



European
Payments Council

One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Scheme Rulebook

Public Consultation on 2024 Change Requests

EPC010-24 / Version 1.0 / Date issued: 12 March 2024

Public Consultation on 2024 Change Requests for OCT Inst Scheme Rulebook

EPC010-24
Version 1.0
Date issued: 12 March 2024



**European
Payments Council**

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

The 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 payment 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 OCT Inst 2024 Change Request Public Consultation Document (document EPC010-24) details change requests for possible modifications to be introduced into the next version of the OCT 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 OCT Inst 2024 Change Request Public Consultation Document offers the analyses and recommendations of the EPC One-Leg Out Task Force (OLO TF) on the way forward regarding individual change requests. A summary overview of the change requests and related recommendations by the OLO TF are provided in section 1 of this Change Request Public Consultation Document.

The EPC submits the OCT 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 OCT Inst scheme rulebook by completing the response template EPC015-24 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 OCT 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 OCT 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 OCT 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 OCT Inst scheme rulebook.

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



Therefore, the EPC reserves the right to make necessary changes to the OCT Inst scheme rulebook at all times in order to ensure that the OCT 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 OCT Inst Scheme Rulebook	7
1.1	EPC Approach	7
1.2	Overview of Change Requests and Proposed Way Forward for Consideration by Respondents to the Public Consultation	9
1.3	Overview of Changes to Align the Next Version of the OCT Inst Scheme Rulebook with any Existing EU Legislation and with the Entry into Force of New EU Legislation	10
2	Detailed Analysis of Major Change Requests to the OCT Inst Scheme Rulebook	11
2.1	# 03: New Entry-Into-Force Time of the SCT Inst and OCT Inst Scheme Rulebooks as of November 2025	11
2.1.1	Description	11
2.1.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	11
2.1.3	Rulebook impact	11
2.2	# 06: Introduction of Hybrid Address of the Payment End-User	12
2.2.1	Description	12
2.2.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	12
2.2.3	Rulebook impact	13
2.3	# 09: Introduce pacs.009 to Replace pacs.008 for Inter-PSP Transactions	14
2.3.1	Description	14
2.3.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	14
2.3.3	Rulebook impact	15
2.4	# 11: Extension of Character Length for Name	16
2.4.1	Description	16
2.4.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	16
2.4.3	Rulebook impact	16
2.5	# 14: Several Occurrences of 'Service Level' field for Incoming and Outgoing OCT Inst Transactions	17
2.5.1	Description	17
2.5.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	17
2.5.3	Rulebook impact	17
2.6	# 16: Hybrid Address Mandatory in Inter-PSP Space and PSPs Are Free to Set only Structured Address in the Customer-to-PSP Space	18
2.6.1	Description	18
2.6.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	18



2.6.3	Rulebook impact	18
2.7	# 17: Extension of Character Length for Name	19
2.7.1	Description	19
2.7.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	19
2.7.3	Rulebook impact	19
2.8	# 21: Extension of Character Length for Name	20
2.8.1	Description	20
2.8.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	20
2.8.3	Rulebook impact	20
2.9	# 22: Amend Implementation Guidelines to Have Two Different Message Sets.....	21
2.9.1	Description	21
2.9.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	21
2.9.3	Rulebook impact	22
2.10	# 23: Introduction of Hybrid Address to Align with CPMI Requirements	23
2.10.1	Description	23
2.10.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	23
2.10.3	Rulebook impact	23
2.11	# 24: Introduction of Common Time Convention for all Message Elements.....	24
2.11.1	Description	24
2.11.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	24
2.11.3	Rulebook impact	24
2.12	# 25: Change of Currency Check Rules at Application Level	25
2.12.1	Description	25
2.12.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	25
2.12.3	Rulebook impact	25
2.13	# 28: Integrate OCT Inst Scheme into SCT Inst Scheme	26
2.13.1	Description	26
2.13.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	26
2.13.3	Rulebook impact	26
2.14	# 29: Precisions on Recalls and Status Requests on Recalls.....	27
2.14.1	Description	27
2.14.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	27
2.14.3	Rulebook impact	27
2.15	# 30: Changes to the OCT Inst Inquiry Procedure	28



2.15.1	Description	28
2.15.2	OLO TF analysis and recommendation	28
2.15.3	Rulebook impact	28
3	Changes Pertaining to the Impact of the SEPA Regulation or any Other EU Legislation	29
4	Detailed Analysis of Minor Changes to the OCT Inst Scheme Rulebook.....	30
5	Principles Governing the Change Management Cycle	31
5.1	Change Request Public Consultation Document.....	31
5.2	Structure of the Change Request Public Consultation Document	31
6	Change Management Cycle in respect of Major Change Requests	32
6.1	Consideration of Change Requests	32
6.2	Change Request Public Consultation Document.....	32
6.3	OLO TF Recommendations	32
6.4	Public Consultation on the Change Requests.....	32
6.5	Next Steps.....	32
6.6	Further Information.....	33
7	Change Management Cycle in respect of Minor Change Requests	34
7.1	Publication of List of Minor Change Requests	34
7.2	Comments on the Minor Change Requests	34
7.3	Submission of the List of Minor Change Requests to the PSMB.....	34
	Annex 1 - Original Change Requests.....	35



1 Executive Summary: Major Change Requests to the OCT 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 OCT 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 payment 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 OCT Inst 2024 Change Request Public Consultation Document highlights change requests for major changes to the OCT Inst scheme rulebook received in this scheme change management cycle. Change requests for minor changes to the OCT Inst scheme rulebook are set out in section 4 of this Change Request Public Consultation Document. All change requests to the OCT 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 **15** change requests for major changes to be introduced into the OCT 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 OCT Inst scheme as of November 2025. Currently, the 2023 OCT 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 Payer, Payee and their respective reference parties from 70 to 140 characters.

One change request proposes that the entry-into-force time of the 2025 version and any future version of the OCT Inst scheme rulebook is set at 03:30 CET on the Sunday concerned. In practice, this would mean that the 2025 OCT 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 OCT Inst scheme rulebook version to the 2025 rulebook version.

One proposal is to allow several occurrences of the 'Service Level' field for both incoming and outgoing OCT Inst transactions. Other suggestions propose amendments to the OCT Inquiry procedure, and to the OCT Inst Recall procedure and the related Request for a Status Update on an OCT Inst Recall.

One item suggests the integration of the OCT Inst scheme into the SCT Inst scheme. Another change request proposes 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.



There are also suggestions to amend the OCT Inst scheme Implementation Guidelines (IGs) to have two different message sets, to introduce a common time convention for all message elements concerned and to change the currency check rules at application level.

