SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Scheme Rulebook

Public Consultation on 2024 Change Requests

Public Consultation on 2024 Change Requests for SCT Inst Scheme Rulebook

EPC007-24
Version 1.0
Date issued: 12 March 2024

The European Payments Council (EPC) payment schemes, as set out in the Single Euro Payments Area (SEPA) Credit Transfer (SCT), the SEPA Instant Credit Transfer (SCT Inst), the SEPA Direct Debit Core (SDD Core), the SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business (SDD B2B) and the One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer (OCT Inst) scheme rulebooks, evolve based on a transparent change management process adhered to by the 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 2024 Change Request Public Consultation Document (document EPC007-24) details change requests for possible modifications to be introduced into the next version of the SCT Inst scheme 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 2024 Change Request Public Consultation Document offers the analyses and recommendations of the EPC Payment Scheme Evolution and Maintenance Working Group (PSEMWG) on the way forward regarding individual change requests. A summary overview of the change requests and related recommendations by the PSEMWG are provided in section 1 of this Change Request Public Consultation Document.

The EPC submits the SCT Inst 2024 Change Request Public Consultation Document for public consultation. The public consultation takes place between 12 March and 09 June 2024.

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 scheme rulebook by completing the response template EPC012-24 and send it to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu by 09 June 2024 at 17h00 CET at the latest. The EPC will not consider any feedback received after this deadline.

Proposed changes detailed in this SCT Inst 2024 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 Payment 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 scheme rulebook will be published in November 2024 for implementation in November 2025. In accordance with industry best practice, payment service providers and their suppliers have a 12 months lead time to address scheme 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 EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules (the Internal Rules) being a binding Annex to the current applicable SCT Inst scheme rulebook.

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

Therefore, the EPC reserves the right to make necessary changes to the SCT Inst scheme rulebook at all times in order to ensure that the SCT Inst scheme 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 Scheme Rulebook

1.1 EPC Approach

The principles governing the evolution of the EPC payment schemes as set out in the SEPA Credit Transfer (SCT), SEPA Direct Debit (SDD) and the One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer (OCT Inst) scheme rulebooks are detailed in the 'EPC Payment Scheme Management 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 2024 Change Request Public Consultation Document detail the application of the Internal Rules in the EPC payment scheme change management process.

The Internal Rules make a difference between so called major and minor changes to the EPC scheme rulebooks. A major change is a change that affects or proposes to alter the substance of the scheme rulebooks and the schemes. Any change to chapters 5 and 6 of the scheme 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 scheme rulebooks.

This executive summary of the SCT Inst 2024 Change Request Public Consultation Document highlights change requests for major changes to the SCT Inst scheme rulebook received in this scheme change management cycle. Change requests for minor changes to the SCT Inst scheme rulebook are set out in section 4 of this Change Request Public Consultation Document. All change requests to the SCT Inst scheme rulebook are submitted for public consultation between 12 March and 09 June 2024. 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 **24** change requests for major changes to be introduced into the SCT Inst scheme rulebook. The change requests submitted to the EPC are included in Annex 1 to this document.

Some change requests suggest amendments to the provision of the type of addresses under the SCT Inst scheme as of November 2025. Currently, the 2023 SCT Inst scheme rulebook specifies that as of November 2025, in case an address is provided, that address must be structured. There are change requests proposing the introduction of a hybrid address as of November 2025 besides the possibility of continuing to use the unstructured address (until November 2026) or the structured address.

Several change requests suggest extending the character length of the name field of the Originator, Beneficiary and their respective reference parties from 70 to 140 characters. There are also suggestions to introduce attributes for the commercial trade names of the Beneficiary and of the Beneficiary Reference Party, and for the address of the Reference Party of the Originator and of the Beneficiary.

One suggestion puts forward the partial transfer back of funds in case of the reason 'Fraud'. Other items propose the optional use of the Unique End-to-end Transaction Reference (UETR).

One change request proposes that the entry-into-force time of the 2025 version and any future version of the SCT Inst scheme rulebook is set at 03:30 CET on the Sunday concerned. In practice, this would mean that the 2025 SCT Inst scheme rulebook goes live on Sunday 16 November 2025 at 03:30 CET. No SEPA-wide downtime period will be scheduled for the change-over from the 2023 SCT Inst scheme rulebook version to the 2025 rulebook version.

Another suggestion proposes amendments to the SCT Inst Recall procedure and the related Request for a Status Update on an SCT Inst Recall.

One item suggests the introduction of the Financial Institution-to-Financial Institution ISO 20022-standard based pacs.009 message to replace the pacs.008 message for pure Inter-PSP transactions.

One proposal calls for a reduction of the current SCT Inst target execution time and time-out deadline. A further contribution is the inclusion of the formal definition of the terms 'Alias' and 'Proxy' for which attributes had been introduced in the 2023 SCT Inst scheme rulebook.

One change request concerns the possibility for the Beneficiary to return a SCT Inst transaction after the amount is credited. Other requests are to apply a unique format of Acceptance Date Time Timestamp, and the possibility of a Payment Reversal in the Inter-PSP space.

One other item proposes adding the reason 'Fraud' for the Request for Recall by the Originator (RFRO) procedure. A final suggestion is to introduce a new XML message type to exchange extra information between PSPs.

All change requests to the SCT Inst scheme rulebook received were reviewed by the EPC Payment Scheme Evolution and Maintenance Working Group (PSEMWG). These change requests include the recommendation of the PSEMWG regarding each of these change requests unless the PSEMWG 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 participant[1] 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:
   - 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 Regulation[2] 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;

---

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

[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.

- 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 PSEMWG 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 PSEMWG on the way forward.

In case the contributors do not agree with the PSEMWG recommendation, they are requested to indicate in the comments section of the response template EPC012-24 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 PSEMWG on the proposed way forward. The final decision is subject to the outcome of the public consultation.
01	Change request has been withdrawn	PSEMWG	Change request has been withdrawn
02	Inclusion of Alias and Proxy Definitions	PSEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
03	New Entry-Into-Force Time of the SCT Inst and OCT Inst Scheme Rulebooks as of November 2025	OLO TF and PSEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
04	Change request has been withdrawn	PSEMWG	Change request has been withdrawn
05	Change request has been withdrawn	PSEMWG	Change request has been withdrawn
06	Introduction of Hybrid Address of the Payment End-User	OLO TF and PSEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b

Change Request item	Topic	Contributor	Recommendation of the PSEMWG on the proposed way forward. The final decision is subject to the outcome of the public consultation.
07	Unique Format of Acceptance Date Time Timestamp	TIPS-Consultative Group from the ECB	**Only the first part** should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
09	Introduce pacs.009 to Replace pacs.008 for Inter-PSP Transactions	Nordic Payments Council (NPC)	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
10	Possibility for Beneficiary to return a SCT (Inst) Transaction after the Amount is Credited	Number of French PSPs	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
11	Extension of Character Length for Name	OLO TF and PSEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
12	Inclusion of Commercial Trade Name	PSEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
13	Inclusion of Reference Party Address	PSEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
15	Optional use of Unique End-to-end Transaction Reference (UETR)	Swiss banking community	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
16	Hybrid Address Mandatory in Inter-PSP Space and PSPs Are Free to Set only Structured Address in the Customer-to-PSP Space	Swiss banking community	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
17	Extension of Character Length for Name	Swiss banking community	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
18	Reduction of target maximum execution time and time-out deadline	Dutch Payments Association	Cannot be part of the existing scheme **for now** - option e
19	Partial Transfer Back of Funds in case of Reason 'Fraud'	Spanish banking community	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
20	Extra Reason Code 'Fraud' for Request For Recall by the Originator (RFRO)	Slovak banking association	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
21	Extension of Character Length for Name	Nordic Payments Council (NPC)	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b

Change Request item	Topic	Contributor	Recommendation of the PSEMWG on the proposed way forward. The final decision is subject to the outcome of the public consultation.
26	Possibility of Payment Reversal in the Inter-PSP Space	BIZUM	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
27	Call for More Suitable Date and Time for Rulebook Version Change-Over (with no downtime)	BIZUM	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
29	Precisions on Recalls and Status Requests on Recalls	BPCE Group	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
31	New XML Message Type to Exchange Extra Info between PSPs	Slovak banking association	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
32	Optional use of Unique End-to-end Transaction Reference (UETR)	TIPS-Consultative Group from the ECB	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e

1.3 Overview of Changes to Align the Next Version of the SCT Inst Scheme 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
At this point in time, no items have been identified that require a change to the SCT Inst scheme rulebook due to any EU legislation.			

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

2.1 # 01: Change request has been withdrawn

2.1.1 Description

This change request has been withdrawn.

2.2   # 02: Inclusion of Alias and Proxy Definitions

2.2.1   Description

This change request was made by the PSEMWG.

During the 2022 SCT and SCT Inst scheme rulebook change management cycle held in 2021 and 2022, the 2022 change request to include the Alias and Proxy as optional attributes in both SCT schemes had been accepted.

However, the concerned 2022 change request from the submitting stakeholder did not include concrete definitions for the terms 'Proxy' and 'Alias'. Consequently, such definitions had not been included in the 2023 SCT scheme rulebooks.

In the subsequent review and finalization of the Risk Management Annexes (RMAs) being an integral part of the two 2023 SCT scheme rulebooks, definitions for the two terms had been taken up in these RMAs. However, the distribution of the RMAs is restricted to only the SCT (Inst) scheme participants and scheme applicants.

Therefore, the suggestion is to insert the 'Proxy' and 'Alias' definitions from these RMAs in the SCT scheme rulebooks. In this way, also the other stakeholders have the same understanding about what is concretely meant with the terms 'Proxy' and 'Alias' in the SCT scheme rulebooks.

2.2.2   PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025**.

2.2.3   Rulebook impact

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

2.3   # 03: New Entry-Into-Force Time of the SCT Inst and OCT Inst Scheme Rulebooks as of November 2025

2.3.1   Description

This change request was made by the EPC One-Leg Out Task Force (OLO TF[3]) and the PSEMWG.

On 27 October 2022, the EPC published the version 1.1 of the 2023 SCT Inst scheme rulebook bearing the amended entry-into-force time of 03:30 CET on Sunday 19 November 2023 (instead of 08:00 CET communicated in the version 1.0 of the 2023 SCT Inst scheme rulebook). The entry-into-force date and time of the 2023 SCT Inst scheme rulebook was eventually changed to 17 March 2024 03:30 CET.

The EPC decision to let the 2023 SCT Inst scheme rulebook enter into force at 03:30 CET was to help all SCT Inst scheme participants and their SCT Inst service-supporting technical partner(s) to make a smooth change-over of their relevant SCT Inst systems, infrastructures and applications from the 2009 version to the 2019 version of the ISO 20022 standard on Sunday 19 November 2023 (now 17 March 2024).

This point in time was chosen as being the most suitable time at which the lowest possible volume of SCT Inst transactions is processed while taking into account the range of geographical time zones in which the SCT Inst scheme is used across SEPA.

With the future obligation under the amended SEPA Regulation whereby EU-based PSPs that already offer credit transfers in euro should also offer their instant version within a defined period, more SCT Inst transactions may be processed at 08:00 CET on Sunday mornings in the future. Making updates to SCT Inst scheme-based systems, infrastructures and applications at a point in time of higher SCT Inst transaction volume processing increases the risk of such updates negatively impacting the smooth processing of these SCT Inst transactions.

As the OCT Inst scheme is also an instant payment scheme whereby it has many similarities with the SCT Inst scheme, the suggestion is that the entry-into-force time of the 2025 version and any future version of the SCT Inst and OCT Inst scheme rulebooks are set at 03:30 CET on the Sunday concerned. In practice, this means that the 2025 SCT Inst and OCT Inst scheme rulebooks go live on Sunday 16 November 2025 at 03:30 CET.

Note: no SEPA-wide downtime period will be scheduled for the change-over from the 2023 SCT Inst and OCT Inst scheme rulebooks to their respective 2025 rulebook versions.

2.3.2   PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025**.

2.3.3   Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the Customer-to-PSP and all inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

---

[3] The OLO TF is in charge of the daily management of One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer (OCT Inst) scheme rulebook.

2.4   # 04: Change request has been withdrawn

2.4.1   Description

Change request has been withdrawn.

2.5   # 05: Change request has been withdrawn

2.5.1   Description

This change request has been withdrawn.

2.6 # 06: Introduction of Hybrid Address of the Payment End-User

2.6.1 Description

This change request was made by the OLO TF and the PSEMWG.

Past EPC decision

The March 2022 EPC Scheme Management Board (SMB) meeting approved the 2022 change request item #06 to exclusively use the structured address of the customer as of November 2025. This change would affect all four SEPA payment scheme rulebooks.

As of 19 November 2023[4], customers would be allowed to send in a structured way their own address and/or the address of their payment counterparty in electronic Customer-to-PSP files at least when based on the corresponding EPC payment scheme Customer-to-PSP IGs.

One element the EPC took into account for its decision was that with the exclusive use of structured addresses as of November 2025, the SEPA payment schemes would be aligned with the deadline set for the use of the structured address under the Cross-border Payments and Reporting Plus (CBPR+) and High Value Payments Plus (HVPS+) usage guidelines.

When the OCT Inst scheme rulebook was published in 2023, it also included the exclusive use of a structured address as of November 2025.

Developments within SWIFT

The December 2023 SWIFT Board meeting decided to adapt its address specifications for the SWIFT Standard Release 2025. SWIFT decided to

- Step back from its initial decision to allow only structured addresses as of November 2025;

- introduce a **hybrid address** version by November 2025 alongside a structured address version with the hybrid address version having no expiration date; and

- Allow the unstructured address version until November 2026 (22 November 2026).

The **hybrid address** concerns a mix of structured and unstructured address details. It allows the combination of structured ISO 20022 address elements **and** up to <u>two</u> lines of 70 characters of unstructured "Address Line" <AdrLine>. Elements available in structured format must be mapped into the respective structured elements. The structured elements for "Country" <Ctry> and for "Town Name" <TwnNm> will become mandatory. Structured elements cannot be repeated in the <AdrLine> elements.

Re-consideration of earlier EPC decision

The EPC Payment Scheme Management Board (PSMB) re-considered the EPC decision taken back in March 2022. It is now in favour of the introduction of the hybrid address alongside the structured and the unstructured addresses in all five EPC payment schemes having in mind the following elements:

- A migration from unstructured addresses directly to fully structured addresses is a true challenge for payment end users and PSPs, especially given the current deadline of November 2025 for SEPA transactions. The time needed to change the addresses in all customer databases or to move to databases capable of supporting structured addresses, would be long.

---

[4] This date was later postponed to 17 March 2024 due to the EPC decision on 24 October 2023 to postpone the ISO version migration for all four 2023 SEPA payment scheme rulebooks to 17 March 2024.

- For customers making SEPA, high value and international payment transactions, an alignment of the address structure between the three groups of payment instruments would be the best;

- Only the structured address fields 'Town' and 'Country' are needed for regulatory screening.

2.6.2   PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025** as follows:

1. Since the 2023 SEPA payment scheme rulebooks, payment end users and payment scheme participants are already allowed to provide <u>fully structured</u> addresses in their respective electronic Customer-to-PSP files and inter-PSP payment messages and r-transactions.

   The provision of fully structured addresses remains supported under the 2025 SEPA payment scheme rulebooks as well.

   This means that all scheme participants must continue to support the delivery of structured addresses when payment end users and scheme participants want a structured address in their outgoing and incoming SEPA payment transactions. Scheme participants cannot reject SEPA payment transactions only due to the inclusion of a structured address.

2. As of the entry-into-force date of the 2025 SEPA payment scheme rulebooks being 16 November 2025, payment end users are allowed to send a **hybrid address** of the payer and/or of the payee in electronic Customer-to-PSP files at least based on the Customer-to-PSP Implementation Guidelines for SEPA payment transactions**.**

   From that same date, also SEPA payment scheme participants are allowed to provide hybrid addresses in their inter-PSP SEPA payment messages and r-transactions.

   As of 16 November 2025, all scheme participants must also be able to support the delivery of hybrid addresses when payment end users and scheme participants want a hybrid address in their outgoing and incoming SEPA payment transactions. From this date, scheme participants cannot reject SEPA payment transactions only due to the inclusion of a hybrid address.

3. As of the entry-into-force date of the 2025 SEPA payment scheme rulebooks being 16 November 2025 up to 22 November 2026, payment end users and scheme participants are allowed to continue providing <u>unstructured</u> addresses in their respective electronic Customer-to-PSP files and inter-PSP SEPA payment messages and r-transactions.

   In the period November 2025 – November 2026, all scheme participants must continue to support the delivery of unstructured addresses when payment end users and scheme participants want an unstructured address in their outgoing and incoming SEPA payment transactions. Scheme participants cannot reject SEPA payment transactions only due to the inclusion of an unstructured address.

   As of 22 November 2026, the use of an **unstructured** address will **no longer be allowed and will hence lead to rejects**. Only hybrid and structured addresses will be allowed from that date onwards.

The EPC nevertheless recommends that scheme participants and their customers to use the time up to November 2026 in which unstructured addresses can still be submitted (compared to initially November 2025), as an opportunity to start right away with the switch from unstructured addresses directly to fully structured addresses.

The use of structured addresses in payment transactions, gives the potential to reduce errors in payment processing, regulatory screening, and reconciliation, thereby increasing the straight-through-processing of SEPA payment transactions.

During the transition period up to November 2026 in which payment end users and scheme participants can start to move to the use of hybrid or preferably structured addresses, the current input of addresses with 2 occurrences of the unstructured address element "Address Line" associated with the structured address element "Country" will continue to be accepted.

2.6.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.7   # 07: Unique Format of Acceptance Date Time Timestamp

2.7.1   Description

This change request was made by the TIPS-Consultative Group from the European Central Bank (ECB).

The contributor raises an issue with the format of the Acceptance Date Time Timestamp , and more specifically the use or not of milliseconds.

The EPC SCT Inst Inter-PSP Implementation Guidelines (IGs) refer to the "ISODateTime" datatype for the Acceptance Date Time message element.

The "ISODateTime" datatype allows the use of decimal fractions of seconds. In this context, ISO 8601 standard, to which the datatype conforms, states that decimal fractions of seconds may be included in the timestamp (with a variable number of decimal digits allowed, depending on the agreement reached within the community concerned).

However, the description of attribute AT-T056 'Timestamp of the SCT Inst Transaction' in the SCT Inst scheme rulebook states that "The Timestamp must be unambiguous and at least include seconds". This is also reflected in the IGs, in which the SEPA Usage Rule states that *"The Timestamp must be unambiguous and at least include seconds. Only UTC time format or local time with UTC offset format can be used."*.

The contributor points out that, for the same payment, the Acceptance Date Time Timestamp format can be handled differently by the different actors involved with regards to milliseconds.

The contributor suggests amending the IGs to specify the number of digits allowed to represent milliseconds in the Acceptance Date Time Timestamp. Consequently, one fixed format of the "ISODate Time" should be specified for the Acceptance Date Time message element in every SCT Inst message, either **YYYY-MM-DDThh:mm:ss.mmmZ** or alternatively **YYYY-MM-DDThh:mm:ss.mmm+hh:mm**. This would allow PSPs to rely on a unified rule to track and reconcile their instant payments, removing de facto reconciliation issues for PSPs.

2.7.2   PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG suggests incorporating **only the first part** of change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025,** i.e. the attribute AT-056 being the timestamp must be unambiguous and at least include **milli**seconds.

In case only seconds would be expressed, the milliseconds would then be rounded up to the next second. As the EU Instant Payments Regulation (IPR) amending the SEPA Regulation shortens the hard timeline for instant euro credit transfers to 10 seconds, a timestamp with at least milliseconds becomes very relevant to reject or not SCT Inst transactions due to a time-out.

As for the suggestion for the exclusive use of one "ISODateTime" format for the SCT Inst timestamp, **the PSEMWG recommends not taking forward the second part of the change request (option e)**.

Several market infrastructures use different date time formats and it would generate an unnecessary burden on all systems. Changing the date time format usage rules would impact the whole end-to-end payment chain. Allowing the two date time formats is in line with the CBPR+ rules.

The PSEMWG recommends allowing the two date time formats i.e. the UTC time format (YYYY-MM-DDThh:mm:ss.sssZ), and the local time with UTC offset format (YYYY-MM-DDThh:mm:ss.sss+/-

hh:mm. This gives the PSPs flexibility. The PSEMWG does not see the added value of prescribing only one of the two formats.

