

# **ISO 20022 Registration Procedures**

**ISO 20022 RMG Rules Subgroup  
Approved by the RMG on 15 June 2010**

1 **Foreword**

2 As pre-reading material, the readers are invited to first go through the scripted 'Introduction to  
3 ISO 20022' Powerpoint presentation available on the home page of [www.iso20022.org](http://www.iso20022.org). The  
4 concepts introduced in the script of the presentation are considered as known by the reader.

5 Readers are also expected to be familiar with the ISO 20022 registration bodies, their mission,  
6 scope, membership and decision-making processes. These are set out in a document entitled  
7 [ISO 20022 Registration Bodies Governance](#).

8 Although these Registration Procedures cover the activities of the various ISO 20022  
9 registration bodies, they are especially targeted to helping Standards Evaluation Group (SEG)  
10 members to understand the ISO 20022 registration process and the particular role and  
11 operations of a SEG. This document is based on the latest version of ISO 20022 – "Universal  
12 financial industry message scheme", initially published on 15 December 2004, but with a  
13 subsequent update to Part 2 published on 4 April 2007. It has been prepared and approved by  
14 the ISO 20022 Registration Management Group (RMG). This document is a non-normative  
15 guide to the operation of the ISO 20022 organisational environment and, as such, provides  
16 operational clarification on matters beyond those contained in the five parts of ISO 20022.

17 For the convenience of the reader, these Registration Procedures include relevant material from  
18 the standard. It is, however, recommended that the reader also read the standard itself. The first  
19 two parts of the standard are particularly important and give a general overview of the ISO  
20 20022 methodology, the organisation of the ISO 20022 Repository and the registration process.  
21 RMG, TSG and SEG members have access to a copy of these standards in the [ISOTC](#)  
22 [Livelihood](#) system<sup>1</sup>.

23

---

<sup>1</sup> Access to the RMG, SEG and TSG subfolders in the TC68 folder of the ISOTC livelihood system requires a user id and password given by ISO upon specific request by either the national standards body or the liaison organisation that nominated the RMG or SEG member.

24	<b>Table of contents</b>	
25		
26	Foreword .....	2
27	<b>1 Registration process for development of new ISO 20022 messages.....</b>	<b>5</b>
28	1.1 Business Justification process .....	5
29	1.1.1 Approval by the RMG .....	5
30	1.1.2 Formation of the Evaluation Team by the SEG(s) .....	7
31	1.2 Development by the submitting organisation.....	7
32	1.3 Evaluation.....	9
33	1.3.1 Scope of the evaluation.....	9
34	1.3.2 Evaluation Recommendation.....	9
35	1.3.3 Timing and priority of evaluations .....	11
36	1.4 Publication of approved ISO 20022 messages .....	12
37	1.5 Withdrawal .....	12
38	<b>2 Maintenance process .....</b>	<b>12</b>
39	2.1.1 The RA collects change requests from users.....	13
40	2.1.2 The SEG performs the initial evaluation of the change requests.....	13
41	2.1.3 The submitting organisation prepares a 'Maintenance Change Request'.....	14
42	2.1.4 The SEG evaluates the Maintenance Change Request .....	15
43	2.1.5 The submitting organisation develops the new candidate ISO 20022 messages.....	16
44	2.1.6 The SEG verifies the documentation of the new candidate ISO 20022 messages .....	16
45	.....	16
46	2.1.7 The RA publishes the new version of the ISO 20022 messages .....	17
47	<b>3 Testing and Implementation .....</b>	<b>17</b>
48	<b>Annex A - Maintenance of the ISO 20022 Repository .....</b>	<b>19</b>
49	3.1 Organisation and Publication of the ISO 20022 Repository .....	19
50	3.1.1 Introduction.....	19
51	3.1.2 Repository, Data Dictionary, Business and Message Concepts .....	19
52	3.1.3 Versioning of the Repository and Repository items.....	20
53	3.1.4 Versions and variants.....	21
54	3.1.5 Publication of the Repository .....	23
55	3.2 Intellectual Property Rights .....	24
56	3.3 Release cycles.....	24

57 **4 Annex B** .....**26**

58 4.1 RMG Voting and RMG voting module..... 26

59 4.1.1 Business Justification for Comment ..... 26

60 4.1.2 Business Justification Approval ..... 26

61 4.1.3 Voting Report Card..... 27

62 4.2 Use of the ISO Livelink Drop In Box ..... 27

63

64

65 **1 Registration process for development of new ISO 20022**  
66 **messages**

67 Registration requests generally relate either to the development of new candidate ISO 20022  
68 messages or to the updating of existing ISO 20022 messages. The former type of requests  
69 follows the 'Registration' process described in this chapter, while the latter follows the  
70 'Maintenance' process described in Chapter 2.