All change requests to the OCT Inst scheme rulebook received were reviewed by the EPC One-Leg Out Task Force (OLO TF). These change requests include the recommendation of the OLO TF regarding each of these change requests unless the OLO TF is not able to provide a recommendation for the public consultation. Each recommendation reflects one of the options detailed in items a) through f) below:

- a) The change request is **already provided for** in the scheme: no action is necessary for the EPC.
- b) The change request **should be incorporated into the scheme**: the change request would become part of the scheme and the rulebook would be amended accordingly.
- c) The change request should be included in the scheme as an **optional feature**:
 - The new feature is optional and the rulebook would be amended accordingly;
 - Each scheme participant¹ may decide to offer the feature to its customers, or not.
- d) The change request is **not considered fit for SEPA wide use** and could be handled as an additional optional service (AOS) by interested communities:
 - The proposed new feature would not be included in the rulebook or in the implementation guidelines released by the EPC with regard to the rulebook;
 - The development of AOS is out of scope of the EPC. The EPC does however publish declared AOS arrangements on its website for information;
 - The EPC may consider the inclusion of AOS arrangements, if supported by enough communities, in a future version of the rulebook.
- e) The change request **cannot** be part of the existing scheme for one of the following reasons:
 - It is technically impossible;
 - It is not feasible (explained on a case by case basis);
 - It is out of scope of the EPC;
 - It does not comply with the SEPA Regulation² or any other relevant EU legislation.
- f) The change request may be considered for the development of a **new scheme**:
 - The change request reflects major changes which cannot be integrated into an existing scheme;
 - To develop the change request further, i.e. to develop a new scheme, the following requirements must be met:
 - The benefits of the new scheme for payment end users are demonstrated prior to the launch of the development phase;
 - It is demonstrated that enough stakeholders will make use of the new scheme;
 - A cost-benefit analysis is provided;
 - It complies with the SEPA Regulation or any other relevant Regulation.

¹ 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



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 OLO TF 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 OLO TF on the way forward.

In case the contributors do not agree with the OLO TF recommendation, they are requested to indicate in the comments section of the response template EPC015-24 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 OLO TF on the proposed way forward. The final decision is subject to the outcome of the public consultation.
03	New Entry-Into-Force Time of the SCT Inst and OCT Inst Scheme Rulebooks as of November 2025	OLO TF and the Payment Scheme Evolution and Maintenance Working Group (PSEMWG)	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
06	Introduction of Hybrid Address of the Payment End-User	OLO TF and the PSEMWG	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
11	Extension of Character Length for Name	OLO TF and the PSEMWG	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
14	Several Occurrences of 'Service Level' field for Incoming and Outgoing OCT Inst Transactions	OLO TF	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
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



Change Request item	Topic	Contributor	Recommendation of the OLO TF on the proposed way forward. The final decision is subject to the outcome of the public consultation.
21	Extension of Character Length for Name	Nordic Payments Council (NPC)	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
22	Amend IGs to Have Two Different Message Sets	European Central Bank	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
23	Introduction of Hybrid Address to Align with CPMI Requirements	European Central Bank	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
24	Introduction of Common Time Convention for all Message Elements	European Central Bank	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
25	Change of Currency Check Rules at Application Level	European Central Bank	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
28	Integrate OCT Inst Scheme into SCT Inst Scheme	Isbank AG	Cannot be part of the existing scheme - option e
29	Precisions on Recalls and Status Requests on Recalls	BPCE Group	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b
30	Changes to the OCT Inst Inquiry Procedure	OLO TF	Should be incorporated into the scheme - option b

1.3 Overview of Changes to Align the Next Version of the OCT 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 OCT Inst scheme rulebook due to any EU legislation.			



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

2.1 # 03: New Entry-Into-Force Time of the SCT Inst and OCT Inst Scheme Rulebooks as of November 2025

2.1.1 Description

This change request was made by the OLO TF and the Payment Scheme Evolution and Maintenance Working Group (PSEMWG)³.

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.

2.1.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

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

2.1.3 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 PSEMWG is in charge of the daily management of the four SEPA payment scheme rulebooks.



2.2 # 06: Introduction of Hybrid Address of the Payment End-User

2.2.1 Description

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

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 2023⁴, 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.

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 two 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.

2.2.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

Given that the OCT Inst scheme rulebook is designed to facilitate international payments, the OLO TF recommends aligning the OCT Inst scheme rulebook with all permitted types of addresses as set under the CBPR+ usage guidelines.

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

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

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.



The provision of fully structured addresses remains supported under the 2025 OCT Inst scheme rulebook 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 OCT Inst transactions. Scheme participants cannot reject OCT Inst transactions only due to the inclusion of a structured address.

2. As of the entry-into-force date of the 2025 OCT Inst scheme rulebook 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 OCT Inst transactions.

From that same date, also OCT Inst scheme participants are allowed to provide hybrid addresses in their inter-PSP OCT Inst 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 OCT Inst transactions. From this date, scheme participants cannot reject OCT Inst transactions only due to the inclusion of a hybrid address.

3. As of the entry-into-force date of the 2025 OCT Inst scheme rulebook being 16 November 2025 up to 22 November 2026, payment end users and scheme participants are allowed to continue providing unstructured addresses in their respective electronic Customer-to-PSP files and inter-PSP OCT Inst 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 OCT Inst transactions. Scheme participants cannot reject OCT Inst 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 OCT Inst 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.

2.2.3 Rulebook impact

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



2.3 # 09: Introduce pacs.009 to Replace pacs.008 for Inter-PSP Transactions

2.3.1 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 Transfers (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.

2.3.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

The OLO TF 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 which was taken as inspiration for the OCT Inst inquiry procedure:

- 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/OCT Inst transaction and the inter-PSP payment for an inter-PSP fee/interest compensation related to that SCT/OCT Inst 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 OLO TF is also unsure whether low-value high-volume retail payment CSMs would be willing to handle FI-to-FI payments as well.

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



2.3.3 Rulebook impact

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



2.4 # 11: Extension of Character Length for Name

2.4.1 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 name fields for the following attributes under the OCT Inst scheme rulebook: 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).

It suggests extending the character length for the 'Name' field for the OCT Inst scheme (and all four SEPA payment schemes) **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 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 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).

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

2.4.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

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

2.4.3 Rulebook impact

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



2.5 # 14: Several Occurrences of 'Service Level' field for Incoming and Outgoing OCT Inst Transactions

2.5.1 Description

This change request was made by the OLO TF.

The Customer-to-PSP Implementation Guidelines (IGs) and the Inter-PSP IGs for incoming and outgoing OCT Inst transactions stipulate that only one occurrence of the 'service level' field is allowed.

The suggestion is to allow several occurrences of the 'service level' field for both incoming and outgoing OCT Inst transactions.