2.7.3   Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact only the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.8   # 09: Introduce pacs.009 to Replace pacs.008 for Inter-PSP Transactions

2.8.1   Description

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

The contributor suggests introducing a pacs.009 message that can replace the pacs.008 used for inter-PSP transactions such as fees and interest compensation. A pacs.009 could be used for other Inter-PSP transactions as well (not only fees and interest compensations).

The use of an adjusted Customer Credit Transfer (pacs.008) is not aligned with the ISO 20022 standard. According to this standard, a pacs.009 should be used to settle in a correct way pure FI-to-FI payments. This change request is in line with a requirement defined by the Committee on Payments and Market Infrastructure (CPMI)[5]:

Requirements Block A – Fundamentals

2.5.1   Requirement #1 – To use the appropriate message for a particular business function

Background and rationale

While ISO 20022 has defined the scope and business function for each message, there is some risk of inconsistent use of messages or deviation from the actual scope defined for that message. This can undermine processing efficiency. For example, instead of implementing the ISO 20022 message for return payments (ie the pacs.004), certain markets choose to use a regular credit transfer message (eg pacs.008 or pacs.009) with customised, proprietary codes to identify this "new" payment as a return payment. This inconsistent use requires financial institutions participating in different markets and/or across multiple solutions to perform the same business function in different ways. This is done by using customised, rather than standardised, message implementations to identify the actual message function of a message, as opposed to the one expected per the message scope.

Proposed solution

The CPMI proposes to require use of ISO 20022 messages identified as part of the core set for cross-border payments in line with their scope as defined by the ISO 20022 standard.

2.8.2   PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**). There were several reasons why the EPC opted for not introducing pacs.009 for the SCT inquiry procedure whereby inter-PSP fees and interest compensations paid between PSPs are done via a pacs.008:

- The introduction of such new pacs. message is a huge work for PSPs and CSMs. At that time of introducing the SCT inquiry procedure, the number of inter-PSP payments for inter-PSP fees and for interest compensations under the SCT scheme was expected to be low;

- It only makes sense when the introduction of pacs.009 can be justified with a convincing level of expected transaction volume;

- The EPC wanted to keep the link between the initial SCT transaction and the inter-PSP payment for an inter-PSP fee/interest compensation related to that SCT transaction.

In addition, a pacs.009 transaction is not a commercial payment but is normally treated via High-Value-Payment infrastructures such as T2. The PSEMWG is also unsure whether low-value high-volume retail payment CSMs would be willing to handle FI-to-FI payments as well.

2.8.3   Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

---

[5] Committee on Payments and Market Infrastructures Consultative report on ISO 20022 harmonization requirements for enhancing cross-border payments, March 2023 (BIS)

2.9   # 10: Possibility for Beneficiary to return a SCT Inst Transaction after the Amount is Credited

2.9.1   Description

This change request was made by a number of French PSPs.

These French PSPs suggest giving the possibility for a Beneficiary to return a SCT Inst transaction <u>after</u> the amount of the initial SCT Inst transaction has been credited on the account of the Beneficiary, i.e. to allow a Return R-transaction reason "return by order of the Beneficiary" for the SCT Inst scheme rulebook.

For the SCT Inst scheme rulebook, this would also then mean the introduction of the Return procedure.

Currently, in case the Beneficiary receives funds but it does not recognize the SCT Inst transaction or the Originator, it cannot make a Return for the credited funds.

The only possibility the Beneficiary has is to give a Reject instruction to the Beneficiary PSP in case of an SCT Inst transaction **<u>before</u>** the funds are credited on the account of the Beneficiary.

Most of the time, the Beneficiaries will only be able to contest the transaction based on their account statement (i.e. after funds have been credited).

In the change request, the contributors also provide several use cases in which the use of the SCT Inst Return R-transaction "Return by order of the Beneficiary" can be useful.

Finally, for the Return reason "Return by order of the Beneficiary", the contributors suggest extending the current <u>SCT</u> Return period of three banking business days after settlement date to e.g., an eight weeks period (which will allow natural persons receiving their statement account once a month to react and express their request for a Return) or to 13 months (in accordance with the PSD2 timeframe to reimburse a non-authorised transaction).

2.9.2   PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

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

This change request is a fundamental change to the SCT Inst scheme as the SCT Inst transaction credit is final. It would change the legal nature of the transaction as currently the transaction becomes final once credited on the account of the Beneficiary. If the Beneficiary wants to send back the funds, it then must create a new transaction.

The Beneficiary PSP can offer solutions to the Beneficiary to transfer back the funds in case e.g., the Beneficiary does not have the IBAN of the Originator at its disposal (in some SEPA countries, this IBAN is not shared with the Beneficiary). Furthermore, such solutions are part of the Customer-to-PSP space where commercial forces are at play.

2.9.3   Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.10 # 11: Extension of Character Length for Name

2.10.1 Description

This change request was made by the OLO TF and the PSEMWG.

The SEPA length of characters is currently set at 70 characters for the <u>name fields</u> for the following attributes under the SCT Inst scheme rulebook: Originator (AT-P001), Originator Reference Party (AT-P006), Beneficiary (AT-E001) and Beneficiary Reference Party (AT-E007).

It suggests extending the character length for the 'Name' field for the SCT Inst scheme **for all upper-mentioned attributes** from 70 to 140 characters as:

- The 2019 ISO 20022 standard foresees up to 140 characters for the 'Debtor', 'Ultimate Debtor', 'Creditor', 'Ultimate Creditor' and 'Financial Institution' name fields.
- The provision of extra characters allows payment service users to enter the complete name(s) concerned. This avoids the issue of data truncation and can provide the payment service user with further transparency about the identity of the payment counterparty and/or its reference parties and the financial institution(s) involved.
- The possibility to provide the complete name(s) can support PSPs with respect to regulatory screening and up-front verification of payment counterparty names (such as Confirmation of Payee).
- The Cross-border Payments and Reporting Plus (CBPR+) specifications also allow 140 characters for these name fields.

This proposed change does not impact the SCT Inst scheme rulebook itself, but only its related Customer-to-PSP and inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

Important: if the 2024 change request item #12 (see section 2.11 in this document) on the inclusion of the commercial trade name would be supported, the maximum length of the commercial trade name could become 140 characters as well (depending on the final message element selected to transport the commercial trade name).

2.10.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025**.

2.10.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will only impact the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.11 # 12: Inclusion of Commercial Trade Name

2.11.1 Description

This change request was made by the PSEMWG.

The Statement of the June 2021 Euro Retail Payments Board (ERPB) meeting endorsed a set of recommendations formulated by the ERPB working group on transparency for retail payment end-users.

One recommendation assigned to payment schemes such as the EPC payment schemes relates to the commercial trade name i.e. recommendation id 01: *Consistently use commercial trade name and provide this name to all involved parties in the payment chain for use in client's payment account statements*.

Furthermore, the commercial trade name is referred to in Article 25 'Information for the payer on individual payment transactions' of the proposed Payment Services Regulation (PSR), and in Article 2 (1c) of the amended SEPA Regulation.

The PSEMWG analysed to what extent the existing EPC payment scheme attributes suffice to meet the identified need or whether additional attributes would be needed.

Following this analysis, new attributes related to the "whom" are proposed being **yellow optional** fields in the relevant payment scheme implementation guidelines. As a yellow optional field, all scheme participants must support this ISO message element throughout their SEPA payment systems even though payment service users would still be free to use these elements or not.

2.11.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025**.

2.11.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.12 # 13: Inclusion of Reference Party Address

2.12.1 Description

This change request was made by the PSEMWG.

The Statement of the June 2021 Euro Retail Payments Board (ERPB) meeting endorsed a set of recommendations formulated by the ERPB working group on transparency for retail payment end-users.

One aspect for which transparency can be improved is about the reference parties of the payer and of the payee.

The SEPA payment scheme rulebooks currently support only the exchange of the name and an identification code of such reference parties. The proposal is to also allow the exchange of the address of such reference parties. Payment end-users would no longer have to use other fields (such as the remittance information field) to provide such address data. It also allows better regulatory processing of such reference party data.

New attributes are proposed being **yellow optional** fields in the relevant payment scheme implementation guidelines. As a yellow optional field, all scheme participants must support this ISO message element throughout their SEPA payment systems even though payment service users would still be free to use this element or not.

Important: the proposed specifications to be followed to complete such addresses are aligned with the specifications proposed for the 2024 change request item #06 (see section 2.6 in this document).

Subject to the final decision by the Payment Scheme Management Board (PSMB) for item #06, the proposed address specifications for the reference parties may remain unchanged or may be adapted accordingly.

2.12.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025**.

2.12.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.13 # 15: Optional use of Unique End-to-end Transaction Reference (UETR)

2.13.1 Description

This change request was made by the Swiss banking community.

The contributor suggests **the option** for scheme participants to transmit the Unique End-to-end Transaction Reference (UETR) for an SCT Inst transaction. The use of the UETR simplifies backend processes.

2.13.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**). The PSEMWG does not see how the UETR adds value for the SCT Inst scheme as SCT Inst transactions must be completed within 10 seconds as stipulated by the future Instant Payments Regulation (IPR) that amends the SEPA Regulation.

2.13.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.14 # 16: Hybrid Address Mandatory in Inter-PSP Space and PSPs Are Free to Set only Structured Address in the Customer-to-PSP Space

2.14.1 Description

This change request was made by the Swiss banking community.

This change request is linked to the potential change of the implementation of the structured address. If the hybrid address is **not** introduced or another decision is taken in regards of the structured address (e.g., postponement to a later change cycle), this change request becomes obsolete.

Preliminary explanation:

Based on the section 0.5.1 'SCT Inst Scheme Implementation Guidelines', the implementation guidelines are binding in the Customer-to-PSP space. Most Swiss PSPs have already implemented the structured address based on the currently valid definition in their offering and internal applications. While in the inter-PSP space the handling of the address must be anyway less strict (e.g., supporting cross-border payments via SWIFT, bank-to-bank payments, cash-legs of other types of transaction), the rules in the Customer-to-PSP space are often implemented more restrictively.

Change request in case the content of the address of the involved parties was changed from structured to hybrid:

The hybrid address becomes only mandatory in the inter-PSP space. In the Customer-to-PSP space, the respective PSP is not obliged to support the hybrid address and can restrict its offering to structured address only.

2.14.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**). Reference is made to the change request item # 06 (see section 2.6 in this document) as submitted by the OLO TF and the PSEMWG.

The change request item # 06 allowing payment service users to submit hybrid addresses (if they wish so) as of November 2025, is an alignment with the SWIFT Standard Release 2025 for the Cross-border Payments and Reporting Plus (CBPR+) usage guidelines. The suggestion is to include this hybrid address possibility in the Customer-to-PSP Implementation Guidelines (IGs) which each Originator PSP is obliged to support at the request of the Originator. The section 0.5.1 of the rulebook points out that these IGs are **binding** supplements for the scheme participants.

2.14.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.15 # 17: Extension of Character Length for Name

2.15.1 Description

This change request was made by the Swiss banking community.

The contributor suggests extending the character length for the relevant 'Name' fields under the SCT Inst scheme, from 70 to 140 characters.

This proposed change does not impact the SCT Inst scheme rulebook itself, but only its related Customer-to-PSP and inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.15.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025**. This change request has the same goal as the change request item # 11 (see section 2.10 in this document).

2.15.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will only impact the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.16 # 18: Reduction of target maximum execution time and time-out deadline

2.16.1 Description

This change request was made by the Dutch Payments Association.

It proposes to reduce the following timelines under the SCT Inst scheme rulebook to adapt to market circumstances and customer needs, especially to the (future) use of SCT Inst at the 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 PSP: 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.

SCT Inst transaction data analysis shows that more than 95% of all SCT Inst transactions are processed within 3 seconds, even in case multiple Clearing and Settlement Mechanisms (CSMs) are involved in one SCT Inst transaction. This demonstrates that the proposed change is feasible and realistic.

2.16.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request **for now** **(option e)**.

The entire SCT Inst processing timeline must be completely reconsidered in light of the contents of the Instant Payments Regulation (IPR) that amends the SEPA Regulation. Any change to the SCT Inst processing timeline will then be considered as a Regulatory Change under section 4.2.9 of the EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules.

2.16.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.17 # 19: Partial Transfer Back of Funds in case of Reason 'Fraud'

2.17.1 Description

This change request was made by the Spanish banking community.

To contribute to a better recovery of funds due to of fraudulently initiated SCT Inst transactions, the contributor proposes the adoption of a specific procedure for a partial transfer back of funds for those cases in which the account of the Beneficiary does not contain sufficient funds to fully meet a Recall request for the reason 'Fraud' (reason code 'FRAD').

When the Beneficiary PSP determines that there are not enough funds on the account of the Beneficiary to fully honour the Recall request, it should then:

- Respond negatively to the Recall request for 'FRAD' reasons, indicating the reason code for this negative response i.e. 'AM04 – insufficient funds'.

- Subsequently, re-imburse the Originator PSP with the funds available on the account of the Beneficiary. To do this, the Beneficiary PSP must issue a new SCT Inst transaction indicating in the payment category purpose the reason code 'OTHR', and in the payment purpose the reason code 'REFU' in order to identify the nature of that transfer.

In addition, the Originator's reference in the new SCT Inst transaction must be the reference relating to the original Recall request.

2.17.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

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

While the PSEMWG sympathises with the underlying rationale of the change request concerned, in the absence of a sound legal basis at EU level it cannot support it at this stage.

Specific provisions allowing Beneficiary PSPs to unilaterally do a (partial) transfer back of funds in case of Fraud should be included into an EU legislation first before business rules and related liabilities can be addressed through the SCT Inst scheme rulebook. The development of the EU Payment Services Regulation (PSR) can be an opportunity to obtain such legislative coverage.

2.17.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.18 # 20: Extra Reason Code 'Fraud' for Request For Recall by the Originator (RFRO)

2.18.1 Description

This change request was made by the Slovak banking association.

Under the Request for Recall by the Originator (RFRO) procedure, the contributor points out that there is no reason code foreseen for the RFRO message from the Originator PSP to the Beneficiary PSP to cover situations whereby the Originator was victim of a fraud. The reason code FRAD is now only possible for the Recall procedure that can be initiated only by the Originator PSP.

For the RFRO procedure, the contributor suggests adding to the existing reason codes "AC03" (Wrong IBAN), "AM09" (Wrong Amount) and "CUST" (Requested By Customer), a new type of reason code for cases when the customer claims to be a victim of a fraudulent transaction.

This new reason code will enable Beneficiary PSPs to ease the evaluation process and take all the necessary steps immediately.

2.18.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

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

It is correct that the Recall procedure can be initiated only by the Originator PSP. However, the Originator PSP may do it on behalf of the Originator for the reasons Duplicate sending, Technical problems, and Fraud (see section 4.3.2.2 of the SCT Inst scheme rulebook).

Secondly, the Originator PSP must first assess whether the fraud claim from the Originator is justified before the claim is addressed to the Beneficiary PSP.

When the Originator is a victim of a fraud, it must contact the Originator PSP to initiate a Recall request for the reason Fraud (as for the other two Recall reasons). The channels through which the Originator can escalate such fraud cases to the Originator PSP are part of the Customer-to-PSP space and lie outside the scope of the SCT Inst scheme rulebook.

2.18.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.19 # 21: Extension of Character Length for Name

2.19.1 Description

This change request was made by the Nordic Payments Council.

The contributor suggests extending the character length for the relevant 'Name' fields under the SCT Inst scheme, from 70 to 140 characters.

This proposed change does not impact the SCT Inst scheme rulebook itself, but only its related Customer-to-PSP and inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.19.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025**. This change request has the same goal as the change request item # 11 (see section 2.10 in this document).

2.19.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will only impact the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.20 # 26: Possibility of Payment Reversal in the Inter-PSP Space

2.20.1 Description

This change request was made by the company BIZUM.

The contributor points out that the SCT Inst scheme has some limitations in handling technical cancellations for initiated SCT Inst instructions.

It suggests the use of an existing inter-PSP ISO 20022 message already used under other SEPA payment schemes, to support a Reversal procedure for SCT Inst transactions. As an example, such message could be the pacs.007 used for Reversals in the inter-PSP space for the SDD schemes, but there could well be other suitable inter-PSP messages to support SCT Inst Reversals. Re-using e.g., the pacs.007 for the SCT Inst scheme would limit the implementation impact for PSPs.

An SCT Inst Reversal proposal should take place in a situation where one of the inter-PSP parties involved in an SCT Inst transaction identifies the status of a transaction as "ambiguous" and therefore decides to abort the SCT Inst transaction process. Such Reversal could be initiated by the Originator PSP or by the Beneficiary PSP.

Such SCT Inst Reversal would only be possible during the actual SCT Inst transfer flow, not subsequently, for instance, on the day after the transaction took place.

The reasons for using an SCT Inst Reversal would be for 'Duplication', 'Technical Error' and 'Ambiguous Transaction Status'.

2.20.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

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

The Beneficiary PSP already makes use of the SCT Inst Reject procedure to resolve one of three suggested SCT Inst Reversal reasons (i.e. Duplication).

The Originator PSP can already use of the SCT Inst Recall Request procedure to resolve two out of three suggested SCT Inst Reversal reasons (i.e. Duplication, Technical Error)

As for the third proposed Reversal reason 'Ambiguous Transaction Status', the PSEMWG fails to understand how such situation could occur. Only the Beneficiary PSP, or in absence of any confirmation message from the Beneficiary PSP within the set time-out deadline, the CSM of the Beneficiary PSP, will transmit either a positive or a negative confirmation message to the Originator PSP.

The PSEMWG sees this CR as a new and complex SCT Inst r-transaction procedure for a very limited number of use cases and for a very limited volume of occurrences.

2.20.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.21 # 27: Call for More Suitable Date and Time for Rulebook Version Change-Over (with no downtime)

2.21.1 Description

This change request was made by the company BIZUM.

The contributor suggests that a technical intervention or SCT Inst rulebook version update should always be planned on a time and a date of minimal foreseen SCT Inst transaction activity (e.g., 02:00h-06:00h CET) without a mandatory down-time period of 30 minutes.

Secondly, the contributor proposes to avoid planning a SCT Inst scheme rulebook version update close to a period of high payment traffic (e.g., weeks before Black Friday in November) or to an expected freeze period by PSPs or Payment infrastructures (e.g., Christmas).

2.21.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025**. This change request has the same goal as the change request item # 03 (see section 2.3 in this document).

However, all new versions of the EPC payment scheme rulebooks enter into force in the third full weekend of November of each year. This rule is applied since the launch of the SCT scheme back in 2008 and is in line with the annual SWIFT release calendar.

2.21.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the Customer-to-PSP and all inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.22 # 29: Precisions on Recalls and Status Requests on Recalls

2.22.1 Description

This change request was made by BPCE Group.

The contributor proposes some precisions to the initiation of Recalls, the initiation of any related Requests for Status Update and their respective handling under the 3 credit transfer scheme rulebooks, i.e. SCT, SCT Inst and OCT Inst.

Reading the relevant Recall sections in each rulebook concerned, one can understand that:

- Only one Recall can be sent for a given original transaction. It is neither mentioned that a second Recall may be sent for this given original transaction, nor specified what could be the timeline for sending such second Recall.

- Only a Request for Status Update on the Recall can be sent in the case no response would have been provided to the Recall, and not a second Recall.

- Given the fact that the response period is 15 Banking Business Days, it seems logical that it is only at the end of this period that such Status Update can be sent.

- A received negative response to a Recall, is it before the end of the response period, is meant to be definitive and not to trigger another Recall on the same given original transaction.

The practice shows that this understanding is not shared by all participants, and this leads in some cases to:

- A second Recall sent by the Originator/Payer's PSP on the same given original transaction before the end of the response period to the first one.

- A second Recall sent by the Originator/Payer's PSP on the same given original transaction instead of a Request for Status Update on the first Recall at the end of the response period.

- A second or even a third Recall and more sent by the Originator/Payer's PSP upon receipt of a first or even second negative response.

This leads to uncertainties in the entire Recall process and possibly to a lot of non-useful (i.e. costly and time consuming) exchange.

The contributor proposes some concrete rulebook amendments.