71 *Note: a [flowchart of the registration process](#) for new candidate ISO 20022 messages is*  
72 *available from the website*

73 The registration process includes four phases which are described below:

- 74 • The Business Justification Process
- 75 • The development
- 76 • The evaluation
- 77 • The publication

78

79 **1.1 Business Justification process**

80 An organisation wishing to develop new candidate ISO 20022 messages must first introduce a  
81 'Business Justification' to give an overview of the scope, reason and estimated  
82 users/volumes/savings of the intended messages. The request is expected to reflect global need  
83 or usage, or to enhance the global relevance of the standard, without excluding large  
84 communities of users at a regional or domestic level.

85 A [Business Justification template](#) can be downloaded from the ISO 20022 website. The  
86 completed Business Justification is sent to the RA at [iso20022ra@iso20022.org](mailto:iso20022ra@iso20022.org) where it is  
87 logged on the ISO 20022 website in the '[Status of Submissions](#)', checked for completeness and  
88 confirmed to the submitter within the next five business days. When returning a positive  
89 acknowledgement, the RA also sends the Business Justification via e-mail to the RMG  
90 secretariat.

91 **1.1.1 Approval by the RMG**

92 The RMG secretariat sends the Business Justification via e-mail to the RMG members and to  
93 the Convener, Vice Convener and Secretary of the SEG(s) to be involved in the evaluation of  
94 the future messages as proposed by the submitting organisation in the 'scope' section of the  
95 Business Justification. The RMG secretariat also copies the Conveners, Vice Conveners and  
96 Secretaries of the other SEGs for information. The purpose of informing the other SEGs is to  
97 give them the possibility to react, if they believe they should be involved in the evaluation as  
98 well.

99 RMG members are given a minimum of four weeks (actually to the middle or end of the month  
100 following the four weeks) to forward any comments or requests for clarification to be  
101 addressed by the submitting organisation to the RMG secretariat. During this period, the  
102 relevant SEG(s) – at least the SEG(s) suggested by the submitting organisation in the Business  
103 Justification – will confirm that the proposed development falls into their business domain and  
104 formulate their opinion on the Business Justification from a ‘future users’ perspective. They  
105 verify that the submitting organisation proposes to include the relevant industry bodies in the  
106 development<sup>2</sup>. The SEG(s) may challenge the information provided by the submitting  
107 organisation and submit clarification requests. The Convener, Vice Convener or Secretary of  
108 the SEG forwards the collated comments from the SEG to the RMG secretariat before the end  
109 of the commenting period.

110 - If no comments have been received within the commenting period or if the only 'comments'  
111 received are the positive opinion of the SEG(s), the RMG secretariat append the opinion of  
112 the SEG to the Business Justification and invites the RMG voting members by e-mail to  
113 vote on the Business Justification within the next two weeks (actually to the middle or end  
114 of the month following the two weeks).

115 - If comments have been received from the RMG or the SEG(s) during the commenting  
116 period, the RMG secretariat sends them via e-mail to the submitting organisation contact  
117 persons mentioned on the BJ, with a copy to the RA. The RMG secretariat gives the  
118 submitting organisation up to three weeks to submit an updated Business Justification to  
119 the RA. The updated Business Justification shall include:

120       ○ the text of the original Business Justification which may be updated by the  
121       submitting organisation based on the comments received. Such updates will be  
122       clearly highlighted using 'track change' or similar mode.

123       ○ a copy of and a response to each of the received comments.