For outgoing OCT Inst transactions, the Euro Leg-Based Payer or the Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP can indicate that the first leg (Euro Leg) must be processed as an OCT Inst transaction (EOLO) but that the second leg (non-Euro Leg) must be processed under a specific service (e.g., SWIFT Go, local instant or non-instant retail payment scheme or system, local RTGS, wallet solution etc). It gives the Euro Leg Exit PSP the indication how the Euro Leg-Based Payer or the Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP wants to process that OCT Inst transaction in the non-Euro Leg.

For incoming OCT Inst transactions, the Euro Leg Entry PSP, the Inter-PSP parties and the Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP get extra valuable information on how the first leg (non-Euro Leg) had been processed.

2.5.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

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

2.5.3 Rulebook impact

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



2.6 # 16: Hybrid Address Mandatory in Inter-PSP Space and PSPs Are Free to Set only Structured Address in the Customer-to-PSP Space

2.6.1 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 'OCT 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.

2.6.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

The OLO TF recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**). Reference is made to the change request item # 06 (see section 2.2 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 Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP is obliged to support at the request of the Payer. The section 0.5.1 of the rulebook points out that these IGs are **binding** supplements for the scheme participants.

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 # 17: Extension of Character Length for Name

2.7.1 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 OCT Inst scheme, from 70 to 140 characters.

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

2.7.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

The OLO TF 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 2.4 in this document).

2.7.3 Rulebook impact

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



2.8 # 21: Extension of Character Length for Name

2.8.1 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 OCT Inst scheme, from 70 to 140 characters.

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

2.8.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

The OLO TF 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 2.4 in this document).

2.8.3 Rulebook impact

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



2.9 # 22: Amend Implementation Guidelines to Have Two Different Message Sets

2.9.1 Description

This change request was made by the European Central Bank (ECB).

The contributor sees a complexity within the current OCT Inst scheme Inter-PSP Implementation Guidelines (IGs) on the messages and business cases to be implemented in order to comply with the scheme.

Unlike what is currently foreseen by the SCT Inst scheme, the OCT Inst IGs contain an additional number of messages and business cases suitable to (i) accommodate specific PSP needs and (ii) respond to actions occurring in the non-Euro Leg. In addition, the allowed messages/business cases depend on the flow direction, outgoing (from Euro Leg to non-Euro Leg) or incoming (from non-Euro Leg to Euro Leg).

In order to be OCT Inst compliant, CSMs and PSPs must implement in full the two Inter-PSP IGs covering both incoming/ outgoing OCT Inst transactions. The level of complexity related to the adoption of OCT Inst specifications is increased by (i) the distinction of messages and business cases to be used depending on the flow direction for the same message and (ii) a number of additional messages/business cases to be supported compared to what is currently in place for the instant scheme already regulated by the EPC, i.e. the SCT Inst scheme.

The contributor suggests amending the IGs in order to have two different sets of messages/business cases: a first set composed by core mandatory messages/business cases (e.g. pacs.008/pacs.002 for the settlement flow and pacs.028 investigation); and a second one composed by optional messages/business cases (all remaining messages and business cases, to be adopted depending on the specific needs of the PSPs part of each CSM community).

This would allow a two-stage adoption approach, with the second optional set being implemented based on the community needs, thus reducing complexity and facilitating - and potentially promoting - the adoption of the overall scheme.

2.9.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

The OLO TF recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**). PSPs who wish to support only incoming OCT Inst transactions in the role of Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP and potentially Euro Leg Entry PSP as well, will only implement the incoming OCT Inst inter-PSP IGs. This will be indicated on their adherence application.

In case these PSPs wish to support outgoing OCT Inst transactions as well in a later stage, only then they will then have to support the outgoing OCT Inst Customer-to-PSP and Inter-PSP IGs.

Furthermore, the OLO TF does not see this change request just as a technical change limited to the IGs only. It directly affects the current business rules and procedures described in the OCT Inst scheme rulebook. Instead, the contributor could have pointed out which procedures under the OCT Inst scheme rulebook could be amended, made optional or taken out.

On the other hand, the OLO TF is open to further discussions with CSMs interested in offering OCT Inst scheme-based services how this change request could be accommodated outside the regular change management cycle process.



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 only.



2.10 # 23: Introduction of Hybrid Address to Align with CPMI Requirements

2.10.1 Description

This change request was made by the European Central Bank (ECB).

The contributor suggests providing structured postal address information to the extent possible to avoid unstructured, free-formatted address options.

The solution proposed by the Payments Market Practice Group (PMPG) and the G20 is to make use of 'Country' and 'Town Name' as minimum required structured postal address information (with the possible addition of 'Postal Code'). This will support a faster processing of cross-border payments, especially facilitating screening processes and prevent the need for manual interventions (e.g., for sanctions checks).

2.10.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

The OLO TF 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 # 06 (see section 2.2 in this document).

2.10.3 Rulebook impact

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



2.11 # 24: Introduction of Common Time Convention for all Message Elements

2.11.1 Description

This change request was made by the European Central Bank (ECB).

The contributor suggests specifying that the datatype “ISODateTime” used for the following message elements is expressed either in Universal Time Coordinated (UTC) or local time with UTC offset:

- Creation Date Time
- Credit Date Time
- Debit Date Time
- Acceptance Date Time

This change request is made with the Requirement #4 “To use a common time convention across all ISO 20022 messages associated with cross-border payments” of the CPML in mind.

Currently, only the Acceptance Date Time message element carries the following EOLO Usage Rule “The Timestamp must be unambiguous and at least include seconds. Only UTC time format or local time with UTC offset format can be used.”.

Making use of a common time convention would be beneficial to support the G20 target for increased speed and transparency in cross-border payment processing times by providing all times in harmonised and unambiguous ways.

2.11.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

The OLO TF suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025** but with the modifications as described below as a distinction must be made between the incoming and outgoing OCT Inst transaction flows:

INCOMING:

For the element ‘Acceptance Date Time’ (AT-T056 Euro Leg Time Stamp of the OCT Inst), the proposed usage rule is that the Time Stamp must be unambiguous and at least include milliseconds and allows two date time formats (i.e. UTC and UTC offset).

For the elements ‘Creation Date Time’ and ‘Settlement Time Indication/Debit Date Time’ (AT-T057 Non-Euro Leg Time Stamp of the OCT Inst), the proposed usage rule “*This is the date time format as received from the non-Euro leg*” is added.

OUTGOING:

For the elements ‘Creation Date Time’, ‘Interbank Settlement Date’ (AT-T051 The Settlement Date of the Euro Leg of the OCT Inst) and ‘Acceptance Date Time’ (AT-T056 Euro Leg Time Stamp of the OCT Inst), the proposed usage rule is that the Time Stamp must be unambiguous and at least include milliseconds and allows two date time formats (i.e. UTC and UTC offset).