2.22.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025**.The suggested amendments make the Recall procedure clearer.

2.22.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact only the rulebook and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.23 # 31: New XML Message Type to Exchange Extra Info between PSPs

2.23.1 Description

This change request was made by the Slovak banking association.

The contributor points out that under the SCT Inst scheme, there is no XML message type used for situations when additional information between PSPs has to be exchanged, such as identification details of the client or any other information/details from a compliance request. Today, PSPs can only send a SWIFT format of such queries (MT19x, MT99x).

The aim of this request is to handle all SEPA messages and communication via the same SEPA channel. Therefore, the contributor suggests introducing a new type of XML message to the SCT Inst scheme rulebook to enable PSPs to exchange such type of information.

2.23.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**). The PSEMWG sees a very low volume for such information requests compared to the costs associated with it for each scheme participant and CSM to implement it.

2.23.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

2.24 # 32: Optional use of Unique End-to-end Transaction Reference (UETR)

2.24.1 Description

This change request was made by the TIPS-Consultative Group from the European Central Bank (ECB).

The contributor suggests **the option** for scheme participants to transmit the Unique End-to-end Transaction Reference (UETR) for an SCT Inst transaction. The UETR should become a yellow optional field.

Allowing UETR as a yellow field would considerably help communities as it would:

- Ease investigation & exceptions handling by providing a truly universally unique identifier;
- Strongly support the scheme participants while searching for the status of a particular transaction;
- Simplify back-end and operational processes.

2.24.2 PSEMWG analysis and recommendation

The PSEMWG recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**). The PSEMWG does not see how the UETR adds value for the SCT Inst scheme as SCT Inst transactions must be completed within 10 seconds as stipulated by the future Instant Payments Regulation (IPR) that amends the SEPA Regulation.

2.24.3 Rulebook impact

If this change request is supported, this will impact the rulebook, the Customer-to-PSP and the inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

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.

For this release management cycle, no such changes have been deemed required at this point in time.

4   Detailed Analysis of Minor Changes to the SCT Inst Scheme Rulebook

For this release management cycle, no minor changes have been raised at this point in time.

5   Principles Governing the Change Management Cycle

5.1   Change Request Public Consultation Document

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

5.2   Structure of the Change Request Public Consultation Document

Sections 2, 3 and 4 describe the changes to the SCT Inst scheme 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 scheme 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 scheme rulebook. These changes consist of minor changes to the SCT Inst scheme rulebook which are uncontroversial in nature and do not affect technical operations.

Annex 1 contains all received original change requests for the 2024 SCT Inst scheme 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 PSEMWG. 24 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 PSEMWG has determined: (a) that the change requests set out in section 2 and 3 meet the criteria for acceptance into the 2024 SCT Inst scheme 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 PSEMWG 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 PSEMWG 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   PSEMWG Recommendations

The PSEMWG 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 scheme 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 PSEMWG on the way forward. In case the contributors do not agree with the PSEMWG 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 PSEMWG 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 2024 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 PSEMWG will produce a Change Proposal Submission Document to the PSMB for decision-making purposes in accordance with section 4.2.5 of the Internal Rules, and to the EPC Stakeholder Fora (see section 4.4 of the Internal Rules) for their respective positions on the PSEMWG Change Proposals.

Approved change requests will be incorporated into the version 1.0 of the 2025 SCT Inst scheme rulebook and published in November 2024 with the intention that they become effective in November 2025.

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

The PSEMWG 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 PSMB

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

Annex 1 - Original Change Requests

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #02

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

Public

Approved

**Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023**

Name of contributor:	**Payment Scheme Evolution and Maintenance Working Group (PSEMWG)**
Organisation:	**EPC**
Address:	
Contact details:	
Your reference:	**#02-SCT schemes-EPC-Inclusion of Alias and Proxy Definitions in the SCT Rulebooks**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: **EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook** ~~EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook~~ ~~EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook~~ ~~EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook~~
Request Date:	**15 December 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

16 November 2025 – effectiveness date of the two 2025 SCT scheme rulebooks.

1.2. Description of the change request:

During the 2022 SCT and SCT Inst scheme rulebook change management cycle held in 2021 and 2022, the 2022 change request to include the Alias and Proxy as optional attributes in both SCT schemes had been accepted.

However, the concerned 2022 change request from the submitting stakeholder did not include concrete definitions for the terms 'Proxy' and 'Alias'. Consequently, such definitions had not been included in the 2023 SCT scheme rulebooks.

In the subsequent review and finalization of the Risk Management Annexes (RMAs) being an integral part of the two 2023 SCT scheme rulebooks, definitions for the two terms had been taken up in these RMAs. Inspiration was taken from the term definitions in the EPC SEPA Proxy Lookup (SPL) scheme. However, the distribution of the RMAs is restricted to only the SCT (Inst) scheme participants and scheme applicants.

Therefore, the suggestion is to insert the 'Proxy' and 'Alias' definitions from these RMAs in the SCT scheme rulebooks. In this way, also the other stakeholders have the same understanding about what is concretely meant with the terms 'Proxy' and 'Alias' in the SCT scheme rulebooks.

Proposed inclusion in Chapter 7 of the two SCT scheme rulebooks:

Alias	Is an alternative name used to retrieve the IBAN of a Payment Account from an Alias lookup application, system or scheme. In case of a person this would be any name different than the birth name. For a company there could be a difference between the legal and commercial name.
Proxy	Data used to retrieve the IBAN of a Payment Account from a Proxy lookup application, system or scheme. This could be e.g., the mobile phone number, an e-mail address of the Originator and/or of the Beneficiary.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

No. It is just the inclusion of term definitions. The rulebook attributes 'Proxy' and 'Alias' are already yellow-shaded optional message elements since the 2023 SCT scheme rulebooks.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

No. These definitions are already known to the SCT (Inst) scheme participants through the RMAs.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

No. These definitions are a clarification for these stakeholders. They will now have the same understanding as the SCT (Inst) scheme participants have about the terms 'Proxy' and 'Alias'.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

No impact. See also the answer to question 1 above.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

No impact.

6. The nature of the change request:

   a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

   Yes.

   b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

   No.

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	YES. It provides clarity to all SCT (Inst) scheme participants and stakeholders about what is concretely meant with 'Proxy' and 'Alias' under the SCT scheme rulebooks.
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	NO. Not necessary.
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	YES. It clarifies in a unique way what the terms 'Proxy' and 'Alias' stand for.
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	YES. It is just an inclusion of two definitions.
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	NO.
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	YES.

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**Payment Scheme Evolution and Maintenance Working Group (PSEMWG) and One-Leg Out Task Force (OLO TF)**
Organisation:	**EPC**
Address:	
Contact details:	
Your reference:	**#03-SCT Inst + OCT Inst-EPC-New Entry-Into-Force Time of the SCT Inst and OCT Inst Rulebooks as of Nov 2025**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: ~~EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook~~ **EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook** ~~EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook~~ ~~EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook~~ **EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook**
Request Date:	**15 December 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

16 November 2025 – effectiveness date of the 2025 SCT Inst and OCT Inst scheme rulebooks.

1.2. Description of the change request:

On 27 October 2022, the EPC published the version 1.1 of the 2023 SCT Inst scheme rulebook bearing the amended entry-into-force time of 03:30 CET on Sunday 19 November 2023 (instead of 08:00 CET communicated in the version 1.0 of the 2023 SCT Inst scheme rulebook).

On 24 October 2023, the EPC postponed the entry-into-force date and time of the 2023 SCT Inst scheme rulebook from Sunday 19 November 2023 03:30 CET to 17 March 2024 03:30 CET due to the EPC decision to postpone the ISO version migration for all four 2023 SEPA payment scheme rulebooks to 17 March 2024.

The EPC decision to let the 2023 SCT Inst scheme rulebook enter into force at 03:30 CET was to help all SCT Inst scheme participants and their SCT Inst service-supporting technical partner(s) to make a smooth change-over of their relevant SCT Inst systems, infrastructures and applications from the 2009 version to the 2019 version of the ISO 20022 standard on Sunday 19 November 2023 (now 17 March 2024).

This point in time was chosen as being the most suitable time at which the lowest possible volume of SCT Inst transactions is processed while taking into account the range of geographical time zones in which the SCT Inst scheme is used across SEPA.

With the obligation proposed by the EU legislators whereby EU-based PSPs that already offer credit transfers in euro should also offer their instant version within a defined period, more SCT Inst transactions may be processed at 08:00 CET on Sunday mornings in the future. Making updates to SCT Inst scheme-based systems, infrastructures and applications at a point in time of higher SCT Inst transaction volume processing increases the risk of such updates negatively impacting the smooth processing of these SCT Inst transactions.

As the OCT Inst scheme is also an instant payment scheme whereby it has many similarities with the SCT Inst scheme, the suggestion is that the entry-into-force time of the 2025 version and any future version of the SCT Inst and OCT Inst scheme rulebooks are set at 03:30 CET on the Sunday concerned. In practice, this means that the 2025 SCT Inst and OCT Inst scheme rulebooks go live on Sunday 16 November 2025 at 03:30 CET.

Note: no SEPA-wide downtime period will be scheduled for the change-over from the 2023 SCT Inst and OCT Inst scheme rulebooks to their respective 2025 rulebook versions.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

No. This change does not affect any technical or business rules.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

Yes. All SCT Inst and OCT Inst scheme participants will have to structurally amend their currently established preparation planning and timeline to implement business, technical and/or functional rule changes for their systems, infrastructures and applications used for SCT Inst scheme-based services.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

Yes. Some payment stakeholders (e.g., SCT Inst/OCT Inst service-supporting technical partners of SCT Inst/ OCT Inst scheme participants) and specific payment end-users (e.g., large corporates, merchants) may have to do similar actions as the SCT Inst/ OCT Inst scheme participants under point 2.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

No impact. See also the answer to question 1 above.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

No impact.

6. The nature of the change request:

   a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

      Yes.

   b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

      No.

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	YES. It provides clarity to all scheme participants and stakeholders about the precise point in time when business, technical and/or functional rule changes for the SCT Inst and OCT Inst schemes enter into force where the risk of a possible negative impact for many SCT Inst and OCT Inst payment end users and transactions is avoided.
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	NO. Not necessary.
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	YES. To have each time a rulebook version change-over at a moment with the lowest possible volume of SCT Inst and OCT Inst transactions taking place.
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	YES. On 17 March 2024 at 03:30 CET, all SCT Inst scheme participants will have already accomplished a change-over from the 2021 version to the 2023 version of the SCT Inst scheme rulebook.
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	NO.
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	YES.

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

CR #06

European Payments Council

**Responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023**

Name of contributor:	**Payment Scheme Evolution and Maintenance Working Group (PSEMWG) and One-Leg Out Task Force (OLO TF)**
Organisation:	**EPC**
Address:	
Contact details:	
Your reference:	**#06 -All schemes-EPC-Introduction of Hybrid Address of the Payment End-User**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: **EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook** **EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook** **EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook**
Request Date:	**15 December 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

16 November 2025 – effectiveness date of all <u>five</u> 2025 EPC payment scheme rulebooks.

1.2. Description of the change request:

Past EPC decision

The March 2022 EPC Scheme Management Board (SMB) meeting approved the 2022 change request item #06 to exclusively use the structured address of the customer as of November 2025. This change would affect all four SEPA payment scheme rulebooks.

As of 19 November 2023[1], customers would be allowed to send in a structured way their own address and/or the address of their payment counterparty in electronic Customer-to-PSP files at least when based on the corresponding EPC payment scheme Customer-to-PSP IGs.

As of 16 November 2025, the use of the structured address would become mandatory for payment service users when they would send electronic Customer-to-PSP files at least when based on the corresponding EPC payment scheme Customer-to-PSP IGs. From that date, the use of an unstructured address would no longer be allowed and would hence lead to rejects.

One element the EPC took into account for its decision was that with the exclusive use of structured addresses as of November 2025, the SEPA payment schemes would be aligned with the deadline set for the use of the structured address under the Cross-border Payments and Reporting Plus (CBPR+) and High Value Payments Plus (HVPS+) usage guidelines. These specifications define how ISO 20022 should be used for such payment messages on the SWIFT network. The SWIFT community decided to move from SWIFT MT messages to ISO 20022 standard-based XML messages by November 2025.

Developments within SWIFT

The December 2023 SWIFT Board meeting decided to adapt its address specifications for the SWIFT Standard Release 2025. SWIFT decided to

- Step back from its initial decision to allow only structured addresses as of November 2025;

- introduce a hybrid address version by November 2025 alongside a structured address version with the hybrid address version having no expiration date; and

- Allow the unstructured address version until November 2026 (22 November 2026).

The hybrid address concerns a mix of structured and unstructured address details. It allows the combination of structured ISO 20022 address elements **and** up to <u>two</u> lines of 70 characters of unstructured "Address Line" <AdrLine>. Elements available in structured format must be mapped into the respective structured elements. The structured elements for "Country" <Ctry> and for "Town Name" <TwnNm> will become mandatory. Structured elements cannot be repeated in the <AdrLine> elements.

The following two diagrams from the SWIFT advisory group Payments Market Practice Group (PMPG) give further details about the upcoming changes in the period November 2025 – November 2026 and the period beyond November 2026.

---

[1] This date was later postponed to 17 March 2024 due to the EPC decision on 24 October 2023 to postpone the ISO version migration for all four 2023 SEPA payment scheme rulebooks to 17 March 2024.

November 2025 – November 2026

November 2026 Onwards

Re-consideration of earlier EPC decision

The EPC Payment Scheme Management Board (PSMB) re-considered the EPC decision taken back in March 2022. It is now in favour of the introduction of the hybrid address alongside the structured and the unstructured addresses in all five EPC payment schemes having in mind the following elements:

- A migration from unstructured addresses directly to fully structured addresses is a true challenge for payment end users and PSPs, especially given the current deadline of November 2025 for SEPA transactions. The time needed to change the addresses in all customer databases or to move to databases capable of supporting structured addresses, would be long.

- For customers making SEPA, high value and international payment transactions, an alignment of the address structure between the three groups of payment instruments would be the best.

- To align the address specifications under the current 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer (OCT Inst) rulebook (which currently stipulate the exclusive use of structured addresses as of November 2025) with those of the SWIFT Standard Release 2025 for CBPR+ and HVPS+.

- Only the structured address fields 'Town' and 'Country' are needed for regulatory screening.

Suggestion to the EPC payment scheme rulebooks

1. Since the 2023 EPC payment scheme rulebooks, payment end users and EPC payment scheme participants are already allowed to provide <u>fully structured</u> addresses in their respective electronic Customer-to-PSP files and inter-PSP EPC payment messages and r-transactions.

    The provision of fully structured addresses remains supported under the 2025 EPC payment scheme rulebooks as well.

    This means that all scheme participants must continue to support the delivery of structured addresses when payment end users and scheme participants want a structured address in their outgoing and incoming EPC payment transactions. Scheme participants cannot reject EPC payment transactions only due to the inclusion of a structured address.

2. As of the entry-into-force date of the 2025 EPC payment scheme rulebooks being 16 November 2025, payment end users are allowed to send a **hybrid** address of the payer and/or of the payee in electronic Customer-to-PSP files at least based on the relevant EPC Customer-to-PSP Implementation Guidelines for SCT, SCT Inst, OCT Inst, SDD Core and SDD B2B transactions**.**

    From that same date, also EPC payment scheme participants are allowed to provide hybrid addresses in their inter-PSP EPC payment messages and r-transactions.

    As of 16 November 2025, all scheme participants must also be able to support the delivery of hybrid addresses when payment end users and scheme participants want a hybrid address in their outgoing and incoming EPC payment transactions. From this date, scheme participants cannot reject EPC payment transactions only due to the inclusion of a hybrid address.

3. As of the entry-into-force date of the 2025 EPC payment scheme rulebooks being 16 November 2025 up to 22 November 2026, payment end users and EPC payment scheme participants are allowed to continue providing <u>unstructured</u> addresses in their respective electronic Customer-to-PSP files and inter-PSP EPC payment messages and r-transactions.

    In the period November 2025 – November 2026, all scheme participants must continue to support the delivery of unstructured addresses when payment end users and scheme participants want an unstructured address in their outgoing and incoming EPC payment transactions. Scheme participants cannot reject EPC payment transactions only due to the inclusion of an unstructured address.

    As of 22 November 2026, the use of an **unstructured** address will **no longer be allowed and will hence lead to rejects**. Only hybrid and structured addresses will be allowed from that date onwards.

The EPC nevertheless recommends that EPC scheme participants and their customers to use the time up to November 2026 in which unstructured addresses can still be submitted (compared to initially November 2025), as an opportunity to start right away with the switch from unstructured addresses directly to fully structured addresses.

The use of structured addresses in EPC payment transactions, gives the potential to reduce errors in payment processing, regulatory screening, and reconciliation, thereby increasing the straight-through-processing of EPC payment transactions.

During the transition period up to November 2026 in which payment end users and scheme participants can start to move to the use of hybrid or preferably structured addresses, the current input of addresses with 2 occurrences of the unstructured address element "Address Line" associated with the structured address element "Country" will continue to be accepted.

Subject to the outcome of the public consultation on this change request and the final decision to be taken by the PSMB, the EPC will update the EPC document 'Guidance on the use of structured addresses under the SEPA payment schemes as of November 2025' (EPC 153-22) accordingly.

The provision of **hybrid** addresses in EPC payment transactions is based on the ISO 20022 "Postal Address" and must comply with following requirements:

- Mandatory use of the structured data elements "Country" and "Town Name";
- Up to two lines of the unstructured data element "Address Line" are allowed;
- Other structured address elements must be mapped into the respective other 12 structured data elements;
- Structured data elements cannot be repeated in the "Address Line" elements.

The provision of **structured** addresses in EPC payment transactions is also based on the ISO 20022 "Postal Address" and must comply with following requirements:

- Data element "Address Line" **must not be used**
- Data elements "Country" and "Town Name" **must be used**
- All other 12 data elements may be used depending on the components of the address.

Guidance for the provision of the ISO 20022 "Postal Address" based on the community practices is provided by the PMPG (SWIFT Payment Market Practice Group) that maintains a "SWIFT ISO20022 Structure Postal Address" to be found on its website.

Proposed changes to the 2025 EPC payment scheme rulebooks:

Important: amended specifications to the provision of the address of the Payer and of the Payee will also be reflected in the mandatory 2025 Customer-to-PSP and Inter-PSP Implementation Guidelines of each concerned EPC payment scheme rulebook.

A. SCT rulebook

4.6 Business Requirements for Attributes

Identification:	AT-P005
Name:	The address of the Originator
Description:	The information should reflect the address of the account holder being debited. Applies for DS-02: This attribute is only mandatory when the Originator PSP or the Beneficiary PSP is located in a non-EEA SEPA country or territory. This attribute

Identification:	AT-P005
Name:	**The address of the Originator**
	can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **Error! Reference source not found.**. *Important: as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.*

Identification:	AT-E004
Name:	**The address of the Beneficiary**
Description:	The address of the Beneficiary as supplied by the Originator. This attribute can be provided in a an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **Error! Reference source not found.**. *Important: as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.*

B. SCT Inst rulebook

4.6 Business Requirements for Attributes

Identification:	AT-P005
Name:	**The address of the Originator**
Description:	The information should reflect the address of the Payment Account holder being debited. Applies for DS-02: This attribute is only mandatory when the Originator PSP or the Beneficiary PSP is located in a non-EEA SEPA country or territory. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **Error! Reference source not found.**. *Important: as of 22 November 2026 at XXHXX CET, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.*

Identification:	AT-E004
Name:	**The address of the Beneficiary**
Description:	The address of the Beneficiary as supplied by the Originator. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **Error! Reference source not found.**. *Important: as of 22 November 2026 at XXHXX CET, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.*

C. SDD Core rulebook and Annex VII

4.8.6 AT-E004 – The Address of the Creditor

Description:	The address of the Creditor as forwarded to the Debtor. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **Error! Reference source not found.**. **Important: *as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed*. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.**

4.8.10 AT-P005 - The Address of the Debtor

Description:	The address of the Debtor as registered by the Creditor. Only mandatory when the Creditor PSP or the Debtor PSP is located in a non-EEA SEPA country or territory. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **Error! Reference source not found.**. **Important: *as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed*. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.**

In the Annex VII of the SDD Core rulebook, the description of the attributes AT-E004 and AT-P005 will include these amendments as well.