124 As soon as the updated Business Justification is received, the RA checks it for  
125 completeness, log a copy on the ISO 20022 website and e-mails it to the RMG secretariat  
126 for immediate re-submission to the RMG members for vote. The RMG members are given  
127 a minimum of four weeks (actually to the middle or end of the month following the four  
128 weeks) to vote on the updated Business Justification. During this period, a conference call  
129 is organised by the RA to give RMG members the opportunity to discuss the response to  
130 the comments with the submitting organisation before casting their vote.

131 The votes are 'Yes', 'No' or 'Abstain'. Comments are no longer accepted with the votes. All  
132 RMG members have an obligation to vote and a vote will not be considered valid if less than  
133 seven RMG members have responded, among which at least five P-member countries.  
134 Countries or liaison organisations that are not involved in the business domain of the Business  
135 Justification or have no opinion on the Business Justification are expected to vote 'Abstain'.  
136 Only the received 'Yes' and 'No' votes are computed. A Business Justification is approved if at

---

<sup>2</sup> In the Business Justification, the submitting organisation has to mention the industry bodies that it intends to involve in the development.

137 least two thirds of the 'Yes'/'No' votes are 'Yes'. The RMG secretariat immediately notifies the  
138 submitting organisation, the SEG(s) and the RA of the result of the vote via e-mail.

139 The Business Justification comment and approval procedure is outlined in Annex A.

### 140 **1.1.2 Formation of the Evaluation Team by the SEG(s)**

141 *Note:* It is sometimes necessary to combine the expertise of more than one SEG to adequately  
142 represent future users of a candidate message set. In this case, the RMG will appoint a 'Lead  
143 SEG' for the evaluation. If the submission does not fall within the scope of an existing SEG,  
144 the RMG will either initiate the creation of a new SEG or widen the scope of an existing SEG.

145 Upon approval of the Business Justification, the SEG may already start composing the  
146 Evaluation Team which will handle the evaluation of the candidate ISO 20022 messages once  
147 ready for evaluation.

148 If several SEGs have been assigned the evaluation, the Convenors, Vice Convenors and  
149 Secretaries of all SEGs involved will be responsible for the composition of the Evaluation  
150 Team under the leadership of the Lead SEG Convenor, Vice Convenor and Secretary.

## 151 **1.2 Development by the submitting organisation**

152 When a Business Justification has been approved, the messages proposed for development are  
153 called 'candidate ISO 20022 messages'<sup>3</sup>.

154 The submitting organisation is expected to develop candidate ISO 20022 compliant models and  
155 messages within the timeframe indicated in its Business Justification. If during the  
156 development, the submitting organisation realises that the candidate ISO 20022 message  
157 models will not be ready for delivery to the RA at the date specified in the business  
158 justification, it will promptly inform the RA about the new submission date.

159 The RA has limited resources<sup>4</sup> which are not available for development work, but provides the  
160 submitting organisation with a clear description of the required deliverables, the materials  
161 necessary to set up the required modelling environment (ISO 20022 UML Profile, ISO 20022  
162 Modeling Template, electronic versions of the ISO 20022 Data Dictionary and copies of any  
163 related existing ISO 20022 models), and a 'compliance checklist' of rules to observe to ensure  
164 ISO 20022 compliance of the candidate models.

---

<sup>3</sup> They keep this name during the development and the evaluation. They become 'ISO 20022 messages' or 'ISO 20022 compliant messages' only if and when approved for publication by the SEG.

<sup>4</sup> The organisation that provides the RA services committed three staff year to this effort. This includes the compliance review of the submissions, the provisional and official registration, the preparation of the SEG documentation, the publication of the Repository, the maintenance of the ISO 20022 website, the participation in the various ISO 20022 related groups and subgroups, the answer to various internal and external queries, the training of RMG and SEG members, etc.