2.11.3 Rulebook impact

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



2.12 # 25: Change of Currency Check Rules at Application Level

2.12.1 Description

This change request was made by the European Central Bank (ECB).

The contributor sees a complexity within the current OCT Inst scheme Inter-PSP Implementation Guidelines (IGs) on the currency restriction to EUR for one leg of the OCT Inst transaction.

The OCT Inst IGs refer to the Usage Rule “Only ‘EUR’ is allowed” in several fields of both outgoing and incoming IGs, due to the nature of the scheme. As for the OCT Inst XSDs, the implementation of this Usage Rule is the definition of a special datatype for these amount fields, which has the attribute field currency (Ccy) composed by an enumeration of only ‘EUR’ as possible currency.

The contributor is of the view that this approach results in a rigid implementation solution. It does not give the Clearing and Settlement Mechanisms (CSMs) the flexibility to choose a different approach, such as implementing the check at application level. The latter approach is the one generally used for more complex Usage Rules defined in both OCT Inst and SCT Inst schemes.

The contributor proposes amending the way in which the OLO Usage Rule “Only ‘EUR’ is allowed” can be technically implemented, i.e. by removing the constraint present at OCT Inst XSD level (for all messages involved, e.g. pacs.008, pacs.004, camt.056, camt.029, etc.) while keeping the above-mentioned OLO Usage Rule included in the IGs, in order to ensure that at least the ‘EUR’ currency is supported.

This change would allow CSMs - whose main purpose is to provide all clearing and settlement services that enable each client-PSP to fulfil its obligations as EPC payment scheme participant - to design their own solutions for the implementation of the OLO’s “Only ‘EUR’ is allowed” Usage Rule.

2.12.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

The OLO TF recommends not taking forward the change request (**option e**) as it is out of scope of the OCT Inst scheme. If euro would be removed in the XSDs then it is no longer an “EOLO” XSD (Euro One Leg Out). The related usage rule specifies that only “EOLO” can be used as Service Level Code (AT-T001 The identification code of the Scheme). In addition, the XSDs must follow the usage rules and the XSDs are not made for production purposes.

2.12.3 Rulebook impact

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



2.13 # 28: Integrate OCT Inst Scheme into SCT Inst Scheme

2.13.1 Description

This change request was made by Isbank AG.

The contributor proposes integrating the OCT Inst scheme into the SCT Inst scheme.

The contributor points out that the OCT Inst and SCT Inst schemes are currently different schemes and participation in each different scheme is troublesome and costly, especially for small and medium-sized PSPs.

Therefore, if the OCT Inst scheme can be integrated into the SCT Inst scheme, the current SCT Inst scheme participants can benefit from this opportunity more easily.

We would also like to point out that we think the participation of the OCT Inst scheme may be low since the two schemes are separate. However, if the two schemes merge and SCT Inst becomes mandatory, OCT Inst scheme will embrace the entire EU geography.

A standalone OCT Inst scheme would likely increase both operational and associated scheme costs.

2.13.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

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

The integration of international payment processing having more attributes, different usage rules, and more regulatory requirements than 'national' SEPA payments, into the SCT Inst scheme would force all SCT Inst scheme participants to make investments to support a certain type of payment transaction.

Some SCT Inst scheme participants may not even support international payment services at all because they do not see a business case in it (e.g., their customer base simply does not request such service, or their customers already use other payment means or other PSPs for such international payments).

There would also be less flexibility to let the OCT Inst transaction features rapidly evolve to international payment market needs. A two-thirds majority of SCT Inst scheme participant representatives would have to agree upon the introduction of OCT Inst scheme-specific features.

Therefore, the EPC decided to develop a standalone scheme supporting both incoming and outgoing one-leg out credit transfers, being optional for SEPA PSPs to adhere. The EPC wants to give PSPs complete freedom in deciding whether to use (or not) the OCT Inst scheme for sending or receiving international credit transfers.

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 # 29: Precisions on Recalls and Status Requests on Recalls

2.14.1 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.

2.14.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

The OLO TF 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.

2.14.3 Rulebook impact

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



2.15 # 30: Changes to the OCT Inst Inquiry Procedure

2.15.1 Description

This change request was made by the OLO TF.

It proposes some changes to the OCT Inst inquiry procedure in the OCT Inst scheme rulebook. It aligns the rulebook with the technical specifications worked out in the Inter-PSP Implementation Guidelines (IGs) for this procedure.

After the version 1.0 of the 2023 OCT Inst scheme rulebook was published in March 2023, the IGs were then worked out in Q2 2023. During the development of these IGs, the EPC Standards Task Force concerned considered how to set specifications in relation to the OCT Inst inquiry procedure.

Consequently, there are currently some minor disconnects between the IGs concerned and the OCT Inst scheme rulebook.

2.15.2 OLO TF analysis and recommendation

The OLO TF suggests incorporating the change request into the scheme (**option b**) entering into effect as of **November 2025**. The suggested amendments align the OCT Inst scheme rulebook with the IGs.

2.15.3 Rulebook impact

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



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 OCT Inst Scheme Rulebook

For this release management cycle, the following minor changes have been raised:

Section	Description	Reason for change	Type of Change
Section 1.4 of the three Implementation Guidelines	The special character underscore _ is missing, and the direction of the accent ´ is to be verified	To be fully aligned with the CBPR+ special character set	Change



5 Principles Governing the Change Management Cycle

5.1 Change Request Public Consultation Document

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

5.2 Structure of the Change Request Public Consultation Document

Sections 2, 3 and 4 describe the changes to the OCT 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 OCT 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 OCT Inst scheme rulebook. These changes consist of minor changes to the OCT 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 OCT 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 EPC. 15 of these are applicable to the OCT Inst scheme.

Following consideration of these change requests as required under chapter 4.1.6 of the Internal Rules, the OLO TF has determined: (a) that the change requests set out in section 2 and 3 meet the criteria for acceptance into the 2024 OCT 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 OLO TF 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 OLO TF 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 OLO TF Recommendations

The OLO TF 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 OCT 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 OLO TF on the way forward. In case the contributors do not agree with the OLO TF 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 OCT Inst scheme to ensure that the views of the payment services constituency are considered in the public consultation process. The OLO TF 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 OLO TF 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 OLO TF Change Proposals.

Approved change requests will be incorporated into the version 1.0 of the 2025 OCT 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 OLO TF has identified certain minor change requests which they consider necessary for the OCT Inst scheme rulebook.

