan | Plaid | Yes |
| NL | Rob van Bergen | ING (nominated by the Dutch Payments Association) | Yes |
| PT | João Sarilho | SIBS (nominated by Association of Portuguese Banks) | Yes |
| SE | Jens Olsson | Trustly | Yes |
| | Observers | | |
| EU | Julia Weits | European Commission | Yes |
| EU | Kerstin Junius | European Central Bank | Yes |
| | EPC Secretariat | | |
| | Christophe Godefroi | | Yes |
| | Etienne Goosse | | Yes |
| | Silvia Di Lillo | | Yes |



Annex II: Action points

| Ref. | Action | Owner | Status/Target |
|-------|--|----------------------|------------------|
| 01-05 | The topic of German “giroAPI” to be put on the agenda of one of the future SPAA MSG meetings | Co-chairs | To be decided |
| 03-01 | Create a finalised version of the customer journeys and business requirements overview document, based on the outcome of today’s meeting and submit as input to the 24 November 2021 Board meeting | SPAA MSG secretariat | 10 November 2021 |
| 03-02 | Check the view of the EACB in relation to the topic of ‘premium AIS’ and report back to the SPAA MSG. | M. Van Berkel | In due course |