- 165 Submitting organisations have, at present, the choice between two modelling tools: Rational  
166 Software Modeler (RSM) from IBM and MagicDraw from No Magic<sup>5</sup>.
- 167 Submitting organisations opting for RSM (the same modelling tool as the RA) benefit from a  
168 software package provided by SWIFT – “SWS Lite”- that enables them to generate more easily  
169 the required ISO 20022 compliant deliverables.
- 170 As use of MagicDraw currently requires extra processing by the RA<sup>6</sup>, RSM/SWS submissions  
171 are processed first in case of concurrent submissions, unless specifically requested otherwise  
172 by the RMG.
- 173 Once developed, the submitting organisation submits the candidate models to the RA which  
174 checks them for compliance. Upon detection of non compliance with a rule, the RA may return  
175 the invalid submission to the submitting organisation with an indication of the rule that was not  
176 observed. The submitting organisation is then expected to correct the models and re-submit to  
177 the RA.
- 178 When the submission is compliant, new or updated candidate dictionary items may be  
179 registered by the RA before evaluation and appear as ‘provisionally registered’ in the  
180 Dictionary. On the contrary, provisionally registered messages are not shown in the  
181 Repository.
- 182 The RA generates the SEG documentation and sends it to the members of the Evaluation  
183 Team, as communicated by the (Lead) SEG Secretary.
- 184 The documentation generated by the RA is provided by e-mail, or uploaded in the SEG 'drop in  
185 box' folder on ISO Livelink or another agreed website. It contains the following  
186 documentation:
- 187 - The UML models of the new messages
  - 188 - A preliminary ‘.pdf’ Message Definition Report (MDR) with the full description of the new  
189 messages generated directly from the message models.
  - 190 - The XML schemas of the new messages generated directly from the models
  - 191 - Additional contextual documentation prepared by the submitting organisation to introduce  
192 the transaction flow and/or illustrate the message usage.
  - 193 - Examples of XML instances of the new messages if provided by the submitting  
194 organisation
  - 195 - A ‘comments template’ for use by the Evaluation Team members

---

<sup>5</sup> The RMG has sanctioned the TSG and the RA to investigate how best to facilitate an environment where at least the recommended modelling tools (RSM and MagicDraw) can operate with similar efficiency, thus offering choice and competition for submitting organisations as to which tool they wish to employ. This includes the periodic review of new or updated modelling tools that could offer similar efficiency.

<sup>6</sup> Magic Draw submissions will require, at each iteration of submission to the RA for compliance check, a preliminary manual intervention before the compliance checks can be performed. A first estimate is a global overhead of minimum 7 days of work for all iterations expected for a MagicDraw submission.

196 The first three above documents can be viewed as different ways of describing the same  
197 information but from different angles and thus containing various levels of details.

198 In addition to the above, the submitting organisation may submit a ['Message Usage Guide'](#)  
199 (MUG) to complement the Message Definition Report when such report is considered  
200 insufficient to provide clear guidance on the ways of using the messages. Such a MUG can be  
201 submitted to the SEG either at the same time as or after the other evaluation documents.

## 202 **1.3 Evaluation**

### 203 **1.3.1 Scope of the evaluation**

204 On top of the evaluation documentation provided by the RA, the submitting organisation is  
205 expected to give an introductory presentation to the Evaluation Team members and may  
206 propose additional documentation to further facilitate the evaluation of the submission.

207 As a first step, the Evaluation Team shall verify that the submission is within the scope  
208 expressed in the corresponding Business Justification approved by the RMG. If it is not the  
209 case (e.g., during the development, the submitting organisation has created additional  
210 messages), the SEG must refer back to the RMG for further approval.

211 The Evaluation Team evaluates the candidate ISO 20022 messages from a business standpoint  
212 before they are officially accepted and published as ISO 20022 messages. In further detail, this  
213 means validating, among others, that:

- 214 - The messages developed, based on the requirements collected by the submitting  
215 organisation, actually address the users' needs and could be used by the user community  
216 represented by each Evaluation Team member. This includes the validation of the  
217 transaction flow, the message scopes, the message descriptions, including all (new or re-  
218 used) components, use of external code lists, data source schemes, or supplementary data  
219 components, definitions and others, as included in the SEG documentation.
- 220 - The information requirements of actors that come into play in other business areas, either  
221 before or after in the end-to-end transaction chain, are taken into account in the submitted  
222 message set.
- 223 - The documentation provided is clear enough and sufficient to ensure that future users will  
224 understand how to use the new or updated message set. The Evaluation Team is responsible  
225 to evaluate the potential need for a [Message Usage Guide](#) (MUG) to be provided by the  
226 submitting organisation to complement the description of the Message Definition Report.

### 227 **1.3.2 External code lists, data source schemes, supplementary data**

228 The Evaluation Team should pay particular attention to the use of external code lists, data  
229 source schemes and supplementary data components.