The OLO TF 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 #03

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) 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:	<u>Highlight which EPC Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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



European
Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #06

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

**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:	<u>Highlight which EPC Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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 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 2023¹, 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 two 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

Preferred

Fully structured

- All available address data is mapped into one of the 14 ISO20022 fields
- No co-mingling of data
- No combination with "AdrLine" allowed

```
<Cdtr>
  <Nm>JOHN SMITH</Nm>
  <PstlAdr>
    <StrtNm>HOOGSTRAAT</StrtNm>
    <BldgNb>6</BldgNb>
    <Flr>18</Flr>
    <PstlCd>1000</PstlCd>
    <TwnNm>BRUSSELS</TwnNm>
    <Ctry>BE</Ctry>
  </PstlAdr>
</Cdtr>
```

Unstructured

- No combination with structured ISO20022 address elements allowed
- Difficulty to interpret data due to co-mingling of address elements

```
<Cdtr>
  <Nm>JOHN SMITH</Nm>
  <PstlAdr>
    <AdrLine>HOOGSTRAAT 6, 18th floor</AdrLine>
    <AdrLine>1000 BRUSSELS</AdrLine>
    <AdrLine>BE</AdrLine>
  </PstlAdr>
</Cdtr>
```

new

Hybrid *In scope of PMPG CR*

- Combination of structured ISO20022 address elements **and** up to 2 lines of 70 characters of unstructured "AdrLine" allowed
- Elements available in structured format must be mapped into the respective structured element (minimum: TownName & Country)
- Structured elements must not be repeated in the AdrLine element(s)

Network validation rules

Textual rule

```
<Cdtr>
  <Nm>JOHN SMITH</Nm>
  <PstlAdr>
    <PstlCd>1000</PstlCd>
    <TwnNm>BRUSSELS</TwnNm>
    <Ctry>BE</Ctry>
    <AdrLine>HOOGSTRAAT 6, 18th floor</AdrLine>
  </PstlAdr>
</Cdtr>
```

November 2026 Onwards

Preferred

Fully structured

- All available address data is mapped into one of the 14 ISO20022 fields
- No co-mingling of data
- No combination with "AdrLine" allowed

```
<Cdtr>
  <Nm>JOHN SMITH</Nm>
  <PstlAdr>
    <StrtNm>HOOGSTRAAT</StrtNm>
    <BldgNb>6</BldgNb>
    <Flr>18</Flr>
    <PstlCd>1000</PstlCd>
    <TwnNm>BRUSSELS</TwnNm>
    <Ctry>BE</Ctry>
  </PstlAdr>
</Cdtr>
```

Unstructured

- No combination with structured ISO20022 address elements allowed
- Difficulty to interpret data due to co-mingling of address elements

```
<Cdtr>
  <Nm>JOHN SMITH</Nm>
  <PstlAdr>
    <AdrLine>HOOGSTRAAT 6, 18th floor</AdrLine>
    <AdrLine>1000 BRUSSELS</AdrLine>
    <AdrLine>BE</AdrLine>
  </PstlAdr>
</Cdtr>
```

new

Hybrid *In scope of PMPG CR*

- Combination of structured ISO20022 address elements **and** up to 2 lines of 70 characters of unstructured "AdrLine" allowed
- Elements available in structured format must be mapped into the respective structured element (minimum: TownName & Country)
- Structured elements must not be repeated in the AdrLine element(s)

Network validation rules

Textual rule

```
<Cdtr>
  <Nm>JOHN SMITH</Nm>
  <PstlAdr>
    <PstlCd>1000</PstlCd>
    <TwnNm>BRUSSELS</TwnNm>
    <Ctry>BE</Ctry>
    <AdrLine>HOOGSTRAAT 6, 18th floor</AdrLine>
  </PstlAdr>
</Cdtr>
```

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 fully structured 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 unstructured 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
	<p>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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>

Identification:	AT-E004
Name:	The address of the Beneficiary
Description:	<p>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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>

B. SCT Inst rulebook

4.6 Business Requirements for Attributes

Identification:	AT-P005
Name:	The address of the Originator
Description:	<p>The information should reflect the address of the Payment Account holder being debited.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>

Identification:	AT-E004
Name:	The address of the Beneficiary
Description:	<p>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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>

C. SDD Core rulebook and Annex VII



4.8.6 AT-E004 – The Address of the Creditor

Description:	<p>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.</p> <p>Important: <i>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.</i></p>
---------------------	--

4.8.10 AT-P005 - The Address of the Debtor

Description:	<p>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.</p> <p>Important: <i>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.</i></p>
---------------------	---

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:	<p>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.</p> <p>Important: <i>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.</i></p>
---------------------	--

4.8.10 AT-P005 - The Address of the Debtor

Description:	<p>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.</p> <p>Important: <i>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.</i></p>
---------------------	---

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:	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Identification:	AT-P008
Name:	The address of the Payer Reference Party
Description:	<p>The information should reflect the address of a person or entity in relation to whom a Payer makes a payment.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Identification:	AT-E004
Name:	The address of the Payee
Description:	<p>The address of the Payee as supplied by the Payer.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Identification:	AT-E009
Name:	The address of the Payee Reference Party
Description:	<p>The information should reflect the address of a person or entity in relation to whom a Payee receives a payment.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>



Identification:	AT-D006
Name:	The address of the non-Euro Leg Payer's FI
Description:	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Identification:	AT-C006
Name:	The address of the non-Euro Leg Payee's FI
Description:	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Identification:	AT-X005
Name:	The address of the Intermediary FI(s) of the non-Euro Leg Payer's FI
Description:	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

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 #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:	<u>Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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 ¹CPMI 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 #11

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) 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:	<u>Highlight which EPC Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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 #12 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 #14

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:	One-Leg Out Task Force (OLO TF)
Organisation:	EPC
Address:	
Contact details:	
Your reference:	#14-OCT Inst-EPC-Several occurrences of 'service level' field for incoming and outgoing OCT Inst transactions
Scheme and document and version number:	<u>Highlight which EPC Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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 OCT Inst scheme rulebook.

1.2. Description of the change request:

The Customer-to-PSP Implementation Guidelines (IGs) and the Inter-PSP IGs for incoming and outgoing OCT Inst transactions stipulate that only one occurrence of the 'service level' field is allowed. The IGs specify the following:

“The use of OCT Inst is implied by element ‘Service Level’ being mandatory and ‘Code’ set to “EOLO” (Euro One Leg Out) and element ‘Local Instrument’ being mandatory and ‘Code’ set to “INST” (Instant Credit Transfer) only.”

The suggestion is to allow several occurrences of the 'service level' field for both incoming and outgoing OCT Inst transactions.