D. SDD B2B rulebook

4.8.8.6 AT-E004 – The Address of the Creditor

Description:	The address of the Creditor as forwarded to the Debtor. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **Error! Reference source not found.**. *Important: as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.*

4.8.10 AT-P005 - The Address of the Debtor

Description:	The address of the Debtor as registered by the Creditor. Only mandatory when the Creditor PSP or the Debtor PSP is located in a non-EEA SEPA country or territory. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **Error! Reference source not found.**. *Important: as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.*

In the Annex VII of the SDD B2B rulebook, the description of the attributes AT-E004 and AT-P005 will include these amendments as well.

E. OCT Inst rulebook

Identification:	AT-P005
Name:	The address of the Payer
Description:	The information should reflect the address of the account holder being debited. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section 0.5.1. *Important: as of 22 November 2026 at XXHXX CET, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed.* From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be permitted.

Identification:	AT-P008
Name:	The address of the Payer Reference Party
Description:	The information should reflect the address of a person or entity in relation to whom a Payer makes a payment. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **0.5.1**. *Important: as of 22 November 2026 at XXHXX CET, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed.* From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be permitted.

Identification:	AT-E004
Name:	The address of the Payee
Description:	The address of the Payee as supplied by the Payer. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **0.5.1**. *Important: as of 22 November 2026 at XXHXX CET, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed.* From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be permitted.

Identification:	AT-E009
Name:	The address of the Payee Reference Party
Description:	The information should reflect the address of a person or entity in relation to whom a Payee receives a payment. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **0.5.1**. *Important: as of 22 November 2026 at XXHXX CET, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed.* From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be permitted.

Identification:	AT-D006
Name:	**The address of the non-Euro Leg Payer's FI**
Description:	The information should reflect the address of the non-Euro Leg Payer's FI. When AT-D005 is provided, then AT-D006 must be provided. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **0.5.1**. *Important: as of 22 November 2026 at XXHXX CET, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed.* **From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be permitted.**

Identification:	AT-C006
Name:	**The address of the non-Euro Leg Payee's FI**
Description:	The information should reflect the address of the non-Euro Leg Payee's FI. When AT-C005 is provided, then AT-C006 must be provided. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **0.5.1**. *Important: as of 22 November 2026 at XXHXX CET, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed.* **From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be permitted.**

Identification:	AT-X005
Name:	**The address of the Intermediary FI(s) of the non-Euro Leg Payer's FI**
Description:	The information should reflect the address of the Intermediary FI(s) of the non-Euro Leg Payer's FI. When AT-X004 is provided, then AT-X005 must be provided. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section **0.5.1**. *Important: as of 22 November 2026 at XXHXX CET, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed.* **From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be permitted.**

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

Yes. This change will impact all EPC payment scheme participants and payment end-users.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

Yes. Such change requires analyses of and implementation preparations for multiple EPC payment and non-payment related applications and databases at the EPC payment scheme participants.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

Yes. Such change requires analyses of and implementation preparations for multiple EPC payment and non-payment related applications and databases at the (corporate) payment end-users.

In their payment files, they will have to provide their EPC payment scheme participants with at least hybrid or structured addresses about payers and payees.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

Yes.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

No impact.

6. The nature of the change request:

   a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

   Yes.

   b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

   No.

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	YES. It aligns the specifications of an address about the payer and the payee in EPC payment transactions with the CBPR+ and HVPS+ transactions. The same address formats will be used for EPC payment, CBPR+ and HVPS+ transactions.
Is the change request underpinned by a cost-benefit analysis?	NO. But it is in line with international standardization efforts to structure ordering customer data in payments.
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	YES. The use of at least hybrid addresses in EPC payment transactions can further reduce errors in payment processing, regulatory screening, and reconciliation. This should increase the straight-through-processing of EPC payment transactions.
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	YES. EPC payment scheme participants and (corporate) end-users already using SWIFT MT messages must move to the delivery of at least hybrid addresses for international payments by November 2026 at the latest. The implementation period of up to November 2026 should give payment end-users sufficient time to determine the resources needed to accomplish this change.
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	NO.
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	YES.

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #07

Public

Approved

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**TIPS-Consultative Group**
Organisation:	**European Central Bank**
Address:	**Sonnemannstraße 20, 60314 Frankfurt am Main**
Contact details:	**Fabrizio Dinacci, Fabrizio.Dinacci@ecb.europa.eu, +491721582041**
	Géraldine Orcel, Geraldine.Orcel@ecb.europa.eu, +49 1751829014
Your reference:	
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:
	~~EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook~~
	<mark>EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook</mark>
	~~EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook~~
	~~EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook~~
	~~EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook~~
Request Date:	**9 October 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

At the earliest possible point in time

1.2. Description of the change request:

<u>Situation, Issue and proposed mitigation solution:</u>

Members of the TIPS-Consultative Group (a group of the TIPS governance including PSPs and ACHS – see list of members at the end of the document) have raised a point regarding the Acceptance Date Time Timestamp. The whole group approved the submission of the present change request to the EPC as the appropriate way to solve the identified issue.

The issue lies in the existing usage rules in the SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Scheme Inter-PSP Implementation Guidelines (IGs) regarding the format of the Acceptance Date Time Timestamp, and more specifically the use or not of milliseconds.

The EPC follows ISO 20022 standard for messages and field datatypes. In particular, the IGs refers to the "ISODateTime" datatype for the Acceptance Date Time field. According to the ISO Documentation, the ISODateTime datatype is in line with the "XML Schema Part 2: Datatypes Second Edition - W3C Recommendation 28 October 2004", which is aligned with the ISO 8601 standard.

The "ISODateTime" datatype allows the use of decimal fractions of seconds. In this context, ISO 8601 standard, to which the datatype conforms, states that decimal fractions of seconds may be included in the timestamp (with a variable number of decimal digits allowed, depending on the agreement reached within the community concerned). However, in the description of attribute AT-T056 'Timestamp of the SCT Inst Transaction' in the SCT Inst rulebook it is stated that "The Timestamp must be unambiguous and **<u>at least include seconds</u>**". This is also reflected in the IGs, in which the SEPA Usage Rule states that "*The Timestamp must be unambiguous and at least include seconds. Only UTC time format or local time with UTC offset format can be used.*"

Consequently, for the same payment, the Acceptance Date Time Timestamp format can be handled differently by the different actors involved with regards to milliseconds.

The main issue is the possibility for counterparties to answer to a pacs.008 featuring different timestamps (in terms of decimal digits for the millisecond representation), but all equally in line with the SEPA Usage Rule (which requires at least seconds and does not provide any constraints/regulations regarding milliseconds). As a matter of fact, this leads to reconciliation issues for the Originator PSP.

To overcome this issue, it is proposed to amend the IGs to specify the number of digits allowed to represent milliseconds timestamping the Acceptance Date Time Timestamp. Consequently, it should be specified at scheme level one fixed format of the ISO-Date Time to be used for the Acceptance Date Time in every SCT Inst message, either YYYY-MM-DDThh:mm:ss.mmmZ or

alternatively YYYY-MM-DDThh:mm:ss.mmm+hh:mm. This would allow PSPs to rely on a unified rule to track and reconcile their Instant Payments, removing de facto reconciliation issues for PSPs.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

Yes, impact on the SCT Inst Rulebook and on the EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

Yes.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

Uncertain.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

Yes, impact on the format of the field Acceptance Date Time Timestamp used in SCT Inst.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

Uncertain.

6. The nature of the change request:

    a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

    b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	**Yes**
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	**No**
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	**Yes (harmonisation of rules /pan-European rules)**
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	**Yes**
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	**Yes**
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	**Yes**

3. Annex:

Institutions composing the TIPS-Consultative Group   (Commercial banks, Automated Clearing Houses, Network Service Providers and National Central Banks)
European Central Bank
4CB
Banca d'Italia
Banco de España
Banco de Portugal
Bank of Greece
Banka Slovenije
Banque Centrale du Luxembourg
Banque de France
Banque Nationale de Belgique
De Nederlandsche Bank
Deutsche Bundesbank
Latvijas Banka
Lietuvos bankas
Národná banka Slovenska
Oesterreichische Nationalbank
Sveriges Riksbank
Bank of Finland
Central Bankof Croatia (HNB)
Danmarks Nationalbank
SWIFT
NEXI-Colt

BPCE
Deutsche Bank
Commerzbank
Banque Internationale à Luxembourg SA
ABN AMRO Bank
Rabobank
Poste Italiane S.p.A
Intesa Sanpaolo
Slovenska sporitelna
Tatra Banka
EBA CLEARING
DIAS

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #09

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

Public

Approved

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**Maria Brogren**
Organisation:	**Nordic Payments Council**
Address:	**Box 7603, 103 94 Stockholm, Sweden**
Contact details:	**info@npcouncil.org**
Your reference:	**N/A**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: **EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook (To be confirmed)**
Request Date:	
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

To be included in 2025 version of SCT and SCT Inst Schemes.

1.2. Description of the change request:

The suggestion is to introduce a pacs.009 message that can replace the pacs.008 used for inter-PSP transactions such as fees and interest compensation. A pacs.009 could potentially be used for other Inter-PSP transactions (not only fees and interest compensations).

In the 2023 version of SCT Scheme a new pacs.008 was introduced with the purpose to handle transactions for fees and interest compensation between PSPs, DS-11. This dataset is used between PSPs but is based on a Customer Credit Transfer (pacs.008) and not a Financial Credit Transfer (pacs.009).

The use of an adjusted Customer Credit Transfers (pacs.008) such as DS-11 provides is not fully aligned with the intentions of the ISO standard. To settle pure inter-PSP transactions in the correct way according to ISO would be to use a pacs.009.

ISO definition of a Customer Credit Transfers (pacs.008):

The FinancialInstitutionToFinancialInstitutionCustomerCreditTransfer message is sent by the debtor agent to the creditor agent, directly or through other agents and/or a payment clearing and settlement system. It is used to move funds from a debtor account to a creditor.

ISO definition of a Financial Credit Transfer (pacs.009):

The FinancialInstitutionCreditTransfer message is sent by a debtor financial institution to a creditor financial institution, directly or through other agents and/or a payment clearing and settlement system. It is used to move funds from a debtor account to a creditor, where both debtor and creditor are financial institutions.

We see that this suggestion is in line with [1]CPMI recommendations:

---

[1] Committee on Payments and Market Infrastructures Consultative report on ISO 20022 harmonisation requirements for enhancing cross-border payments, March 2023 (BIS)

Requirements Block A – Fundamentals

2.5.1   Requirement #1 – To use the appropriate message for a particular business function

Background and rationale

While ISO 20022 has defined the scope and business function for each message, there is some risk of inconsistent use of messages or deviation from the actual scope defined for that message. This can undermine processing efficiency. For example, instead of implementing the ISO 20022 message for return payments (ie the pacs.004), certain markets choose to use a regular credit transfer message (eg pacs.008 or pacs.009) with customised, proprietary codes to identify this "new" payment as a return payment. This inconsistent use requires financial institutions participating in different markets and/or across multiple solutions to perform the same business function in different ways. This is done by using customised, rather than standardised, message implementations to identify the actual message function of a message, as opposed to the one expected per the message scope.

Proposed solution

The CPMI proposes to require use of ISO 20022 messages identified as part of the core set for cross-border payments in line with their scope as defined by the ISO 20022 standard.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1.   Impact on the Scheme in general:

Introduce a pacs.009 means that a new payment message must be implemented. This will affect the Rulebooks including process descriptions and rules around the message even though the purpose will still be the same as the DS-11 pacs.008 message (to start with, a possible extensional use for other purpose than fees/interest compensation could be a next step). It would also affect Scheme participants and further on even the CSM delivering the payment processing for the Scheme participants.

2.   Impact on the inter-PSP space:

DS-11 in SCT Scheme will change from a pacs.008 to a pacs.009 message and Scheme participants need to develop this functionality.

3.   Impact on other payment stakeholders:

N/A - This message is only between PSPs, but it will have an impact on CSMs.

4.   Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

DS-11 in SCT Scheme will change from a pacs.008 to a pacs.009 message and Scheme participants need to develop this functionality.

5.   Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

N/A

6.   The nature of the change request:

a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a completely new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

A - Change

b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	**Yes**
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	**No**
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	**Yes**
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	**Yes**
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	**Yes**
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	**Yes**

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #10

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

Public

Approved

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023

Name of contributors:	**Banque de France – Groupe BPCE – Crédit Agricole – Caisse des Dépôts et Consignations – La Banque Postale – Société Générale**
Organisation:	
Address:	
Contact details:	**Philippe Evenot – Geraldine Debost**
Your reference:	**Creation of an R-transaction : possibility for a beneficiary to return a SCT or SCT INST after the amount is credited**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook
Request Date:	
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

23 November 2025

1.2. Description of the change request:

The present change request aims to create an R-transaction "return by order of the beneficiary" which will substitute to the current R-transaction "refusal by order of the beneficiary" regarding the SCT Scheme, and will apply simultaneously to the SCT INST scheme. The beneficiaries confronted with SCT/SCT INST they do not recognise will then have a dedicated R-transaction code to return them.

Extract Guidance On Reason Codes For SCT R-transactions (EPC135-18 v4.0)

Code	Iso def	Reasons in the Rulebook or IGs	Type of R-transaction	Exhaustive list of use-cases	Possible root cause	Suggested action
MS02	Not specified reason customer generated	By order of the beneficiary	Return	Refusal by beneficiary at presentation of the SCT transaction to the beneficiary bank	The beneficiary bank acts on behalf of the beneficiary following an instruction from the beneficiary for not accepting funds from a specific account, originator or via a specific payment scheme	Originator to contact the beneficiary directly how the originator should settle any financial obligation towards the beneficiary.

Our comprehension of the reason code "refusal by order of the beneficiary" as it is set out in the EPC guidance on reason code for SCT seems rather limitative. We understand that beneficiaries must instruct their PSP **before** they receive the unwanted SCT to return it. To do so, the customers will communicate to their PSPs information such as IBAN of the Originator or Originator name (information which might have been registered on a blacklist).

This implies that customers will be able to anticipate the reception of an unwanted SCT (scenario only feasible in case of recurrent SCT). Hence the situation whereby the beneficiaries identify on their account statements a credit transfer they don't recognise doesn't seem to be considered.

This limitation is corroborated by the paragraph 4.3.2.2 which states functional principals related to the management of a SCT return :

- " A 'Return' occurs when a SEPA Credit Transfer is diverted from normal execution after inter-PSP Settlement, and is sent by the Beneficiary PSP to the Originator PSP for a SEPA Credit Transfer that cannot be executed for valid reasons such as wrong account number or account closed with the consequence **that the Beneficiary account cannot be credited on the basis of the information contained in the original SEPA Credit Transfer message**. The return procedure must not be used in cases where the beneficiary wishes to return the funds. Instead the procedure of initiating a new SEPA Credit Transfer applies".

- (…/…) Return' messages initiated by the Beneficiary PSP must be transmitted to the Originator PSP within three Banking Business Days after Settlement Date.

- Consequences of this statement are:

  o A Return is not authorised once a SCT has been credited on the beneficiary account.
  o A Return is only possible within three banking business day after settlement date

Regarding the AT-R004 reason for a Return by the Beneficiary PSP "By order of the Beneficiary", this limitation doesn't seem accurate as most of time the customers will contest the transaction on the basis of their account statement (i.e., after funds have been credited).

  o As an alternative way to the return, beneficiaries will be obliged to initiate a new Credit Transfer to the originator of the initial transaction. It is to be noted that in country such as France whereby the IBAN of the originator is never transmitted to the beneficiary (data being considered as sensitive) the transfer-back procedure must be activated otherwise a credit transfer in the other way around will not be possible.

  o Even with the assumption that the transfer-back is widely used (which is not the case in France), this procedure does not seem completely meet with the use-case "refusal by order of the beneficiary". For an end-user, the transfer-back is meant to be used as a way of reimbursement without contesting the legitimacy of the initial transaction. We believe that beneficiaries which don't acknowledge a credit transfer credited received from a given counterpart could have the possibility to mark their disagreement by **reversing the initial transaction with a dedicated R-transaction reason code.**

- Examples of use-case in which the use of the return SCT R-transaction "return by order of the beneficiary" might apply:
  o The beneficiaries have already been credited by some other means and they can't accept the funds related to the received SCT, particularly if the amount is substantive (e.g., specific transaction such as the selling business assets). In this situation the beneficiaries should be in position of refusing directly the transaction by notifying its PSP the sending of a return "by order of the beneficiary". In this specific situation the return by order of the beneficiary" might be considered as an alternative to RFRO.

- o Consecutively to an error made by originators during the instruction phase (wrong IBAN of the beneficiary) beneficiaries receive SCT they do not recognize. Even though possibility is given to originators to request the fund by the sending of RFRO, the beneficiaries should also have the possibility to signify their disagreement by the sending of a return. The rationales behind that is that beneficiaries are not always able to identify the originators and to instruct them the sending of a RFRO.
- o A corporate (utility for instance) received an SCT but failed to reconciliate it and is unable to identify the originator as a customer. For accounting clarification, it should have the possibility to return the transaction.
- o The reception of an unwanted received SCT can sometimes be linked to laundering attack targeting beneficiaries themselves (the latter being asked to resend the amount received by SCT or other mean of payment). In case of doubt, the best way to exonerate beneficiaries in this situation is to allow them to clearly signify their disagreement by giving them the possibility to send a return. A transfer back will not be protective as it is another transaction fully separated of the contested received one.
- o For laundering reasons, some regulated professions (e.g., lawyers) cannot freely accept some payments which are not legally justified from the beneficiary point of view and should have the possibility to expressly refuse them.

- In all the cases above, a clear and unambiguous link with the initial transaction is necessary and therefore the return is the right instrument. Those use-cases are as relevant for SCT than for SCT INST.

Consequently, we suggest for the reason code "return by order of the beneficiary" (new appellation for "refusal by order of the beneficiary") to open the possibility to return an R-transaction **after** the fund have been credited on the beneficiary account. In this specific case the 3 days period will be far too short. We propose an extension of this timeline **not defined at the present time** but which might extend from an eight weeks period (which will allow natural persons receiving their statement account once a month to react and express their request for a return) to 13 months (in accordance with the PSD2 timeframe to reimburse a not authorised transaction). This new timeline will apply to the only reason code "return by order of the beneficiary" (three days' timeline remaining for the other return reason codes related to SCT scheme).

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:
   - Regarding SCT:
     - o Change of a functional rule: a return will become possible after funds having been credited on the account of the beneficiary.
     - o Creation of a new timeline for return with reason code "return by order of the beneficiary".
   - Regarding SCT INST:
     - o Functional change as return consequent to an initial transaction will be allowed.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

   - If we consider CSM cannot distinguish R-transactions related to their reason codes, all R-transactions will become technically "passing" after the settlement date and during the agreed timeframe. Communication towards CSM especially when they check the timeline of R-transaction will be necessary.
   - In between the reception of the initial SCT and the sending of the return it might happen that the originator account is closed. Such situation might cause issue for the originator PSP (similar to the one exiting in SDD Core scheme) and will probably require an update of SCT RMA.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

   - PSPs might adapt their acquisition channel (bank online, digital app) to give their customers the possibility to return a SCT/SCT INST transaction after the beneficiary account has been credited and for the agreed period.
   - For customers in position of beneficiaries receiving an SCT/SCT INST they do not acknowledge it will constitute an improvement in comparison to the current situation by giving them the possibility to mark their refusal.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

None identified at this stage.