230 An external code list is a closed list of valid values for a code, but the list is maintained  
231 independently of the message(s) it is used in, ie the list of values can be maintained without  
232 need to update the message itself. The Evaluation Team should be satisfied that there is

233 sufficient reason to keep the list outside the message schema (it may be part of another  
234 standard, or be too dynamic to maintain within the message), and that the maintenance  
235 procedures for the code list can be followed. External code lists that are specific to ISO 20022  
236 messages are maintained by the relevant SEG on a quarterly basis and are [published on the ISO](#)  
237 [20022 website](#).

238 A data source scheme (DSS) is a mechanism allowing an external body to maintain its own  
239 external code list of valid values for a specific message component. Once use of the DSS  
240 mechanism has been approved by the SEG for a specific message component, any external  
241 body can register its code list(s) for use in this component without need to update the message  
242 itself. The list of message components supporting the DSS mechanism and the list of DSSs  
243 currently registered by the RA for use in each of these components [is published on the ISO](#)  
244 [20022 website](#), but the lists of values are not. The Evaluation Team must satisfy itself that  
245 there is a need for such type of proprietary code lists (for example, the lists of identifiers  
246 maintained by market infrastructures).

247 A supplementary data component is a mechanism that allows a community of users to add  
248 information to an ISO 20022 message that was unknown to and/or not catered for by the  
249 developer at the time the message was designed, without need to update the message itself and,  
250 hence, without impacting the other users of the message. The information will be included in  
251 the supplementary data component of the message at implementation time in a schema that is  
252 made available on the ISO 20022 website. It can also be used at message design time to store  
253 information that is very specific to a community and cannot be agreed globally. The Evaluation  
254 Team must satisfy itself that sufficient market-specific requirements exist, that the use of a  
255 supplementary data will protect the user base against changes required by a specific  
256 community or that the message is (or will be) used in a changing environment, where changes  
257 may be required to take place at a speed greater than that allowed by the ISO 20022  
258 maintenance process. The Evaluation Team should first explore more usual options such as  
259 creating a specific message component in the message itself if the business use of the  
260 component can be globally agreed and semantically defined.

261 For some of the above mechanisms, the SEG is required to approve not just the use of the  
262 mechanism in a particular case, but also the additional information that supports the  
263 mechanism. This additional information may be supplied at the same time as the message  
264 design, or as part of a subsequent Change Request (see section 2 below). Full details are  
265 available on the ISO 20022 website.

266 For an external code list, the SEG must approve the values on the list. For the supplementary  
267 data component, the SEG must approve the components within it (which will also be  
268 registered in the ISO 20022 repository).

### 269 **1.3.3 Evaluation Recommendation**

270 The Evaluation Team, coordinated by the Facilitator, is responsible for collecting comments on  
271 the submission in writing from its members, reviewing them as a group and establishing a  
272 single commonly agreed upon list of comments to be addressed either by the submitting  
273 organisation and/or, possibly by the RA (e.g., comments related to the (non)re-use of  
274 dictionary items). Comments that are not directly related to the submission contents, such as

275 questions about the ISO 20022 Governance or Registration Procedures or the  
276 specifications/conventions defined in the ISO 20022 standard itself should not be addressed to  
277 the submitting organisation, but to the appropriate group within the RMG, RA, TSG or TC68.

278 The commonly agreed list of SEG comments are disposed of in writing by the submitting  
279 organisation and/or the RA. Based on this disposition of comments, the Evaluation Team  
280 Facilitator shall strive to reach a consensus<sup>7</sup> recommendation of approval or rejection of the  
281 submission. In the case of a rejection, the recommendation will explain the reason(s) for the  
282 rejection and what would need to be changed to get an approval.

283 The Evaluation Team Facilitator submits the Team's recommendation to the SEG for  
284 endorsement. In general, it is expected that the SEG(s) will not take more than two weeks to  
285 endorse the recommendation of the Evaluation Team it has selected and approved for this  
286 evaluation. The (Lead) SEG Convenor shall notify the RA immediately after the decision has  
287 been taken. The RA will then officially inform the submitting organisation and the RMG via e-  
288 mail, update the submission status on the ISO 20022 website, and proceed with the publication  
289 of the messages.