For outgoing OCT Inst transactions, the Euro Leg-Based Payer or the Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP can indicate that the first leg (Euro Leg) must be processed as an OCT Inst transaction (EOLO) but that the second leg (non-Euro Leg) must be processed under a specific service (e.g., SWIFT Go, local instant or non-instant retail payment scheme or system, local RTGS, wallet solution etc). It gives the Euro Leg Exit PSP the indication how the Euro Leg-Based Payer or the Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP wants to process that OCT Inst transaction in the non-Euro Leg.

For incoming OCT Inst transactions, the Euro Leg Entry PSP, the Inter-PSP parties and the Euro Leg-Based Payee's PSP get extra valuable information on how the first leg (non-Euro Leg) had been processed.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

No. This change does not affect any business rules.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

Yes. The Euro Leg PSPs obtain more information about how the non-Euro Leg of the OCT Inst transaction should be processed or has been processed.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

Yes. Payment service users can indicate via which non-Euro Leg networks or payment systems they want to see their outgoing international transactions being processed. They can also get valuable information about the non-Euro Leg service their incoming transaction has been processed under.

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

Small impact. More occurrences of the service level field can happen.



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 all parties with upfront transparency about how the OCT Inst transaction has been processed or must be processed in the respective legs.
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	NO. Not necessary. Just one ISO 20022 message element can now have multiple occurrences.
Does the change fit into the strategic objectives for SEPA?	YES. It gives the Payer in the Euro Leg the possibility to indicate how the OCT Inst transaction should be processed 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 service level field is already a yellow mandatory field.
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 #16

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 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:	<u>Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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 data 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



European
Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #17

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 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:	<u>Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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 AT-P001 Name of the Originator. SEPA Usage Rule(s) Mandatory. ISO Name Name ISO Definition Name by which a party is known and which is usually used to identify that party. XML Tag Nm Type Max140Text ISO Length 1 .. 140 SEPA Length 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 data 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 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 #21

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:	<u>Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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	<i>SEPA Rulebook</i> AT-P001 Name of the Originator. <i>SEPA Usage Rule(s)</i> Mandatory. <i>'Name' is limited to 70 characters in length.</i> ISO Name Name ISO Definition Name by which a party is known and which is usually used to identify that party. XML Tag Nm Type Max140Text ISO Length 1 .. 140 SEPA Length 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



European
Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #22

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:	European Central Bank
Organisation:	European Central Bank
Address:	Sonnemannstraße 20, 60314 Frankfurt am Main
Contact details:	Roberta Bezzi, roberta.bezzi@ecb.europa.eu , Sriramulu Tadepalli, sriramulu.tadepalli@ecb.europa.eu ,
Your reference:	
Scheme and document and version number:	<u>Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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):

At the earliest possible point in time.

1.2. Description of the change request:

Situation, Issue and proposed mitigation solution:

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).

The identified complexity lies in the way in which the current One-Leg Out (OLO) Instant Credit Transfer (OCT Inst) scheme Inter-PSP Implementation Guidelines (IGs) have been structured, with particular reference to the messages and business cases to be implemented in order to comply with the scheme.

Unlike what is currently foreseen by the SCT Inst scheme, the OCT Inst IGs contain an additional number of messages and business cases suitable to (i) accommodate specific PSP needs and (ii) respond to actions occurring in the non-Euro Leg. In addition, the allowed messages/business cases depend on the flow direction, OUTGOING (from Euro Leg to non-Euro Leg) or INCOMING (from non-Euro Leg to Euro Leg).

For example, comparing the OCT Inst scheme with the SCT Inst scheme:

- a new message is supported (camt.027 – OCT Inst Inquiry) and new business cases have been created for pacs.028, camt.029, pacs.008 and pacs.004 – for the OUTGOING flow direction;
- the only allowed business cases are: Settlement of OLO Instant Payments (pacs.008, pacs.002), Recall (camt.056, pacs.004, camt.029) and Investigation on OLO IP and Recall (pacs.028) – for the INCOMING flow direction.

Considering that to be OCT Inst compliant CSMs and PSPs must implement in full the two Inter-PSP IGs covering both INCOMING / OUTGOING OCT Inst transactions, the level of complexity related to the adoption of OCT Inst specifications is increased by (i) the distinction of messages and business cases to be used depending on the flow direction for the same message and (ii) a number of additional messages/business cases to be supported compared to what is currently in place for the instant scheme already regulated by the EPC, i.e. the SCT Inst.

With this change request it is proposed to amend the IGs in order to have two different sets of messages/business cases: a first set composed by core mandatory messages/business cases (e.g. pacs.008/pacs.002 for the *settlement flow* and pacs.028 *investigation*) and a second one composed by optional messages/business cases (all remaining messages and business cases, to be adopted depending on the specific needs of the PSPs part of each CSM community).



This would allow a two-stage adoption approach, with the second optional set being implemented based on the community needs, thus reducing complexity and facilitating - and potentially promoting - the adoption of the overall scheme.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

Yes, impact on the OCT Inst 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 how the OCT Inst Implementation Guidelines are structured.

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)
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
Deutsche Bundesbank
Latvijas Banka
Lietuvos bankas
Národná banka Slovenska
Oesterreichische Nationalbank
Sveriges Riksbank
Bank of Finland
Central Bank of Croatia (HNB)
Danmarks Nationalbank
SWIFT
NEXI-Colt
Deutsche Bank
Commerzbank
Banque Internationale à Luxembourg SA
ABN AMRO Bank
Poste Italiane S.p.A
Intesa Sanpaolo
Slovenska sporitelna
Tatra Banka
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 #23

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:	European Central Bank
Organisation:	European Central Bank
Address:	Sonnemannstraße 20, 60314 Frankfurt am Main
Contact details:	Roberta Bezzi, roberta.bezzi@ecb.europa.eu , Marek Kozok, marek.kozok@ecb.europa.eu
Your reference:	
Scheme and document and version number:	<u>Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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):

At the earliest point in time. For November 2025, aligned with the use of hybrid postal address as proposed by the Payments Market Practice Group¹.

1.2. Description of the change request:

Situation, Issue and proposed mitigation solution:

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 EPC OCT Inst EOLO Usage Rule for the message element “Postal Address” indicates that: **If ‘Address Line’ is used, then ‘Postal Address’ sub-elements other than ‘Country’ are forbidden. A combination of ‘Address Line’ and ‘Country’ is allowed. If ‘Address Line’ is not used, then at least ‘Town Name’ and ‘Country’ must be used.**

In order to align the OCT Inst scheme with CPMI **Requirement #9** “To identify all entities involved in a cross-border payment in a standardised and structured way”, **requirement #10** “To identify all persons involved in a cross-border payment in a standardised and structured way” and **requirement #11** “To provide a common minimum level of postal address information structured to the extent possible”, the **proposal would be to provide structured postal address information**, avoiding unstructured, free-formatted address options to the extent possible.