6. The nature of the change request:

   a. **A change** (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

   b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	**Yes if we consider it provides a new service to end-user.**
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	**Not at this stage**
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	**Yes as it contributes to the improvement of the scheme, and is more protective for a beneficiary receiving a SCT without being the legitimate recipient.**
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	**On the technical point of view, no major difficulties have been identified at this stage.**
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	**No issue identified so far.**
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	**Yes.**

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #11

Public

Approved

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**Payment Scheme Evolution and Maintenance Working Group (PSEMWG) and One-Leg Out Task Force (OLO TF)**
Organisation:	**EPC**
Address:	
Contact details:	
Your reference:	**#11-All schemes-EPC-Extension of Character Length for Name**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: **EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook** **EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook** **EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook**
Request Date:	**15 December 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

16 November 2025 – effectiveness date of all five EPC payment scheme rulebooks.

1.2. Description of the change request:

In the Customer-to-PSP and Inter-PSP Implementation Guidelines (IGs) for each of the five EPC payment scheme rulebooks, the SEPA length of characters is currently set at 70 characters for the name fields for the following attributes:

- Originator (AT-P001), Originator Reference Party (AT-P006), Beneficiary (AT-E001) and Beneficiary Reference Party (AT-E007) for the SCT and SCT Inst rulebooks;
- Creditor (AT-E001), Creditor Reference Party (AT-E007), Debtor (AT-P001) and Debtor Reference Party (AT-P006) for the SDD Core and SDD B2B rulebooks;
- Payer (AT-P001), Payer Reference Party (AT-P006), Payee (AT-E001), Payee Reference Party (AT-E007), non-Euro Leg Payer's FI (AT-D005), non-Euro Leg Payee's FI (AT-C005), Intermediary FI(s) of the non-Euro Leg Payer's FI (AT-X004) for the OCT Inst rulebook.

The current limit of 70 characters for the name fields dates to the early development of the message specifications for the SCT rulebook in the 2000s. Initially, the 2006 message version of the ISO 20022 standard was used for these specifications. The 2006 message version had a limit of 70 characters for the name fields. When the first operational SCT scheme version was launched in 2008, it was based on the 2006 message version.

From the version 4.0 of the SEPA payment schemes entering into force in November 2010, they were based on the 2009 message version of the ISO 20022 standard which then already supported 140 characters for the name field. As there was no request from European communities to extend the name length for SEPA transactions, the limit of 70 characters was maintained and taken over as such for the SDD, SCT Inst and OCT Inst schemes.

The suggestion is to extend the number of characters of the name fields **for all upper-mentioned attributes** from 70 to 140 characters as:

- The 2019 ISO 20022 standard foresees up to 140 characters for the 'Debtor', 'Ultimate Debtor', 'Creditor', 'Ultimate Creditor' and 'Financial Institution' name fields.
- The Cross-border Payments and Reporting Plus (CBPR+) specifications also allow 140 characters for these name fields. This allows all EPC payment schemes, and the OCT Inst scheme in particular, to be aligned with these international specifications.
- The provision of extra characters allows payment service users to enter the complete name(s) concerned. This avoids the issue of data truncation and can provide the payment service user with further transparency about the identity of the payment counterparty and/or its reference parties and the financial institution(s) involved (the latter only for the OCT Inst scheme).
- The possibility to provide the complete name(s) can support the obligations for PSPs with respect to regulatory screening and up-front verification of payment counterparty names (such as Confirmation of Payee).

This proposed change does not impact the EPC payment scheme rulebooks themselves, but only their related Customer-to-PSP and inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

Important: if the 2024 change request item #11 on the inclusion of the commercial trade name would be supported, the maximum length of the commercial trade name could become 140 characters as well (depending on the final message element selected to transport the commercial trade name).

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

No. It does not impact the business rules of each scheme concerned as such.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

Yes. it has major implications in the various systems supporting the acceptance, the processing and storage of EPC payment scheme transactions and related data.

PSPs must increase the character capacity for the various name fields in their payment initiation channels, their internal EPC payment transaction processing systems, and in their account statement and payment transaction archiving systems.

The transaction message exchange systems with other PSPs and with other inter-PSP space actors (e.g., CSMs) will have to be adapted as well to accept and to support the transmission of longer name data.

With respect to the OCT Inst scheme in particular: when (to be) provided, the legal entity name(s) of the non-Euro Leg FI(s) involved in the entire international payment chain can be delivered in full which facilitates further regulatory screening.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

Yes. They will have the opportunity to send and/or receive the full first name(s) and surname(s) or the full legal entity name of themselves, their payment counterparties, and/or of their reference parties. The truncation of long names or of name combinations (e.g., account held by multiple natural persons) can be avoided at all or strongly reduced. This gives the payment service user more transparency about the identity of its payment counterparty and/or of its reference party.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

No impact. The 2019 version of the ISO 20022 standard already supports the transmission of up to 140 characters for the name field. The maximum SEPA length for the name field must be set from 70 to 140 characters.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

No impact.

6. The nature of the change request:

a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

    Yes.

b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

    No.

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	YES. It can provide the payment service user with further transparency about the identity of itself, the payment counterparty and/or their respective reference parties.
	For the OCT Inst scheme, it is also an alignment with the specifications set for a name field under the CBPR+ usage guidelines.
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	NO.
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	YES. Providing the payment end-user with more transparency is part of the work plan of the Euro Retail Payments Board (ERPB).
	For the OCT Inst scheme, it also provides Euro Leg PSPs with the full or a more elaborate name about the non-Euro Leg FIs involved in the non-Euro Leg.
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	YES. The maximum SEPA length for the name field must be set from 70 to 140 characters.
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	NO. It only concerns extending the data capacity of a specific message element for EPC payment scheme transactions.
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	YES.

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European
Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #12

Public

Approved

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**Payment Scheme Evolution and Maintenance Working Group (PSEMWG)**
Organisation:	**EPC**
Address:	
Contact details:	
Your reference:	**#12-All SEPA schemes-EPC-Inclusion of commercial trade name**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: **EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook** **EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook** ~~EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook~~
Request Date:	**15 December 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

16 November 2025 – effectiveness date of the **four** SEPA payment scheme rulebooks concerned.

1.2. Description of the change request:

The <u>Statement</u> of the June 2021 Euro Retail Payments Board (ERPB) meeting endorsed a <u>set of recommendations</u> formulated by the ERPB working group on transparency for retail payment end-users.

One recommendation assigned to payment schemes such as the EPC payment schemes relates to the commercial trade name i.e. recommendation id 01: *Consistently use commercial trade name and provide this name to all involved parties in the payment chain for use in client's payment account statements*.

Furthermore, the commercial trade name is referred to in Article 25 'Information for the payer on individual payment transactions' of the proposed Payment Services Regulation (PSR), and in Article 2 (1c) of the amended SEPA Regulation.

The PSEMWG analysed to what extent the existing EPC payment scheme attributes suffice to meet the identified need or whether additional attributes would be needed.

Following this analysis, the following new attributes related to the "whom" are proposed being **yellow optional** fields in the relevant payment scheme implementation guidelines. As a yellow optional field, all scheme participants must support this ISO message element throughout their SEPA payment systems even though payment service users would still be free to use these elements or not.

A. SCT rulebook

New attributes

Identification:	AT-E002
Name:	**The commercial trade name of the Beneficiary**
Description:	The commercial trade name of the Beneficiary, if different to the legal name of the Beneficiary as used in AT-E001, as supplied by the Originator. This attribute is used in combination with AT-E001 and cannot substitute attribute AT-E001.

Identification:	AT-E008
Name:	**The commercial trade name of the Beneficiary Reference Party**
Description:	The commercial trade name of a person in relation to whom a Beneficiary receives a payment, if different to the legal name of the Beneficiary Reference Party as used in AT-E007. This attribute is used in combination with AT-E007 and cannot substitute attribute AT-E007.

These attributes are added in the following datasets in the SCT rulebook **and related Annex V**:

- DS-01 Customer-to-PSP SEPA Credit Transfer Information
- DS-02 The Inter-PSP Payment
- DS-04 The PSP-to-Customer SEPA Credit Transfer Information

These new attributes will be indicated as <u>optional</u> attributes in the datasets DS-02 and DS-04. This means that only when these attributes are completed in DS-01, they must be transported as such in DS-02 and DS-04.

Changes to datasets in the SCT rulebook and related Annex V:

Identification	DS-04
Name:	**The PSP-to-Customer SEPA Credit Transfer Information**
Description:	Description of the minimum information that a Beneficiary PSP needs to make available to the Beneficiary.
Attributes contained:	• (…)
Rules applied:	(…) A Beneficiary PSP may drop received extended Reference Party information (attributes P006, P007, E007, E008, E010 and T007) and not make it available to a Beneficiary who uses an interface which does not comply with the ISO 20022 XML standard.
Remarks:	These attributes reflect business requirements

B. SCT Inst rulebook

New attributes

Identification:	AT-E002
Name:	**The commercial trade name of the Beneficiary**
Description:	The commercial trade name of the Beneficiary, if different to the legal name of the Beneficiary as used in AT-E001, as supplied by the Originator. This attribute is used in combination with AT-E001 and cannot substitute attribute AT-E001.

Identification:	AT-E008
Name:	**The commercial trade name of the Beneficiary Reference Party**
Description:	The commercial trade name of a person in relation to whom a Beneficiary receives a payment, if different to the legal name of the Beneficiary Reference Party as used in AT-E007. This attribute is used in combination with AT-E007 and cannot substitute attribute AT-E007.

These attributes are added in the following datasets:

- DS-01 Customer-to-PSP Credit Transfer Information
- DS-02 The Inter-PSP Payment
- DS-04 The PSP-to-Customer SCT Inst Information

These new attributes will be indicated as <u>optional</u> attributes in the datasets DS-02, DS-04 and DS-10. This means that only when these attributes are completed in DS-01, they must be transported as such in DS-02, DS-04 and DS-10.

Changes to datasets in the SCT Inst rulebook

Identification	DS-04
Name	**The PSP-to-Customer SCT Inst information dataset**
Description	Description of the minimum information that a Beneficiary PSP needs to make available to the Beneficiary.
Attributes contained	• (….)
Rules applied	(…) A Beneficiary PSP may drop received extended Reference Party information (attributes P006, P007, E007, E008, E010 and T007) and not make it available to a Beneficiary who uses an interface which does not comply with the ISO 20022 XML standard.
Remarks	These attributes reflect business requirements. This message cannot be confused with the dataset DS-10 Positive Notification Message to the Beneficiary.

C. SDD Core rulebook

New attribute sections

AT-E002 – The Commercial Trade Name of the Creditor

Description:	The commercial trade name of the Creditor, if different to the legal name of the Creditor as used in AT-E001, as supplied by the Creditor. This attribute is used in combination with AT-E001 and cannot substitute attribute AT-E001.

AT-E008 – The Commercial Trade Name of the Creditor Reference Party

Description:	The commercial trade name of a person in relation to whom a Creditor collects a payment, if different to the legal name of the Creditor Reference Party as used in AT-E007. This attribute is used in combination with AT-E007 and cannot substitute attribute AT-E007. Information relating to a Creditor Reference Party is included only for the purpose of assisting the Debtor and/or Creditor in managing their payments and is not required to be provided to or by the Debtor PSP and/or Creditor PSP for the purpose of effecting the payment to which the information relates.

These attributes are added in the following datasets:

- DS-01 The Mandate
- DS-02 The Dematerialised Mandate
- DS-03 Customer to PSP Collection
- DS-04 The Inter-PSP Collection
- DS-12 The e-Mandate proposal /request message (only in Annex VII of the rulebook)
- DS-13 The validation message (only in Annex VII of the rulebook)

These new attributes will be indicated as

- Part of the sub-section *'Additional attributes for information only'* in DS-01;
- New attribute items *'By the Creditor: E002… (optional)'* and *'By the Creditor: E008… (optional)'* in DS-01;

- Attributes with the mention *'(if present in DS-01)'* in the dataset DS-02;
- Attributes with the mention *'(if present in DS-02)'* in the dataset DS-03;
- Attributes with the mention *'(if present in DS-03)'* in the datasets DS-04;
- Optional attributes in the datasets DS-12 and DS-13.

This means that only when these attributes are completed in DS-01, they must be transported as such in DS-03, DS-04, DS-12 and DS-13 included.

Amendments in Annex VII – e-Mandates: process steps PT-07.01, PT-08.01 and PT-09.01

(…)

"If the Creditor does not need to use the attributes "AT-E007 The name of the Creditor reference party", "AT-E008 The Commercial Trade Name of the Creditor Reference Party", "AT-E010 The identification code of the Creditor Reference party", "AT-P006 The name of the Debtor Reference party" and "AT-P007 The identification code of the Debtor Reference Party", he does not need to present these attributes in the template based on DS-01."

And add in the section "a. By the Creditor:" of each concerned process step, the new attributes AT-E002 and AT-E008 while indicating that both attributes are *"(optional)"*.

    D. SDD B2B rulebook

New attribute sections

AT-E002 – The Commercial Trade Name of the Creditor

Description:	The commercial trade name of the Creditor, if different to the legal name of the Creditor as used in AT-E001, as supplied by the Creditor. This attribute is used in combination with AT-E001 and cannot substitute attribute AT-E001.

AT-E008 – The Commercial Trade Name of the Creditor Reference Party

Description:	The commercial trade name of a person in relation to whom a Creditor collects a payment, if different to the legal name of the Creditor Reference Party as used in AT-E007. This attribute is used in combination with AT-E007 and cannot substitute attribute AT-E007. Information relating to a Creditor Reference Party is included only for the purpose of assisting the Debtor and/or Creditor in managing their payments and is not required to be provided to or by the Debtor PSP and/or Creditor PSP for the purpose of effecting the payment to which the information relates.

These attributes are added in the following datasets:

- DS-01 The Mandate
- DS-02 The Dematerialised Mandate
- DS-03 Business Customer-to-PSP Collection
- DS-04 The Inter-PSP Collection
- DS-12 The e-Mandate proposal /request message (only in Annex VII of the rulebook)
- DS-13 The validation message (only in Annex VII of the rulebook)

These new attributes will be indicated as

- Part of the sub-section *'Additional attributes for information only'* in DS-01;

- New attribute items *'By the Creditor: E002… (optional)'* and *'By the Creditor: E008… (optional)'* in DS-01;
- Attributes with the mention *'(if present in DS-01)'* in the dataset DS-02;
- Attributes with the mention *'(if present in DS-02)'* in the dataset DS-03;
- Attributes with the mention *'(if present in DS-03)'* in the datasets DS-04, DS-06, and DS-08 to DS-11 included;
- Optional attributes in the datasets DS-12 and DS-13.

This means that only when these attributes are completed in DS-01, they must be transported as such in DS-03, DS-04, DS-12 and DS-13 included.

Amendments in Annex VII – e-Mandates: process steps PT-07.01, PT-08.01 and PT-09.01

(…)

"If the Creditor does not need to use the attributes "AT-E007 The name of the Creditor reference party", "AT-E008 The Commercial Trade Name of the Creditor Reference Party", "AT-E010 The identification code of the Creditor Reference party", "AT-P006 The name of the Debtor Reference party" and "AT-P007 The identification code of the Debtor Reference Party", he does not need to present these attributes in the template based on DS-01."

And add in the section "a. By the Creditor:" of each concerned process step, the new attributes AT-E002 and AT-E008 while indicating that both attributes are *"(optional)"*.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

Yes. This change will impact all SEPA payment scheme participants and payment end-users.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

Yes. The new attributes require appropriate XML message fields and/or usage rules to be implemented by all SEPA payment scheme participants.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

Yes. Payees now have the possibility to provide the payer with more details about the other name(s) the payee and the payee reference party use in their commercial activities. This gives the payer more information about the payee.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

Yes.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

No impact.

6. The nature of the change request:

   a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

   Yes.

   b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

No.

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	YES. It is based on the recommendation agreed upon by the supply side and the demand side of the euro payments market representatives in the Euro Retail Payments Board (ERPB). It also reflects the developments noted in the relevant (updated) EU legislations which refer to commercial trade names as well.
Is the change request underpinned by a cost-benefit analysis?	NO.
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	YES. Transparency for the payment end-user is part of the ERPB's work plan.
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	YES.
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	NO.
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	YES.

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #13

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

Public
Approved

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**Payment Scheme Evolution and Maintenance Working Group (PSEMWG)**
Organisation:	**EPC**
Address:	
Contact details:	
Your reference:	**#13-All SEPA schemes-EPC-Inclusion of reference party address**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: **EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook** **EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook** ~~EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook~~
Request Date:	**15 December 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

16 November 2025 – effectiveness date of the **four SEPA** payment scheme rulebooks concerned.

1.2. Description of the change request:

The Statement of the June 2021 Euro Retail Payments Board (ERPB) meeting endorsed a set of recommendations formulated by the ERPB working group on transparency for retail payment end-users.

One aspect for which transparency can be improved is about the reference parties of the payer and of the payee.

The SEPA payment scheme rulebooks currently support only the exchange of the name and an identification code of such reference parties. The proposal is to also allow the exchange of the address of such reference parties. Payment end-users would no longer have to use other fields (such as the remittance information field) to provide such address data. It also allows better regulatory processing of such reference party data.

The following new attributes are proposed being **yellow optional** fields in the relevant payment scheme implementation guidelines. As a yellow optional field, all scheme participants must support this ISO message element throughout their SEPA payment systems even though payment service users would still be free to use this element or not.

Important: the proposed specifications to be followed to complete such addresses are aligned with the specifications proposed for the 2024 change request item #06.

Subject to the final decision by the Payment Scheme Management Board (PSMB) for item #06, the proposed address specifications for the reference parties may remain unchanged or may be adapted accordingly.

> A. **SCT rulebook**

New attributes

Identification:	AT-P008
Name:	The address of the Originator Reference Party
Description:	The information should reflect the address of a person or entity in relation to whom an Originator makes a payment. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section 0.5.1. *Important: as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.*

Identification:	AT-E009
Name:	The address of the Beneficiary Reference Party
Description:	The information should reflect the address of a person or entity in relation to whom a Beneficiary receives a payment. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section 0.5.1.

	Important: as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.

These attributes are added in the following datasets in the SCT rulebook **and related Annex V**:

- DS-01 Customer-to-PSP SEPA Credit Transfer Information
- DS-02 The Inter-PSP Payment
- DS-04 The PSP-to-Customer SEPA Credit Transfer Information

These new attributes will be indicated as <u>optional</u> attributes in the datasets DS-02 and DS-04. This means that only when these attributes are completed in DS-01, they must be transported as such in DS-02 and DS-04.

Changes to datasets in the SCT rulebook and related Annex V:

Identification	DS-04
Name:	The PSP-to-Customer SEPA Credit Transfer Information
Description:	Description of the minimum information that a Beneficiary PSP needs to make available to the Beneficiary.
Attributes contained:	- (…)
Rules applied:	(…) A Beneficiary PSP may drop received extended Reference Party information (attributes P006, P007, P008, E007, E009, E010 and T007) and not make it available to a Beneficiary who uses an interface which does not comply with the ISO 20022 XML standard.
Remarks:	These attributes reflect business requirements

B. SCT Inst rulebook

New attributes

Identification:	AT-P008
Name:	The address of the Originator Reference Party
Description:	The information should reflect the address of a person or entity in relation to whom an Originator makes a payment. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section 0.5.1. *Important: as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.*

Identification:	AT-E009
Name:	The address of the Beneficiary Reference Party
Description:	The information should reflect the address of a person or entity in relation to whom a Beneficiary receives a payment. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section 0.5.1.

	Important: as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.

These attributes are added in the following datasets:

- DS-01 Customer-to-PSP Credit Transfer Information
- DS-02 The Inter-PSP Payment
- DS-04 The PSP-to-Customer Credit Transfer Information

These new attributes will be indicated as <u>optional</u> attributes in the datasets DS-02 and DS-04. This means that only when these attributes are completed in DS-01, they must be transported as such in DS-02 and DS-04.

Changes to datasets in the SCT Inst rulebook

Identification	DS-04
Name	**The PSP-to-Customer SCT Inst information dataset**
Description	Description of the minimum information that a Beneficiary PSP needs to make available to the Beneficiary.
Attributes contained	• (....)
Rules applied	(...) A Beneficiary PSP may drop received extended Reference Party information (attributes P006, P007, P008, E007, E009, E010 and T007) and not make it available to a Beneficiary who uses an interface which does not comply with the ISO 20022 XML standard.
Remarks	These attributes reflect business requirements. This message cannot be confused with the dataset DS-10 Positive Notification Message to the Beneficiary.