The **solution proposed by the Payments Market Practice Group (PMPG) and the G20 is to make use of Country and Town Name as minimum required structured postal address information** (with the possible addition of Postal Code), in order to support a faster processing of cross-border payments, especially facilitating screening processes and prevent the need for manual interventions (e.g., for sanctions checks).

Therefore, this change request aims at amending the above mentioned EOLO Usage Rule for the message element “Postal Address” as follows: *If ‘Address Line’ is used, then ‘Postal Address’ sub-elements other than ‘Country’ and **‘Town Name’** are forbidden. A combination of ‘Address Line’, ‘Country’ and **‘Town Name’** is allowed. If ‘Address Line’ is not used, then at least ‘Town Name’ and ‘Country’ must be used.*

¹ Please refer to <https://www.swift.com/swift-resource/252113/download> for further information.



1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

Yes, impact on the OCT Inst Implementation Guidelines

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

Yes

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

No

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

Yes, impact on the OCT Inst Implementation Guidelines

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)
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
Deutsche Bundesbank
Latvijas Banka
Lietuvos bankas
Národná banka Slovenska
Oesterreichische Nationalbank
Sveriges Riksbank
Bank of Finland
Central Bank of Croatia (HNB)
Danmarks Nationalbank
SWIFT
NEXI-Colt
Deutsche Bank
Commerzbank
Banque Internationale à Luxembourg SA
ABN AMRO Bank
Poste Italiane S.p.A
Intesa Sanpaolo
Slovenska sporitelna
Tatra Banka
DIAS
BPCE

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme



European
Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #24

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:	European Central Bank
Organisation:	European Central Bank
Address:	Sonnemannstraße 20, 60314 Frankfurt am Main
Contact details:	Roberta Bezzi, roberta.bezzi@ecb.europa.eu , Marek Kozok, marek.kozok@ecb.europa.eu
Your reference:	
Scheme and document and version number:	<u>Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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):

At the earliest possible point in time.

1.2. Description of the change request:

Situation, Issue and proposed mitigation solution:

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 EPC OCT Inst scheme implementation guidelines define the use of datatype “ISODatetime” for the following fields part of the EOLO Core Mandatory Subset: Creation Date Time, Credit Date Time, Debit Date Time and Acceptance Date Time. However, only the Acceptance Date Time field carries the following EOLO Usage Rule “The Timestamp must be unambiguous and at least include seconds. Only UTC time format or local time with UTC offset format can be used.”

In line with Requirement #4 of the CPML “To use a common time convention across all ISO 20022 messages associated with cross-border payments”, this change request aims at **specifying that the datatype “ISODatetime” used for all fields mentioned above is expressed either in Universal Time Coordinated (UTC) or local time with UTC offset.**

Making use of common time convention would be beneficial “to support the G20 target for increased speed and transparency in cross-border payment processing times by providing all times in harmonised and unambiguous ways”¹. Contrary, the inconsistent use of time indications in ISO 20022 messages may cause confusion and complicate the task of meeting time-sensitive processing requests.

Furthermore, the implementation effort is not expected to be significant, as the use of such time convention is already supported by most systems and solutions today.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

Yes, impact on the OCT Inst Implementation Guidelines

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

Yes

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

¹ [Harmonised ISO 20022 data requirements \(bis.org\)](https://www.bis.org)



No

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

Yes, impact on the OCT Inst Implementation Guidelines

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)
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
Deutsche Bundesbank
Latvijas Banka
Lietuvos bankas
Národná banka Slovenska
Oesterreichische Nationalbank
Sveriges Riksbank
Bank of Finland
Central Bank of Croatia (HNB)
Danmarks Nationalbank
SWIFT
NEXI-Colt
Deutsche Bank
Commerzbank
Banque Internationale à Luxembourg SA
ABN AMRO Bank
Poste Italiane S.p.A
Intesa Sanpaolo
Slovenska sporitelna
Tatra Banka
DIAS
BPCE

Template for Proposing a Change Request in an EPC Payment Scheme



European
Payments Council

EPC 164-21
Version 1.1
28 March 2023

CR #25

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:	European Central Bank
Organisation:	European Central Bank
Address:	Sonnemannstraße 20, 60314 Frankfurt am Main
Contact details:	Roberta Bezzi, roberta.bezzi@ecb.europa.eu , Sriramulu Tadepalli, sriramulu.tadepalli@ecb.europa.eu ,
Your reference:	
Scheme and document and version number:	<u>Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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):

At the earliest possible point in time.

1.2. Description of the change request:

Situation, Issue and proposed mitigation solution:

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).

The identified complexity lies in the way in which the current One-Leg Out (OLO) Instant Credit Transfer (OCT Inst) scheme Inter-PSP Implementation Guidelines (IGs) have been structured, with particular reference to the message XSDs and the way the restriction on the currency to EUR has been implemented for one leg of the OLO transaction.

The OCT Inst IGs refer to the OLO Usage Rule “*Only ‘EUR’ is allowed*” in several fields of both OUTGOING and INCOMING IGs, due to the nature of the scheme. Examples of such fields are the *Total Interbank Settlement Amount* and *Interbank Settlement Amount* fields in pacs.008, *Total Returned Interbank Settlement Amount*, *Original Interbank Settlement Amount* and *Returned Instructed Amount* fields in pacs.004, *Original Interbank Settlement Amount* in camt.056, etc.

As for OCT Inst XSDs, the suggested implementation of this OLO Usage Rule is the definition of a special datatype for these amount fields, which has the attribute field currency (Ccy) composed by an enumeration of only ‘EUR’ as possible currency.

This approach, although in line with the purpose of the OCT Inst and the mandate of the EPC, results in a rigid implementation solution, which does not give the CSMs the flexibility to choose a different approach such as implementing the check at application level. The latter approach is the one generally used for more complex Usage Rules defined in both OCT Inst and SCT Inst schemes.

With this change request it is proposed to amend the way in which the OLO Usage Rule “*Only ‘EUR’ is allowed*” can be technically implemented, i.e. by removing the constraint present at OCT Inst XSD level (for all messages involved, e.g. pacs.008, pacs.004, camt.056, camt.029, etc.) while keeping the above-mentioned OLO Usage Rule included in the IGs, in order to ensure that at least the ‘EUR’ currency is supported.

This change would allow CSMs - whose main purpose is to provide all clearing and settlement services that enable each client-PSP to fulfil its obligations as EPC payment scheme participant - to design their own solutions for the implementation of the OLO’s “*Only ‘EUR’ is allowed*” Usage Rule. From a CSM standpoint, this could imply a number of necessary adaptations at application layer, in agreement with their own communities, provided that the result still complies with the rules of the EPC payment schemes. This approach would allow a clear separation between the “scheme layer” and clearing & settlement or “infrastructure layer” that is part of the competitive market space and, as such, outside the scope of the EPC activities.



1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

Yes, impact on the OCT Inst Implementation Guidelines XSDs.

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 XSD structure of messages described in the OCT Inst Implementation Guidelines.

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)
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
Deutsche Bundesbank
Latvijas Banka
Lietuvos bankas
Národná banka Slovenska
Oesterreichische Nationalbank
Sveriges Riksbank
Bank of Finland
Central Bank of Croatia (HNB)
Danmarks Nationalbank
SWIFT
NEXI-Colt
Deutsche Bank
Commerzbank
Banque Internationale à Luxembourg SA
ABN AMRO Bank
Poste Italiane S.p.A
Intesa Sanpaolo
Slovenska sporitelna
Tatra Banka
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 #28

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:	Alp Akyürek
Organisation:	Isbank AG, Frankfurt
Address:	Zeil 123, 60313 Frankfurt/Germany
Contact details:	alp.akyurek@isbank.de
Your reference:	EPC158-22 2023 One-Leg Out Instant Credit Transfer Rulebook
Scheme and document and version number:	<u>Highlight which EPC SEPA Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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:	
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):

1.2. Description of the change request:

Merging the OCT Scheme into an existing SCT Scheme.

We recognize the real need for an OCT arrangement. So far this was missing on the market, especially for Banks like us having strong connections to other non-EU countries.

Thus, too many creative “alternative” solutions are popping up in the market.

OCT Inst and SCT Inst are currently different schemes and participation in each different scheme is troublesome and costly, especially for small and medium-sized banks like us. Therefore, if these schemes are merged and the OCT can be integrated into the SCT Inst scheme, banks that are currently members of the SCT Inst scheme can benefit from this opportunity more easily. We would also like to point out that we think the participation of the OCT scheme may be low since the two schemes are separate. However, if the two schemes merge and SCT Inst becomes mandatory, OCT will embrace the entire EU geography. A standalone SEPA OCT scheme would likely increase both operational and associated scheme costs. We also believe that incorporating an OCT arrangement into existing schemes will enable the EPC to build an arrangement in the shortest possible timeframe.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:
2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:
3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:
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:
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?	Yes
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 #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:	<u>Highlight which EPC Scheme Rulebook(s) this change request relates to:</u> 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, other than the positive response.

I. Reminder of the content of the schemes :

Currently, the rulebooks indicate what is mentioned below :

- SCT rulebook, 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**

○ **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**

○ **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:

- SCT rulebook, 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 the 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 #30

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:	One-Leg Out Task Force (OLO TF)
Organisation:	EPC
Address:	
Contact details:	
Your reference:	#30-OCT Inst-EPC- Changes to the OCT Inst Inquiry Procedure
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:	29 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 OCT Inst scheme rulebook.

1.2. Description of the change request:

The OCT Inst Inquiry procedure is created to make an inquiry about **outgoing** OCT Inst transactions. The OLO TF proposes the following changes to the OCT Inst Inquiry processes:

First change

Section 4.4.2 'Response to OCT Inst Inquiry'

This practice is only allowed for a **positive** response to an OCT Inst Inquiry for the reason 'Claim of Non-Receipt'. For this purpose, AT-Q007 is foreseen in the response message DS-09. The reference [2] specifies how the Euro Leg Exit PSP can provide the Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP with the concrete account of the Euro Leg Exit PSP ~~(or of the non-Euro Leg Payee's FI itself)~~ to be credited and the fee amount itself.

The proposed rulebook change is to align the OCT Inst scheme rulebook with the OCT Inst Inter-PSP Outgoing Implementation Guidelines (IGs). The IGs are developed on the principle that only the account of the Euro Leg Exit PSP can be given. Furthermore, this is also aligned with the description of the attributes AT-Q008 'The unique identifier of the account to be credited at the Euro Leg Exit PSP' and AT-Q009 'Reference of the Euro Leg Exit PSP for the OCT Inst Inquiry fee payment'.

Second change

Section 4.5.11 DS-11 Inter-PSP OCT Inst Inquiry Fee Payment

Identification:	DS-11
Name:	Inter-PSP OCT Inst Inquiry Fee Payment
Description	This dataset contains the attributes for the payment of an Inter-PSP OCT Inst Inquiry fee by the Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP to the Euro Leg Exit PSP.
Attributes contained:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D002 The Identification Code of the Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP • C002 The Identification Code of the non-Euro Leg Payee's FI • Q002 The specific OCT Inst Inquiry reference of the Participant initiating the OCT Inst Inquiry • Q007 Fee for handling the OCT Inst Inquiry • Q008 The unique identifier of the account to be credited at the Euro Leg Exit PSP • Q009 Reference of the Euro Leg Exit PSP for the OCT Inst Inquiry fee payment • Q010 The Settlement Date of the OCT Inst Inquiry fee amount • Q011 Category purpose of the OCT Inst Inquiry fee payment • Q012 The unique identifier of the account to be debited at the Euro Leg-Based Payer's PSP • T001 The identification code of the Scheme



Identification:	DS-11
Name:	Inter-PSP OCT Inst Inquiry Fee Payment
Rules applied:	The dataset settles the OCT Inst Inquiry fee payment for a single OCT Inst Inquiry case only or for multiple OCT Inst Inquiry cases.

After the version 1.0 of the 2023 OCT Inst scheme rulebook was published in March 2023, the IGs were then worked out in Q2 2023. During the development of these IGs, the EPC Standards Task Force concerned considered how to set specifications in relation to the pacs.008 message to be used for the payment of an OCT Inquiry fee.

It concluded that the best way forward would be to remain within the OCT Instant framework i.e., the fee payment is made via an OCT Inst transaction, meaning a **single** pacs.008 message (with 'Service Level/Code' = "EOLO" and 'Local Instrument/Code' = "INST"). This would also prevent mixing this OCT Inst inquiry fee payment process with a similar process foreseen under the SCT scheme rulebook. Consequently, there is currently a minor disconnect between the IGs concerned and the OCT Inst scheme rulebook. This proposed change to the rulebook will resolve this disconnect.

1.3. Wherever possible, please indicate:

1. Impact on the Scheme in general:

Yes. This change does affect the business rules although the IGs concerned already reflect the proposed amended business rules in their technical specifications.

2. Impact on the inter-PSP space:

No. the IGs concerned already reflect these proposed business rules in their technical specifications.

3. Impact on other payment stakeholders:

No. It concerns an Inter-PSP process only.

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 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.

- 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 follows the technical specifications already outlined in the IGs concerned.
Is the change request supported by a cost-benefit analysis?	NO. Limited impact on PSPs to implement.
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. Limited impact on PSPs to implement.
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.