C. SDD Core rulebook

New attribute sections

AT-E009 – The address of the Creditor Reference Party

Description:	The information should reflect the address of a person or entity in relation to whom a Creditor collects a payment. This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section 0.5.1. *Important: as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.*

AT-P008 – The address of the Debtor Reference Party

Description:	The information should reflect the address of a person or entity in relation to whom a Debtor is debited for.
	This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section 0.5.1. ***Important: as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.***

These attributes are added in the following datasets:

- DS-01 The Mandate
- DS-02 The Dematerialised Mandate
- DS-03 Customer to PSP Collection
- DS-04 The Inter-PSP Collection
- DS-12 The e-Mandate proposal /request message (only in Annex VII of the rulebook)
- DS-13 The validation message (only in Annex VII of the rulebook)

These new attributes will be indicated as

- Part of the sub-section *'Additional attributes for information only'* in DS-01;
- New attribute items *'By the Creditor: E009… (optional)'* and *'By the Debtor: P008… (optional)'* in DS-01;
- Attributes with the mention *'(if present in DS-01)'* in the dataset DS-02;
- Attributes with the mention *'(if present in DS-02)'* in the dataset DS-03;
- Attributes with the mention *'(if present in DS-03)'* in the dataset DS-04;
- Optional attributes in the datasets DS-12 and DS-13.

This means that only when these attributes are completed in DS-01, they must be transported as such in DS-03, DS-04, DS-12 and DS-13 included.

Amendments in Annex VII – e-Mandates: process steps PT-07.01, PT-08.01 and PT-09.01

(…)

"If the Creditor does not need to use the attributes "AT-E007 The name of the Creditor reference party", "AT-E010 The identification code of the Creditor Reference party", "AT-E009 – The address of the Creditor Reference Party", "AT-P006 The name of the Debtor Reference party", "AT-P007 The identification code of the Debtor Reference Party" and "AT-P008 – The address of the Debtor Reference Party", he does not need to present these attributes in the template based on DS-01."

And add in the section "a. By the Creditor:" of each concerned process step, the new attribute AT-E009 while indicating that the attribute is *"(optional)"*.

And add in the section "b. By the Debtor:" of each concerned process step, the new attribute AT-P009 while indicating that the attribute is *"(optional)"*.

D. SDD B2B rulebook

New attribute sections

AT-E009 – The address of the Creditor Reference Party

Description:	The information should reflect the address of a person or entity in relation to whom a Creditor collects a payment. <mark>This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section 0.5.1. *Important: as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.*</mark>.

AT-P008 – The address of the Debtor Reference Party

Description:	The information should reflect the address of a person or entity in relation to whom a Debtor is debited for. <mark>This attribute can be provided in an unstructured, hybrid or structured format following the specifications set out in the documents referred to in section 0.5.1. *Important: as of 22 November 2026, only the use of a hybrid or a structured address will be allowed. From that point in time onwards, the transmission of an unstructured address will no longer be allowed.*</mark>

These attributes are added in the following datasets:

- DS-01 The Mandate
- DS-02 The Dematerialised Mandate
- DS-03 Customer to PSP Collection
- DS-04 The Inter-PSP Collection
- DS-12 The e-Mandate proposal /request message (only in Annex VII of the rulebook)
- DS-13 The validation message (only in Annex VII of the rulebook)

These new attributes will be indicated as

- Part of the sub-section *'Additional attributes for information only'* in DS-01;
- New attribute items *'By the Creditor: E009… (optional)'* and *'By the Debtor: P008… (optional)'* in DS-01;
- Attributes with the mention *'(if present in DS-01)'* in the dataset DS-02;
- Attributes with the mention *'(if present in DS-02)'* in the dataset DS-03;
- Attributes with the mention *'(if present in DS-03)'* in the dataset DS-04;
- Optional attributes in the datasets DS-12 and DS-13.

This means that only when these attributes are completed in DS-01, they must be transported as such in DS-03, DS-04, DS-12 and DS-13 included.

Amendments in Annex VII – e-Mandates: process steps PT-07.01, PT-08.01 and PT-09.01

(…)

"If the Creditor does not need to use the attributes "AT-E007 The name of the Creditor reference party", "AT-E010 The identification code of the Creditor Reference party", "AT-E009 – The address of the Creditor Reference Party", "AT-P006 The name of the Debtor Reference party", "AT-P007 The identification code of the Debtor Reference Party" and "AT-P008 – The address of the Debtor Reference Party", he does not need to present these attributes in the template based on DS-01."

And add in the section "a. By the Creditor:" of each concerned process step, the new attribute AT-E009 while indicating that the attribute is *"(optional)"*.

And add in the section "b. By the Debtor:" of each concerned process step, the new attribute AT-P009 while indicating that the attribute is *"(optional)"*.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

Yes. This change will impact all SEPA payment scheme participants and payment end-users.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

Yes. The new attributes require appropriate XML message fields and/or usage rules to be implemented by all SEPA payment scheme participants.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

Yes. Payers and payees now have the possibility to provide the payees and payers with concrete address details about their respective reference parties in their commercial activities. This gives the payer and the payee more information about the reference parties of the payee and of the payer.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

Yes.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

No impact.

6. The nature of the change request:

   a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

   Yes.

   b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

   No.

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	YES. It provides payers and payees more transparency about the reference parties on whose behalf the payee and payer is credited and debited.
Is the change request underpinned by a cost-benefit analysis?	NO.
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	YES. Transparency for the payment end-user is part of the ERPB's work plan.
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	YES.
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	NO.
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	YES.

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

Public

Approved

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

CR #15

**Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023**

Name of contributor:	**Payment Committee Switzerland**
Organisation:	**SIX Interbank Clearing Ltd**
Address:	**Hardturmstrasse 201, 8021 Zürich**
Contact details:	**Martin Walder, SIX BBS**
Your reference:	**SEPA-2025-CR-UETR**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: **EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook** *EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook* *EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook* EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook
Request Date:	**14.12.2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request
1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):
Change Cycle November 2025

1.2. Description of the change request:
Add an attribute "Unique End-to-End Transaction Reference (UETR)" for SCT and SCT Inst. Include this attribute in the data-sets, where beneficial and feasible (e.g. DS-01 Customer-to-PSP SEPA Credit Transfer Information, DS-02 The Inter-PSP Payment Dataset, DS-03 The Reject or Return SEPA Credit Transfer Dataset, DS-04 The PSP-to-Customer SEPA Credit Transfer Information, DS-05 The Recall of a SEPA Credit Transfer Dataset, DS-06 Response to a Recall of SEPA Credit Transfer Dataset, DS-07 Request for Recall by the Originator dataset, DS-08 Dataset for the Response to the Request for Recall by the Originator, DS-09 SCT Inquiry Dataset, DS-10 Response-to-SCT-Inquiry Dataset, and its equivalent in SCT-Inst, respectively in the new rulebooks).

The attribute should be optional, but if delivered by one involved parties, it has to be passed on. In addition, if a inquiry is sent with an UETR, the response has to include the respective UETR unchanged.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:
1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

To include and UETR in a payment instruction is becoming more and more common. Therefore, this adaption closes a gap to other schemes, market practices and implementation. SCT and SCT Inst are getting better aligned with OCT Inst.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

UETR is not only used for tracking, but also for identifying a specific transaction in case of exception and investigation handling. Therefore, that this enhancement facilitates automation and improvements of such processes.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

Clients and PSP can align their processes with other market practices and improve the quality of their services.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

Open an existing ISO 20022 element and mark it as "yellow" field.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

n/a

6. The nature of the change request:

    a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

Add an optional attribute.

    b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

Add arule in regards of responses.

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	**YES**
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	**YES** especially the facilitation for E&I
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	**YES** closes a gap to other networks and market practices
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	**YES** UETR is already used with CBPR+ (SWIFT) and OCT Inst
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	**YES** the attribute remains optional
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	**YES**

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #16

Public

Approved

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

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**Payment Committee Switzerland**
Organisation:	**SIX Interbank Clearing Ltd**
Address:	**Hardturmstrasse 201, 8021 Zürich**
Contact details:	**Martin Walder, SIX BBS**
Your reference:	**SEPA-2025-CR-Name**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: **EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook** **EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook** **EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook**
Request Date:	**14.12.2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

Change Cycle November 2025

1.2. Description of the change request:

This change request is linked to the potential change of the implementation of the structured address. If the hybrid address is not introduced or another decision is taken in regards of the structured address (e.g. postponement to a later change cycle), this CR becomes obsolete.

Preliminary explanation:
Based on section 0.5.1 SEPA Credit Transfer Scheme Implementation Guidelines (and equivalent in other rulebooks) the implementation guidelines are binding in the Customer-to-PSP space. Most Swiss PSP have already implemented the structured address based on the currently valid definition in their offering and internal application. While in the inter-PSP space the handling of the address has to be anyway less strict (e.g. supporting cross-border payment via SWIFT, bank-to-bank payments, cash-legs of other types of transaction), the rules in the Customer-to-PSP space are often implement more restrictively.

Change request (in case the content of the address of the involved parties was changed from structured to hybrid):
The hybrid address becomes only mandatory in the inter-PSP space. In the Customer-to-PSP space, the respective PSP is not obliged to support the hybrid address and can restrict its offering to structured address only.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

No impact.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

No impact. PSPs can still use the hybrid address, e.g. to fulfil their compliance obligation.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

Clients might have to follow a more restrictive validation of the address for the beneficiary (SCT, SCT Inst, OCT Inst) or the debtor (SDD, SDD business) when initiating a payment. Nevertheless, the impact is minor as those addresses are commonly already covered by the fully structured address.

The PSP, which already supports structured address with its solutions and applications do not have to adapt.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

The preferred solution is, that the element "AdrLine", which is the added element in the hybrid address and the sole difference to the fully structured address, becomes an optional part only in the Inter-PSP-Guidelines (yellow field), but remains a white field in the Customer-to-Bank-Guidelines.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

This change request is linked to "5.2 Compliance with the Rulebook", point 3 "The SEPA Credit Transfer Scheme Customer-to-PSP Implementation Guidelines when as Originator PSP it offers to its Originators the service of accepting and processing electronically bundled Customer-to-PSP Credit Transfer Instructions;"

6. The nature of the change request:

   a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

Option 1: the respective section in the rulebook might be changed in order restrict the binding in the Customer-to-PSP space.

   b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

Option 2 (preferred): the changed attributes (hybrid address) are implemented only in the inter-PSP guidelines.

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	**YES**
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	**YES** PSP already using the structured address in their application and channels do not have to change again.
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	**YES** Overall, structured date are preferred.
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	**YES**
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	**YES** Inter-PSP is not affected.
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	**YES**

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #17

Public

Approved

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

**Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023**

Name of contributor:	**Payment Committee Switzerland**
Organisation:	**SIX Interbank Clearing Ltd**
Address:	**Hardturmstrasse 201, 8021 Zürich**
Contact details:	**Martin Walder, SIX BBS**
Your reference:	**SEPA-2025-CR-Name**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: **EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook** **EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook** **EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook**
Request Date:	**14.12.2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

Change Cycle November 2025

1.2. Description of the change request:

The implementation guidelines referred in section 0.5.1 are changed for the following attributes:

P001 The name of the Originator

P006 The name of the Originator Reference Party

E001 The name of the Beneficiary

E007 The name of the Beneficiary Reference Party

or equivalent attributes (e.g. name of the Initiation Party or Originators in context of status reason information.

There should be no limitation of the maximum length such as today (max length 70 characters. The respective element in the ISO 20022 message allows 140 characters*.

(*In case the element in the ISO 20022 base message allows less than 140 characters, the maximum according to the base message should be applied).

Example:

Source: SEPA Credit Transfer Inter-PSP IGs 2023 Version 1.1

| 2.54 | 1..1 | FITo FICustomer Credit Transfer V08
+Credit Transfer Transaction Information
++Debtor
+++Name | *SEPA Rulebook*
SEPA Usage Rule(s)

ISO Name
ISO Definition

XML Tag
Type
ISO Length
SEPA Length | *AT-P001 Name of the Originator.*
Mandatory.
'Name' is limited to 70 characters in length.
Name
Name by which a party is known and which is usually used to identify that party.
Nm
Max140Text
1 .. 140
1 .. 70 |

New: *SEPA Length 1 .. 140, respective no SEPA limitation*

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

No impact.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

The respective elements have to be changed and supported by all CSMs and PSPs. With this change, the SEPA IGs will be aligned with CBPR+ (SWIFT) and other market practices.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

The respective elements have to be changed supported by all clients and PSPs.
With this change, the clients and PSPs have no difference between a SEPA payment and cross-border payment based on CBPR+ (SWIFT) for static reference data.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

Delete SEPA restriction and use ISO definitions for the respective elements.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

n/a

6. The nature of the change request:

    a. Change all implementation guidelines and change the maximal length of the respective elements.

Add an optional attribute

    b. n/a)

Add an rule in regards of responses.

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	**YES**
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	**YES** reference/client data can be used for SEPA in the same way as for other market practices
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	**YES** reference/client date can be used for SEPA in the same way as for other market practices
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	**YES,** the affected elements are alreade are already in use with CBPR+ (SWIFT) without restriction of length
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	**YES** changes supports interoperability
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	**YES**

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #18

Public

Approved

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**R. Vlek**
Organisation:	**Dutch Payments Association**
Address:	**P.O. Box 83073, 1080 AB Amsterdam, the Netherlands**
Contact details:	**giraal@betaalvereniging.nl** **M +31(0)6 12 74 17 83**
Your reference:	**EPC164-21 v1.1 SEPA SCT Inst CR DPA_1_ 2024**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook
Request Date:	**21 December 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

Publication: November 2024
Operational: November 2025

1.2. Description of the change request:

We propose to reduce both the Target maximum execution time (from 10 to 5 seconds) and the Time-out deadline (from 20 seconds to 7 seconds for positive or negative confirmation message and from 5 to 2 seconds for this message to reach the Originator PSP).
This change request will offer end-users an experience that comes close to the current processing times for card based transactions and SCT Inst will be able to compete with other innovative payment solutions at the Point of Interaction (POI). All end users will benefit from this change request.

As the use of SCT Inst at the Point of Interaction (POI), possibly in combination with SEPA Request-to-Pay, both in a physical and online environment, is not yet widespread, payment service users may not yet call to reduce the current timelines. However, we would like to be pro-active and avoid as much as possible any negative customer experience caused by a time-out deadline of 20 seconds for SCT Inst transactions compared to a time-out deadline of typically 7 to 10 seconds for card-based transactions.

On earlier submission of this change request, there were some concerns this reduction of Target maximum execution time and Time-out deadline may negatively affect the appetite for implementing SCT Inst. With the announced regulation making SCT Inst mandatory for PSPs offering SCT, we only see benefits for an even stronger payment scheme.

Based on experience to date with several CSMs and almost 2 billion SCT Inst transactions processed with suggested shorter timelines in the Netherlands, the processing of large volumes of SCT Inst transactions shows no deterioration in performance at all. More than 95% of all SCT Inst transactions are processed within 3 seconds, even in case multiple CSMs are involved in the SCT Inst transaction. This shows that the proposed reduced Target maximum execution time and Time-out deadline are feasible and realistic.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1.   Impact on the Scheme in general:

Scheme will be adapted to market circumstances and customer needs.

2.   Impact on the inter-PSP space:

All participants and any other parties on their behalf in the interbank space have to respect the new Target maximum execution time and Time-out deadline

#18-SCT Inst-Dutch Paym. Assoc.-Reduction of target max. execution time and time-out deadline

3 / 4

3.   Impact on other payment stakeholders:

None

4.   Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

None

5.   Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

None

6.   The nature of the change request:

   a.   A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

Change, amended Rulebook elements

   b.   A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

-

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted. Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	**Yes, it will apply to all Payment Scheme Participants. All end users will benefit from this change request.**
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	**No**
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	**Yes. This change request will offer end-users an experience that comes close to the current processing times for card based transactions. All end users will benefit from this change request.**
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	**Yes. In the Netherlands more than 95% of all SCT Inst transactions are processed within 3 seconds, even in case multiple CSMs are involved.**
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	**Yes. This change request is based on experience of almost 2 billion SCT Inst transactions processed with suggested shorter timelines in the Netherlands, even in case multiple CSMs are involved. As the requested change will have to be respected by all participants and does not impact the message standards, it will not impede SEPA-wide interoperability.**
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	**Yes**

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #19

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

Public

Approved

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**Spanish Banking Community**
Organisation:	**Spanish Banking Community**
Address:	
Contact details:	macarvallo@aebanca.es; jcastill@cecabank.es; secretariageneral@unacc.es; altorio@gruposantander.com; fxherrero@caixabank.com; imerchan@gruposantander.es;
Your reference:	**Recovery of funds from fraudulent transfers**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook
Request Date:	**20/12/2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request
1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):
November 2025 (next Rulebook)

1.2. Description of the change request:
In order to contribute to increase the recovery of funds of fraudulent origin in SCT Inst and SCT, as a good practice for all SEPA participants, we propose the adoption of a specific procedure for the processing of partial returns for those cases in which the beneficiary entity does not have sufficient funds to meet a request for the reversal, due to fraud previously sent by the payer entity and referring to an unauthorized payment transaction, as defined in guideline 1.1.a of Directive (EU) 2015/2366 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2015 on payment services in the internal market.

Thus, when the beneficiary PSP does not have sufficient available balance to face the return of funds that the payer entity has previously claimed, by sending the request for retrocession due to fraud, it must:

1) respond negatively to the retrocession request for "FRAD" reasons, indicating the following reason code for the denial: "AM04 – insufficient funds".

2) subsequently, reimburse the ordering entity the amount corresponding to the funds available. To do this, the beneficiary PSP must issue a new transfer indicating in the payment category purpose the reason code "OTHR", and in the payment purpose the reason code "REFU" in order to identify the nature of that transfer.

In addition, the originator's reference in the new transfer must be the reference relating to the original retrocession request.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

No impact

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

 Yes. Both Originator PSP and the Beneficiary PSP should update their processes to adjust the tags that unambiguously identify that the new transfer is a consequence of a request for cancellation on FRAD reason.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

No impact.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

No impact

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

No impact

6. The nature of the change request:

    A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	YES
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	NO
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	YES
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	YES
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	YES
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	YES

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #20

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

Public

Approved

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**Slovak Banking Association**
Organisation:	**Slovak Banking Association**
Address:	**Mytna 48, Bratislava**
Contact details:	**Eva Horvathova, eva.horvathova@sbaonline.sk**
Your reference:	
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook
Request Date:	**18 Dec 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

November 2025 Rulebook release

1.2. Description of the change request:

Currently there is no reason code used in camt.056 RFRO to cover situation when the ordering client was victim of a fraud. The reason code FRAD is now possible to use only in camt.056 that is initiated by the Originator PSP.

Therefore we suggest to add to existing reason codes in camt.056 - "AC03" (Wrong IBAN), "AM09" (Wrong Amount) and "CUST" (Requested By Customer) a new type of reason code for cases when the customer claims fraudulent transaction.

This new reason code will enable beneficiary PSPs to ease the evaluation process and take all the necessary steps immediately.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

yes

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

yes, applicable for all PSPs

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

no

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

yes – new reason code implementation

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

n/a

6. The nature of the change request:

   a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

yes, new type of reason code

   b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	SCT, SCT^{Inst} Scheme
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	no
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	n/a
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	yes
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	yes
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	yes

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #21

Public

Approved

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

**Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023**

Name of contributor:	**Maria Brogren**
Organisation:	**Nordic Payments Council**
Address:	**Box 7603, 103 94 Stockholm, Sweden**
Contact details:	**info@npcouncil.org**
Your reference:	**N/A**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook
Request Date:	
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

To be included in 2025 version of SCT, SCT Inst and OCT Inst Schemes.

1.2. Description of the change request:

The suggestion is to expand number of characters for Name from 70 to 140.

The suggestion to expand number of characters for Name from 70 to 140 (ISO have 140). Today SCT & SCT Inst and OCT Inst Schemes have a limitation of 70 characters due to historical reasons such as limitations in legacy systems. CBPR+ as Market Practice used worldwide for cross border transactions also have 140 characters.

This relates to the following attributes I NCT & NCT Inst Schemes:

- AT-P001 - The name of the Originator

- AT-P006 - The name of the Originator Reference Party

- AT-E001 - The name of the Beneficiary

- AT-E007 - The name of the Beneficiary Reference Party

It is in the Guidelines details for Name are stated (example from SCT DS-01):

| 2.54 | 1..1 | FITo FICustomer Credit Transfer V08
+Credit Transfer Transaction Information
++Debtor
+++Name | *Type*
SEPA Rulebook
SEPA Usage Rule(s)

ISO Name
ISO Definition

XML Tag
Type
ISO Length
SEPA Length | PartyIdentification135
AT-P001 Name of the Originator.
Mandatory.
'Name' is limited to 70 characters in length.
Name
Name by which a party is known and which is usually used to identify that party.
Nm
Max140Text
1 .. 140
1 .. 70 |

The suggestion is to extend the number of characters of the name fields for all upper-mentioned attributes from 70 to 140 characters as:

- The 2019 ISO 20022 standard foresees up to 140 characters for the 'Debtor', 'Ultimate Debtor', 'Creditor', 'Ultimate Creditor' and 'Financial Institution' name fields.
- The Cross-border Payments and Reporting Plus (CBPR+) specifications also allow 140 characters for these name fields. This allows all EPC payment schemes, and the OCT Inst scheme in particular, to be aligned with these international specifications.
- The provision of extra characters allows payment service users to enter the complete name(s) concerned. This avoids the issue of data truncation and can provide the payment service user with further transparency about the identity of the payment counterparty and/or its reference parties and the financial institution(s) involved (the latter only for the OCT Inst scheme).
- The possibility to provide the complete name(s) can support the obligations for PSPs with respect to regulatory screening and up-front verification of payment counterparty names (such as Confirmation of Payee).

The importance of expanding to 140 characters using the full ISO 20022 standard goes hand in hand with upcoming regulation such as Instant Payment Regulation for EUR Instant Payments and PSR/PSD3.

This proposed change does not impact the EPC payment scheme rulebooks themselves, but their related Customer-to-PSP and inter-PSP implementation guidelines.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1.   Impact on the Scheme in general:

No. change is relevant for all messages but only in the Implementation Guidelines are impacted. No impact on business rules.

2.   Impact on the Inter-PSP space:

Yes. PSPs need to be able to handle extended number of characters for name in their systems which demand development and adjustment in legacy systems handling and processing SEPA scheme transactions. Instead of limiting the Scheme, truncation is possible for those PSPs that can't handle full ISO Standard of 140 characters.
PSPs must increase the character capacity for the various name fields in their payment initiation channels, their internal EPC payment transaction processing systems, and in their account statement and payment transaction archiving systems.
The transaction message exchange systems with other PSPs and with other inter-PSP space actors (e.g., CSMs) will have to be adapted as well to accept and to support the transmission of longer name data.

3.   Impact on other payment stakeholders:

Yes. They will have the opportunity to send and/or receive the full first name(s) and surname(s) or the full legal entity name of themselves, their payment counterparties, and/or of their reference parties. The truncation of long names or of name combinations (e.g., account held by multiple natural persons) can be avoided at all or strongly reduced. Instead of limiting the Scheme, truncation is possible for those PSPs that can't handle full ISO Standard of 140 characters. This gives the payment service user more transparency about the identity of its payment counterparty and/or of its reference party.

4.   Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

No impact. The 2019 version of the ISO 20022 standard already supports the transmission of up to 140 characters for the name field. The maximum SEPA length for the name field must be set from 70 to 140 characters.

5.   Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

No impact foreseen.

6. The nature of the change request:

   a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a completely new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

Yes - Change

   b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

No

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	**Yes** - It can provide the payment service user with further transparency about the identity of itself, the payment counterparty and/or their respective reference parties. For the OCT Inst scheme, it is also an alignment with the specifications set for a name field under the CBPR+ usage guidelines
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	**No**
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	**Yes** - Providing the payment end-user with more transparency is part of the work plan of the Euro Retail Payments Board (ERPB). For the OCT Inst scheme, it also provides Euro Leg PSPs with the full or a more elaborate name about the non-Euro Leg FIs involved in the non-Euro Leg.
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	**Yes** - The maximum SEPA length for the name field must be set from 70 to 140 characters.
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	**No** - It only concerns extending the data capacity of a specific message element for EPC payment scheme transactions.
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	**Yes**

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #26

Public

Approved

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

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**BIZUM S.L.**
Organisation:	**BIZUM S.L.**
Address:	**C. FRANCISCO SANCHA 12, 28034, MADRID, SPAIN**
Contact details:	**informacion@bizum.es // martin.azcuel@bizum.es**
Your reference:	https://bizum.es/en/
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook
Request Date:	**Thursday, December 28th 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

As soon as possible; at the latest: Rulebook 2025.

1.2. Description of the change request:

Context – Current limitation of the SCT-Inst scheme in the absence of technical cancellations:

In everyday use, a negligible number of error situations occur that fall within the realm of technical issues that are the responsibility of the issuing and/or beneficiary PSPs or even at a settlement level at a Clearing House, which result in the completion of a payment that should not have been processed. These type of incidents, usually associated with specific issues suffered by any of the agents involved during the processing of a payment transaction, generate uncertainty and make it impossible be certain about the final status of a payment, either because services available to check a transaction status might indicate that the payment is still in progress or because some of the parties involved are not operational (and thus no feedback to confirm status is received).

As a result, additional friction and manual procedures are imposed to the different parties involved in these transactions (as the issuing PSP is not able to execute a transaction, with the impact in terms of service level that this implies, and beneficiaries will need to give consent to manage refunds through the standard procedures currently enabled by the scheme). In addition, timeframes currently defined by the scheme allow a delay of up to 25 business days when it comes to performing a regularization of the transaction.

Solution proposal: Leverage on an **existing SEPA message** to introduce the **possibility of payment reversals into the Inter-PSP space** (for illustration purposes and after an analysis on potential candidates with similar capabilities to these features, **this proposal focuses on FIToFIPayment ReversalV01 message <pacs.007.001.09>** which could be taken as a reference for these purposes, and with the possibility of having a different message defined or agreed by EPC working groups if considered more suitable).

As a solution, this Change request proposal addresses the possibility of **using an equivalent message to FIToFIPayment ReversalV01 message <pacs.007.001.09> from the ISO 20022 standard**, which is currently used at other EPC schemes for an interbank reversal of a direct debit order, which is defined in section 2.4.1 of the Inter-PSP Implementation Guidelines of the SEPA Direct Debit Core Scheme[1] as it follows:

---

[1] See Inter-PSP Implementation Guidelines of the SEPA Direct Debit Core Scheme underlined reference documentation here.

Use of the Payment Reversal (pacs.007.001.09): The message is used to transport the Inter-PSP Reversal Instruction for a Collection sent by the Creditor PSP to the Debtor PSP, directly or through intermediaries.

Reusing a message with equivalent capabilities to others already in place for a different EPC scheme (EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook) which already follows ISO 20022 standard would be considered to **provide an optimal solution with a minimum level of impact for PSPs** (already used to this message when dealing with these types of transactions on their direct debit operative).

Solution description: Scope, time frames and type of payment reversals:

Scope of payment reversal applicability:

The proposal to **use an equivalent message to FIToFIPayment ReversalV01 <pacs.007.001.09>** on an SCT-Inst should take place in a **situation where one of the parties involved in a payment** (issuing/beneficiary PSP or settlement ACH) **identifies the status of a transaction as "ambiguous"** and therefore decides to abort the process.

A payment reversal through <u>this message would work under the following principles</u> depending on the party initiating this technical cancellation:

- **Payment reversal / Technical cancellation initiated by the payer's PSP:** In this scenario, the amount transfer could have been already credited into the beneficiary's account and thus it's PSP should proceed to the refund of this erroneously credited amount, as it is considered incorrect or duplicated.
- **Payment reversal / Technical cancellation initiated by the payee's PSP:** If initiated by the beneficiary, the payment reversal should trigger a refund of the amount debited into the issuer's account because of the payment instructed by this party, as the transaction is considered incorrect or duplicated (in this case only one reversal on the original transfer will be accepted).

With the aim of guaranteeing that the introduction of this type of message would be protected against any malpractices by any of the agents participating in a transaction, **a payment reversal through this message should only be available to be triggered during the transfer flow** (this is, only during the transaction process and not subsequently, for instance, on the day after the transaction first took place).

Reasons to consider the use of a payment reversal on an SCT-Inst transaction (by either the payer or the payee's PSP):

- **Duplication**

- **Technical error**

- **Unambiguous final transaction status.**

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

   Defining the message to use into Inter-PSP space, its rules, and obligations, enables an additional capability for PSPs conducting these transactions to be able to perform a regularization that might be needed due to an error or duplicate. This proposal does not involve any changes on the core features of the SCT-Inst messaging / functionalities. The main changes foreseen would imply defining the rules to allow the use of the message proposed, or the one PSPs could finally decide to use, and the mandate for them to implement it.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

   Reduced compared to the impact of managing the retrocession of duplicates and erroneous transactions (due to technical reasons) outside of the scheme under a non-standardised solution. Something that happens today in communities using payment solutions leveraging on SCT-Inst.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

   The main impact derives on the introduction of a message with equivalent features and technical implications as others already in place for other EPC schemes that are already complying with messaging standards (ISO 20022) and that, for instance, participants in the SEPA DIRECT DEBIT scheme already have in place. If there is ambition to extend SCT-Inst to merchant payments, the introduction of this message seems as an important need to consider (as this is a feature demanded by merchants that they already enjoy at other traditional payment methods).

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

   This proposal addresses the possibility of allowing both, the payer and the payee PSP, to initiate a payment reversal during the transaction flow, which would be something with a certain level of impact in the messaging standards, as this is not common for other EPC messages. However, its application could have a positive impact and be applied in other scenarios and messages in the future.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

   None, as the proposal only addresses the introduction of a new technical capability to be available at the Scheme, without any other modifications in terms of reachability, eligibility, participation, obligations liability or termination.

6. The nature of the change request:

    a. **A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements).**

    The proposal in this document aims to provide with a new message to allow the possibility to make payment reversals on transactions that require these types of adjustments, when the final status of a transaction is ambiguous or not clear due to a technical error.

    This use case requires de definition of the message to be used (as discussed in previous sections, an equivalent message to <pacs.007.001.09>) and its regulation under the Scheme rules to be adopted by participants if considered to be part of a future Rulebook version.

    b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	Yes, since the **adoption of instant transfers by merchants to receive, payments should see increasing growth** in the next years in Europe (especially considering the coming into force of the new instant payments regulation) and **mechanisms like the one defined in this proposal would help providing a better service to all parties involved.**
	After its launch as a mobile payment solution leveraging on SCT -Inst for all its use cases (P2P, e-commerce etc.), **Bizum has gained extensive knowledge on the additional needs that the current scheme may need to cover** to offer a competitive experience for PSPs, end users and merchants.
	The changes described in this proposal are aimed to offer the possibility of applying **payment reversals / technical cancellations** to allow the **possibility of fixing mismatches in consolidation and potential transaction duplicities** arising from different incidents suffered from any of the agents participating in an instant transfer (both on P2P and merchant use cases) that **may require manual regularization processes** to be applied.
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	Whenever an incident requires a regularization process, PSPs, Payment Processors and Clearing/Settlement parties need to **dedicate a significant amount of time to manually track, validate and apply regularizations** to solve for any mismatches or duplicities generated. As **instant transfer solutions expand to e-commerce and specially to POS** payments (typically requiring shorter response times), the **risks of these incidents will be higher** and thus, enabling a simple and efficient technical mechanism would result in **lower time, effort, and economic costs to solve them.**
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	Yes, as in order to fulfil the ambition of European institutions to consolidate SEPA Instant transfers (SCT-Inst) as a robust European payment solution **the scheme needs to build additional capabilities that would allow PSPs using SCT-Inst to offer a competitive service, especially if the aim is to foster the adoption of instant payments as a solution also aimed at merchant payments** (this means, evolving the scheme so that it can grow beyond a P2P solution to a standard that also fits merchant needs).
	Otherwise, if these capabilities are not standardised at a scheme level, **SEPA Instant transfer-based solutions will either need to develop their own procedures** (which would introduce barriers to interoperability) **or lag behind other payment methods when it comes to adoption by merchants.**

Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	Yes, as **similar processes are already in place for other payment instruments, and this is a basic capability to be offered by any retail payment solution.** Therefore, any solution willing to leverage on SCT-Inst to offer a competitive solution for payments to merchants will **either use the standards set by the scheme** (always better even if it has implementation costs, as this guarantees interoperability) **or need to build ad-hoc processes** to cover for potential gaps that might not be offered by this scheme.
	Moreover, since **these payment reversal mechanisms already exist and are implemented by PSPs for other payment methods**, there could be an opportunity to assess the possibility of **leveraging on either existing processes of common elements that could be reused** in other to align how these mechanisms work and **reduce the effort required to implement this change request** for the whole scheme (in this case a type of message already in use for SEPA Direct Debits).
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	No. On the contrary, **this change would reduce potential gaps for interoperability between different SCT-Inst based payment solutions**, as it would help standardise a process that is needed in any retail payment solution (also for end-user focused services but specially for payments involving merchants) that would **otherwise need to be developed specifically by each PSP/payment solutions,** which in the medium run **would prevent full interoperability across European SEPA Instant based payment solutions** (as ad-hoc procedures without a standard could lead to the creation of non-compatible procedures across different solutions).

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #27

Public

Approved

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**BIZUM S.L.**
Organisation:	**BIZUM S.L.**
Address:	**C. FRANCISCO SANCHA 12, 28034, MADRID, SPAIN**
Contact details:	**informacion@bizum.es // martin.azcuel@bizum.es**
Your reference:	https://bizum.es/en/
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook
Request Date:	**Thursday, December 28th 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

As soon as possible (concerning time frame proposed and suggestion to avoid a 30 minute down time on the scheduled date, to be considered for Rulebook 2023 postponed migration on March 17th, 2024). Rulebook 2025 at the latest.

1.2. Description of the change request:

This change request intends to **propose a series of best practices applied by other retail payment schemes when performing an update on Rulebook versions**.

Payment solutions based on SEPA Instant transfers have grown to become a relevant payment method for merchants (beyond their initial focus on peer-to-peer transfers). Solutions like Bizum in Spain, which account for over 25,5 million users and over 57.000 merchants using its services, now process a significant transaction volume on a daily basis (expected transactions for 2023 should be over 900 million transfers with an estimated volume of 46.000 million euros).

Since the launch its e-commerce solution back in 2019, **Bizum has faced the challenge of building and deploying a payment use case to merchant based on SCT-Inst**, as because of being the first (and only at least for the time being) European payment solution leveraging on this scheme for a retail payment solution, **it has encountered several limitations concerning use cases and technical needs that merchants request in order to adopt and promote a payment method** (one of them, the availability of having technical cancellations being the subject of a different change request proposal to be submitted to the EPC, which are likely to be followed by others beyond 2024 in order to allow SEPA Instant transfers to offer equivalent capabilities to users and merchants than those currently offered by other payment instruments).

Besides the potential evolution of the SCT-Inst scheme to allow for a full coverage of a retail payment's system operative (which Bizum believes will be achieved thanks to the market efforts and the EPCs standards), **Rulebook version updates is also a process that has room for improvement in order to minimise the impacts of these changes that end-users, merchants, or any agent in the payment's value chain might suffer** during the migration to a new Rulebook.

In this sense, **the need to add a set of relevant criteria on how these changes are applied is a key element to ensure that Instant Transfers can keep extending their reach** and contribute to the development of a robust European payments market.

The following measures are proposed by BIZUM following the analysis of market best practices for them to be considered to guide the definition of future version updates:

- **Version update time/date:** Any technical intervention or version update should always be planned on time/dates of minimal foreseen activity (ex. 2:00h-6:00h), **without a mandatory "shut-down" time of 30 minutes** as it is currently the case with Rulebook version changes (to ensure availability from the first minute after a migration).

- **Considering transaction "peak" seasons when defining dates for a Rulebook update:** The Rulebook update calendar should try to avoid any date close to a period of high payment traffic (ex. weeks before Black Friday) or with an expected freeze period by PSPs or Payment infrastructures (ex. Christmas).

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

Minimal, as this would only imply the definition of an update framework regarding when Rulebook changes are performed.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

The changes proposed would only be beneficial for PSPs, as there would be higher guarantees that Rulebook updates would only take place during periods of minimum activity.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

The changes proposed would have positive impact on all the payment's industry, end-users and merchants, as they are all addressed to ensure that efforts put into the Rulebook version update process falls outside of periods with the highest transaction volumes.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

    None.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

    None.

6. The nature of the change request:

    a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

    b. **A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)**

        These changes do not have any direct impact on the current rules of the Scheme but propose to establish additional criteria on the dates in which Rulebook updates would take place.

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	Yes, as **the changes detailed in this proposal would help defining update periods that would allow stakeholders to manage the changes to new Rulebook versions more efficiently.**
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	Yes. **Implementing Rulebook changes outside of minimal transaction timeframe/periods always increases the risk of technical incidents** that may cause the loss of a significant number of transactions (especially looking forward to the availability of SCT-Inst on POS payments).
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	Yes, as in order to fulfil the ambition of European institutions to consolidate SEPA Instant transfers (SCT-Inst) as a robust European payment solution, **the scheme needs to consider that Rulebook updates need to be defined in periods that minimise the risk of having an impact on high-peak seasons.** **Introducing version change management criteria aligned to market standards should be a part of the expected evolution of any retail payment solution that expects to become relevant for merchants and users.**
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	Yes, as **this would only impact the schedule management of Rulebook updates** and would not have any technical impact on PSPs.
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	No. On the contrary, this change would enhance the capabilities of the scheme and thus, **help to make it more appealing to PSPs throughout all SEPA countries** for its adoption on as many use cases as possible.

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #29

Public

Approved

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

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**Eric VERONNEAU**
Organisation:	**Groupe BPCE**
Address:	
Contact details:	
Your reference:	**#BPCE-All 3 CT schemes-EPC-Precisions on Recalls**
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: **EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook** **EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook**
Request Date:	**21 December 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

23 November 2025 – effectiveness date of the EPC payment scheme rulebooks concerned.

1.2. Description of the change request:

The change requests addresses the processing of response to Recalls in the 3 credit transfer scheme rulebooks, i.e. SCT, SCT Inst and OCT Inst, <u>other than the positive response</u>.

I. **Reminder of the content of the schemes :**

Currently, the rulebooks indicate what is mentioned below :

- <u>SCT rulebook</u>, EPC125-05 2023
    o under art. 4.3.2.3 Recall :
        "A Recall occurs when the Originator PSP requests to cancel a SEPA Credit Transfer Transaction. […]"
        […]
        ▪ "The Originator PSP must send out the Recall within the period of **10 Banking Business Days** for the reasons 'Duplicate sending' and 'Technical problems resulting in erroneous SCTs', and within the period of 13 months for the reason 'Fraudulent originated SEPA Credit Transfer' following the execution date of the initial SEPA Credit Transfer Transaction subject to the Recall;"
        ▪ […]
        ▪ "The Beneficiary PSP must provide the Originator PSP with a response to a Recall within 15 Banking Business Days following the receipt of the Recall from the Originator PSP.
        The Beneficiary PSP is in breach with the Rulebook if it has not responded to the Recall by the Originator PSP within this period of 15 Banking Business Days. If the Beneficiary PSP has received no response from the Beneficiary to this Recall within these 15 Banking Business Days, the Beneficiary PSP must send a negative response with the reason "No response from the Beneficiary" to the Originator PSP;"
        […]
        ▪ And later, under CT-02.07: "In the exceptional case of no response from the Beneficiary PSP **within the deadline of 15 Banking Business Days** following the receipt of the Recall from the Originator PSP, the Originator PSP may send a **Request for Status Update** to the Beneficiary PSP."
    o But under art. 4.3.2.4 Request for Recall by the Originator
        "A Request for Recall by the Originator can be initiated by the Originator PSP after an Originator has requested the Originator PSP to get the reimbursement of a settled SEPA Credit Transfer Transaction for a reason other than duplicate sending, technical problems resulting in an erroneous SEPA Credit Transfer Transaction and a fraudulently originated SEPA Credit Transfer Instruction (see section 4.3.2.3)."
        […]
        ▪ "The Beneficiary PSP must send its response to a Request for Recall by the Originator within 15 Banking Business Days following the receipt of the Request for Recall by the Originator from the Originator PSP."

> ▪ "A Request for Status Update can refer to one single Request for Recall by the Originator, or to several Requests for Recall by the Originator."
>
> [...]
>
> ▪ And later, under Step 4c: "In an exceptional case of no response from the Beneficiary PSP **after 15 Banking Business Days** after the receipt of the Request for Recall by the Originator, the Originator PSP may send a **Request for Status Update** to the Beneficiary PSP"

- **SCT Inst rulebook**, EPC004-16 2023
  - o Under 4.3.2.2 SCT Inst Recall

    "An **SCT Inst Recall** occurs when the Originator PSP requests to cancel an SCT Inst Transaction."

    [...]

    ▪ "The Originator PSP must send out the SCT Inst Recall within 10 Banking Business Days for the reasons 'Duplicate sending' and 'Technical problems resulting in an erroneous SCT Inst', and within the period of 13 months for the reason 'Fraudulent originated SCT Inst' following the execution date of the initial SCT Inst Transaction subject to the SCT Inst Recall;"

    ▪ [...]

    ▪ "The Beneficiary PSP must provide the Originator PSP with a response to the SCT Inst Recall within 15 Banking Business Days following the receipt of the SCT Inst Recall from the Originator PSP.
    The Beneficiary PSP is in breach with the Rulebook if it has not responded to the SCT Inst Recall by the Originator PSP within this period of 15 Banking Business Days. If the Beneficiary PSP has received no response from the Beneficiary to this SCT Inst Recall within these 15 Banking Business Days, the Beneficiary PSP must send a negative response with the reason "No response from the Beneficiary" to the Originator PSP;"

    [...]

    ▪ And later, under CT-02.07 "In the exceptional case of no response from the Beneficiary PSP **within the deadline of 15 Banking Business Days** following the receipt of the SCT Inst Recall from the Originator PSP, the Originator PSP may send a **Request for Status Update** to the Beneficiary PSP."

- **OCT Inst rulebook**, EP158-22 2023
  - o Under 4.3.4.3 OCT Inst Recall

    "An OCT Inst Recall occurs when the Euro Leg Entry PSP receives a request from the non-Euro Leg Payer's FI to cancel an OCT Inst Transaction, or when the Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP makes such request to the Euro Leg Exit PSP."

    [...]

    ▪ "The Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP/ Euro Leg Exit PSP must provide the Euro Leg Entry PSP/ Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP with a response to an OCT Inst Recall within 15 SEPA Banking Business Days following the receipt of the OCT Inst Recall from the Euro Leg Entry PSP/ Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP;"

    ▪ "The Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP/ Euro Leg Exit PSP is in breach with the Scheme when it has not responded to the OCT Inst Recall request by the Euro Leg Entry PSP/ Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP, within this period of 15 SEPA Banking Business Days."

    ▪ [...]

- ▪ "If the Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP/ Euro Leg Exit PSP has received no response from the Payee/ non-Euro Leg Payee's FI to this OCT Inst Recall within these 15 SEPA Banking Business Days, it must send a negative response with the reason "No response from the Payee"/ "No response from the non-Euro Leg Payee's FI" to the Euro Leg Entry PSP/ Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP;"
- ▪ […]
- ▪ "The Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP/ Euro Leg Exit PSP may exceptionally not respond **within the deadline of 15 SEPA Banking Business Days** following the receipt of the OCT Inst Recall from the Euro Leg Entry PSP/ Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP. The Euro Leg Entry PSP/ Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP may send a **Request for Status Update** to the Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP/ Euro Leg Exit PSP."

II.   The issue:

One can understand from the above that

- - Only one Recall can be sent for a given original transaction. Indeed, it is neither mentioned that a second Recall may be sent for this given original transaction, nor specified what could be the time line for sending such second Recall.
- - Only a Request for Status Update on the Recall can be sent in the case no response would have been provided to the Recall, and not a second Recall.
- - Given the fact that the response period is 15 Banking Business Days, it seems logical that it is only at the end of this period that such Status Update can be sent.
- - A received negative response to a Recall, is it before at the end of the response period, is meant to be definitive and not to trigger another Recall on the same given original transaction.

The practice shows that this understanding is not shared by all participants, and this leads in some cases to:

- - A second Recall sent by the Originator PSP on the same given original transaction before the end of the response period to the first one.
- - A second Recall sent by the Originator PSP on the same given original transaction instead of a Request for Status Update on the first Recall at the end of the response period.
- - A second or even a third Recall and more sent by the Originator PSP upon receipt of a first or even second negative response.

➔ This leads to uncertainties in the process and possibly lots of unuseful (i.e. costly and time consuming) exchange.

III.   The proposed solution, highlighted in yellow:

- - <u>SCT rulebook</u>, EPC125-05 2023
    - a.   under art. 4.3.2.3 Recall :
        "A Recall occurs when the Originator PSP requests to cancel a SEPA Credit Transfer Transaction. […]"
        […]
        - • "The Originator PSP must send out the Recall within the period of 10 Banking Business Days for the reasons 'Duplicate sending' and 'Technical problems resulting in erroneous SCTs', and within the period of 13 months for the reason 'Fraudulent originated SEPA Credit Transfer' following the execution date of the initial SEPA Credit Transfer Transaction subject to the Recall; Only one Recall can be sent on a given transaction over the mentioned periods"

- […]
- "The Beneficiary PSP must provide the Originator PSP with a response to a Recall within 15 Banking Business Days following the receipt of the Recall from the Originator PSP.
- The Beneficiary PSP is in breach with the Rulebook if it has not responded to the Recall by the Originator PSP within this period of 15 Banking Business Days. If the Beneficiary PSP has received no response from the Beneficiary to this Recall within these 15 Banking Business Days, the Beneficiary PSP must send a negative response with the reason "No response from the Beneficiary" to the Originator PSP; Sending another Recall on the same initial SCT after the Beneficiary PSP has provided a response is not allowed."
- […]
- "In the exceptional case of no response from the Beneficiary PSP ~~within~~ **at the end of the** ~~deadline of~~ **15 Banking Business Days period** following the receipt of the Recall from the Originator PSP, the Originator PSP may send a Request for Status Update to the Beneficiary PSP. Sending a second Recall on the same original SCT is not allowed."

[…]

- And later, under CT-02.07: "In the exceptional case of no response from the Beneficiary PSP ~~within the deadline of 15 Banking Business Days following the receipt of the Recall from the Originator PSP~~, the Originator PSP may send a Request for Status Update to the Beneficiary PSP. […]"

b. And under art. 4.3.2.4 Request for Recall by the Originator

"A Request for Recall by the Originator can be initiated by the Originator PSP after an Originator has requested the Originator PSP to get the reimbursement of a settled SEPA Credit Transfer Transaction for a reason other than duplicate sending, technical problems resulting in an erroneous SEPA Credit Transfer Transaction and a fraudulently originated SEPA Credit Transfer Instruction (see section 4.3.2.3)."
[…]

- Only one Recall can be sent on a given transaction over the mentioned periods"
- "The Beneficiary PSP must send its response to a Request for Recall by the Originator within 15 Banking Business Days following the receipt of the Request for Recall by the Originator from the Originator PSP. Sending another Recall on the same initial SCT after the Beneficiary PSP has provided a response is not allowed."
- […]
- "In an exceptional case of no response from the Beneficiary PSP ~~after~~ **at the end of the 15 Banking Business Days period** after the receipt of the Request for Recall by the Originator, the Originator PSP may send a **Request for Status Update** to the Beneficiary PSP". Sending a second Request for Recall by the Originator on the same original SCT is not allowed."

[…]

- And later, under Step 4c: "In an exceptional case of no response from the Beneficiary PSP ~~after 15 Banking Business Days after the receipt of the~~

~~Request for Recall by the Originator~~, the Originator PSP may send a **Request for Status Update** to the Beneficiary PSP"

- **SCT Inst rulebook**, EPC004-16 2023
    - c. Under 4.3.2.2 SCT Inst Recall
        "An **SCT Inst Recall** occurs when the Originator PSP requests to cancel an SCT Inst Transaction."

        [...]
        - "The Originator PSP must send out the SCT Inst Recall within 10 Banking Business Days for the reasons 'Duplicate sending' and 'Technical problems resulting in an erroneous SCT Inst', and within the period of 13 months for the reason 'Fraudulent originated SCT Inst' following the execution date of the initial SCT Inst Transaction subject to the SCT Inst Recall; Only one Recall can be sent on a given transaction over the mentioned periods"
        - [...]
        - "The Beneficiary PSP must provide the Originator PSP with a response to the SCT Inst Recall within 15 Banking Business Days following the receipt of the SCT Inst Recall from the Originator PSP.
        - The Beneficiary PSP is in breach with the Rulebook if it has not responded to the SCT Inst Recall by the Originator PSP within this period of 15 Banking Business Days. If the Beneficiary PSP has received no response from the Beneficiary to this SCT Inst Recall within these 15 Banking Business Days, the Beneficiary PSP must send a negative response with the reason "No response from the Beneficiary" to the Originator PSP; Sending another Recall on the same initial SCT after the Beneficiary PSP has provided a response is not allowed."
        - [...]
        - "In the exceptional case of no response from the Beneficiary PSP ~~within~~at the end~~deadline~~ of the 15 Banking Business Days period following the receipt of the SCT Inst Recall from the Originator PSP, the Originator PSP may send a **Request for Status Update** to the Beneficiary PSP. Sending a second Request for Recall by the Originator on the same original SCT is not allowed."

        [...]
        - And later, under CT-02.07: "In the exceptional case of no response from the Beneficiary PSP ~~within the deadline of 15 Banking Business Days following the receipt of the SCT Inst Recall from the Originator PSP~~, the Originator PSP may send a **Request for Status Update** to the Beneficiary PSP."
- **OCT Inst rulebook**, EP158-22 2023
    - d. Under 4.3.4.3 OCT Inst Recall
        "An OCT Inst Recall occurs when the Euro Leg Entry PSP receives a request from the non-Euro Leg Payer's FI to cancel an OCT Inst Transaction, or when the Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP makes such request to the Euro Leg Exit PSP. Only one Recall can be sent on a given transaction"

        [...]
        - "The Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP/ Euro Leg Exit PSP must provide the Euro Leg Entry PSP/ Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP with a response to an OCT Inst Recall within 15 SEPA Banking Business Days following the receipt of the OCT Inst Recall from the Euro Leg Entry PSP/ Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP;

The Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP/ Euro Leg Exit PSP is in breach with the Scheme when it has not responded to the OCT Inst Recall request by the Euro Leg Entry PSP/ Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP, ~~within~~at the end of this period of 15 SEPA Banking Business Days. Sending another Recall on the same initial SCT after the Beneficiary PSP has provided a response is not allowed."

- [...]
- "If the Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP/ Euro Leg Exit PSP has received no response from the Payee/ non-Euro Leg Payee's FI to this OCT Inst Recall within these 15 SEPA Banking Business Days, it must send a negative response with the reason "No response from the Payee"/ "No response from the non-Euro Leg Payee's FI" to the Euro Leg Entry PSP/ Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP; Sending a second Request for Recall by the Originator on the same original SCT is not allowed."

- [...]
- The Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP/ Euro Leg Exit PSP may exceptionally not have responded ~~within~~ at the end ~~deadline~~ of the 15 SEPA Banking Business Days period following the receipt of the OCT Inst Recall from the Euro Leg Entry PSP/ Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP. The Euro Leg Entry PSP/ Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP may send a **Request for Status Update** to the Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP/ Euro Leg Exit PSP. Sending a second Request for Recall by the Originator on the same original SCT is not allowed."

[...]

- Add a Step 07, "In the exceptional case of no response from the Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP, the Euro Leg Exit PSP may send a **Request for Status Update** to the Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP."

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

The impact is limited to the inter-PSP space.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

Yes. This change will impact the rules and therefore potentially all EPC payment scheme participants.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

No. This change does not impact non-scheme participants. End users are not impacted.

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

No, not as such, but it could be useful to remind in the introduction section of the Recall message (and possibly the RFRO message) in the IGs that only one Recall can be send for a given original transaction. This can only be of help for the implementors.

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

No impact.

6. The nature of the change request:

   a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

   Yes, it is a precision on existing requirements.

   b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

   No.

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	**YES. The change request applies to all scheme participants SEPA wide.**
Is the change request underpinned by a cost-benefit analysis?	**NO.**
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	**YES. Clarity on processing of the answers to Recalls can only participate to a smoother processing SEPA wide.**
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	**YES.**
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	**NO. On the contrary, clarifying rules can only help to a better interoperability**
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the schemes involved?	**YES.**

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #31

Public

Approved

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

Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023

Name of contributor:	**Slovak Banking Association**
Organisation:	**Slovak Banking Association**
Address:	**Mytna 48, Bratislava, Slovakia**
Contact details:	**Eva Horvathova, eva.horvathova@sbaonline.sk**
Your reference:	
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook ~~EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook~~ ~~EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook~~ ~~EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook~~
Request Date:	**18 Dec 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

November 2025 Rulebook release

1.2. Description of the change request:

Currently there is no XML message type used in SEPA schemes to cover situation when additional information between banks have to be exchanged, like identification details of the client or any other information/details from compliance request.

Today we can send only SWIFT format of such queries (MT19x, MT99x) which is not aimed way of communication related to SEPA payments. The aim of this request is to handle all SEPA messages and communication via the same SEPA channel.

Therefore we suggest to introduce a new type of XML message to the SEPA SCT and SEPA SCT^{Inst} Rulebooks to enable PSPs to exchange such type of information.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

yes

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

yes, applicable for all PSPs

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

no

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

yes – new XML message type(s) implementation

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

n/a

6. The nature of the change request:

   a. A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)

yes, new type of message

   b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	SCT, SCT^{Inst} Scheme
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	no
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	n/a
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	yes
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	yes
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	yes

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme

European Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023
Public
Approved

CR #32

**Submit your responses by e-mail to change-request.EPC-scheme@epc-cep.eu
by 31 December 2023**

Name of contributor:	**European Central Bank**
Organisation:	**European Central Bank**
Address:	**Sonnemannstraße 20, 60314 Frankfurt am Main**
Contact details:	**Marek Kozok, Marek.Kozok@ecb.europa.eu, +496913441964** **Géraldine Orcel, Geraldine.Orcel@ecb.europa.eu, +49 1751829014**
Your reference:	
Scheme and document and version number:	Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to: EPC125-05 2023 SEPA Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC004-16 2023 SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook EPC016-06 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Core Rulebook EPC222-07 2023 SEPA Direct Debit Business to Business Rulebook EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook
Request Date:	**December 2023**
For information:	This template is provided by EPC to allow any person or organisation to submit a change request for making a change to the EPC Payment Schemes in accordance with the rules set out in the document 'EPC Payment Scheme Management Rules' available on the EPC Website.

1. General Description of the Change Request

1.1. Suggested launch date (if any):

23 November 2025

1.2. Description of the change request:

This EPC change request is submitted by the European Central Bank and is supported by a majority of the members of the TIPS Consultative Group (a group of the TIPS governance including PSPs and ACHS – see list of supportive members at the end of the document).

Today, the Unique End-to-End Transaction Reference (UETR) based on UUID v4 for an SCT Inst transaction is an optional field classified as a white field only (i.e. it can be developed and documented by Additional Optional Service (AOS) Communities).

Today's SEPA Instant Credit Transfer Scheme Customer-to-PSP Implementation Guidelines:

2.77	0..1	Customer Credit Transfer Initiation V09 +Payment Information ++Credit Transfer Transaction Information +++Payment Identification ++++UETR	ISO Name	UETR
			ISO Definition	Universally unique identifier to provide an end-to-end reference of a payment transaction.
			XML Tag	UETR
			Type	UUIDv4Identifier
			Pattern	[a-f0-9]{8}-[a-f0-9]{4}-4[a-f0-9]{3}-[89ab][a-f0-9]{3}-[a-f0-9]{12}

However, given the growing number of instant payments and the evolution of international industry standards (e.g. the EPC OCT Inst scheme, the CPMI report on harmonised ISO 20022 data requirements for cross-border payments and the ISO 20022 registration of new exception and investigation messages), **it appears appropriate to change the UETR in the SCT Inst scheme in order to classify the field as a yellow field** (i.e. still as on optional field but without the need for an AOS).

Allowing UETR as a yellow field would considerably help communities as it would:
- ease investigation & exceptions handling by providing a truly universally unique identifier
- strongly support the scheme participants while searching for the status of a particular transaction
- simplify back-end and operational processes

In fact, it appears that already today some financial institutions are forced into using temporary technical workarounds in order to be able to leverage the benefits of UETR/UUID v4 being a white field. These technical workarounds have the downside that financial institutions cannot benefit from the schema validation (in particular pattern validation according to UUID v4) foreseen by relevant ISO 20022 base messages. By classifying the UETR as yellow field these technical workarounds could be removed, and financial institutions could leverage the ISO 20022 schema validation foreseen for this purpose.

The aim of this change request is not to replace the Transaction Id. Contrary, the UETR would come as a complement if a scheme participant decided to add it in its transactions which eases the adoption on side of financial institutions not leveraging the benefits of UETR/UUID v4 for the time being.

Two additional benefits of this change are that:

1. it would align the SCT Inst scheme with the EPC OCT Inst scheme regarding the possibility to use UETR

   Today's One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer (OCT Inst) Scheme Inter-PSP Implementation Guidelines:

| 2.5 | 0..1 | FITo FICustomer Credit Transfer V08
+Credit Transfer Transaction Information
++Payment Identification
+++UETR | *EOLO Rulebook*

ISO Name
ISO Definition

XML Tag
Type
Pattern | *AT-T016 Unique End-to-End Transaction Reference (UETR).*
UETR
Universally unique identifier to provide an end-to-end reference of a payment transaction.
UETR
UUIDv4Identifier
[a-f0-9]{8}-[a-f0-9]{4}-4[a-f0-9]{3}-[89ab][a-f0-9]{3}-[a-f0-9]{12} |

2. Also, it would align the SCT Inst scheme with the Requirement #5 of the CPMI "To include a unique end-to-end reference for all cross-border payments"[1].

Consequently, this change would support the ISO 20022 work replacing the current investigation & exception handling messages to increase straight-through processing (STP) globally. The recently registered ISO 20022 investigation and exception handling messages (i.e. InvestigationRequestV01 - camt.110 &InvestigationRequestV01 - camt.111) make extensive use of UETR/UUID v4 and consider universally unique identification to be of high relevance for automation purposes.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

Yes

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

Yes

---

[1] The use of the UETR in cross-border payments will enable easier tracking and thereby improve transparency in cross-border payments. It will also simplify investigation and exception handling, facilitating automated processing solutions that enhance the speed of cross-border payments overall. This is also expected to indirectly reduce costs by enabling automation of inquiry and exception management processes.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

No

4. Impact on the message standards (EPC Payment Scheme Implementation Guidelines and other standards):

Yes

5. Impact on the legal rules as defined in chapter 5 of the EPC Payment Scheme Rulebooks:

No

6. The nature of the change request:

    a. ~~A change (an existing Rulebook element is deleted, amended or replaced by a new one, or a complete new Rulebook element is added alongside the existing Rulebook elements)~~

    b. A variant (adding an alternative – optional – rule alongside an existing Rulebook element)

2. Elements of evaluation

The submitting party is requested to give an appropriate answer to each of these questions with sufficient detail to allow the EPC to make an evaluation of the change request submitted.

Is the change request a case for SEPA wide adoption?	**Yes**
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	**No**
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	**Yes** **(This change reflects a technical evolution of international standards, as documented in the CPMI ISO 20022 harmonisation requirements in view of the G20 targets for enhancing cross-border payments as well as the industry initiative to increase the automation of exception and investigation process by replacing current ISO 20022 messages with the newly registered camt.110(InvestigationRequestV01) and camt.111 (InvestigationResponseV01))**
Do you consider that the implementation of the change resulting from the acceptance of the change request is feasible?	**Yes**
Do you consider that the change request does not impede SEPA-wide interoperability?	**Yes**
Do you consider that the change request is in the scope of the scheme involved?	**Yes**

Institutions of the TIPS-Consultative Group supporting this change request
European Central Bank
4CB
Banca d'Italia
Banco de España
Banco de Portugal
Bank of Greece
Banka Slovenije
Banque Centrale du Luxembourg
Banque de France
Banque Nationale de Belgique
De Nederlandsche Bank
Latvijas Banka
Lietuvos bankas
Národná banka Slovenska
Oesterreichische Nationalbank
Sveriges Riksbank
Bank of Finland
Central Bankof Croatia (HNB)
Danmarks Nationalbank
SWIFT
NEXI-Colt
Banque Internationale à Luxembourg SA
Rabobank
Poste Italiane S.p.A
Slovenska sporitelna
Tatra Banka
DIAS