290 If the Evaluation Team cannot reach a consensus, the issues are first submitted to the full  
291 SEG(s) for resolution before being submitted, via the RA, to the RMG for resolution in case  
292 the issues cannot be resolved at SEG level.

293 A record of the commonly agreed upon list of Evaluation Team members' comments, how the  
294 comments were disposed of, and the final recommendation of the SEG, shall be kept by the  
295 SEG Secretary on ISO Livelink. This central record can be used for future reference when  
296 answering questions or when changes are requested to the approved messages.

#### 297 **1.3.4 Timing and priority of evaluations**

298 A recommendation on a full documentation shall be given by the Evaluation Team as quickly  
299 as possible and take no longer than three calendar months, unless otherwise agreed upon with  
300 the RMG (e.g., when the submission covers a large number of items).

301 The above timing does not include the time required to establish the Evaluation Team or the  
302 two-week endorsement by the SEG. If there are several concurrent submissions ready for  
303 evaluation by a single Evaluation Team, they shall be treated in the sequence fixed by the  
304 RMG, one after the other and each within the response time described above, unless it makes  
305 sense to the Evaluation Team to combine them into a single evaluation.

306 In the case of multiple concurrent submissions, they shall normally be treated on a first-come  
307 first-served basis, except if the RMG decides otherwise. Should the submitting organisation or  
308 the SEG wish to change the priority order of evaluations, the endorsement of the RMG is  
309 required.

---

<sup>7</sup> "Consensus: General agreement, characterized by the absence of sustained opposition to substantial issues by any important part of the concerned interests and by a process that involves seeking to take into account the views of all parties concerned and to reconcile any conflicting arguments. NOTE Consensus need not imply unanimity."  
Source: ISO Directives.

310 If resources are available, the SEG may create several Evaluation Teams to address several  
311 submissions in parallel.

## 312 **1.4 Publication of approved ISO 20022 messages**

313 The RA publishes the ISO 20022 messages on the ISO 20022 website. This includes:

- 314 – Making available an HTML, XMI or RSM version of the approved models; and publishing  
315 the full Message Definition Report, the XML schemas, and possibly XML instances and a  
316 MUG in the [Catalogue of ISO 20022 messages](#).
- 317 – Registering the new Message Definitions and all related message items in the Business  
318 Process Catalogue.
- 319 – Officially registering all related, new or updated Data Dictionary items (items that would  
320 have been 'provisionally registered' are switched to 'registered' status).
- 321 – Making a new extract of the ISO 20022 Repository (Business Process Catalogue and Data  
322 Dictionary) accessible through the [Simple Repository Search](#), [Advanced Dictionary Search](#)  
323 and [Advanced Catalogue Search](#) functions. In case several submissions are expected to be  
324 approved within the same timeframe (eg in the same quarter), the RA will wait until the last  
325 set of messages is published to generate a new repository extract.

## 326 **1.5 Withdrawal**

327 At any time during the registration process and until the messages are approved by the SEG for  
328 publication, the submitting organisation may decide to withdraw or suspend its submission,  
329 simply by informing the RA and providing the reason for such decision. The RA will change  
330 the status of the submission accordingly and inform the RMG and SEG of the decision and the  
331 reason thereof.

332

## 333 **2 Maintenance process**

334 *Note: a [flowchart of the maintenance process](#) for existing ISO 20022 messages is available*  
335 *from the website*

336 The process for updating existing messages is different from the new message development  
337 process since the deployment of a new version of a message may impact a whole community  
338 of users. Therefore, change requests are validated and approved by the SEG(s) which approved  
339 the current version of the messages on behalf of the community of users.

340 Existing ISO 20022 messages can be updated on a yearly basis provided changes are requested  
341 by the users and approved by the [SEG\(s\)](#). New versions of messages, if any, are published in  
342 April/May of each year. Change requests for the following yearly cycle must be introduced  
343 prior to the 1<sup>st</sup> of June of the preceding year.

344 In certain circumstances such as urgency or where required by the relevant business  
345 community, it is possible to request the maintenance of ISO 20022 messages outside of the  
346 yearly cycle.

### 347 **2.1.1 The RA collects change requests from users**

348 Actual or potential users of ISO 20022 messages, or their representatives, are invited to  
349 forward their requests for changes to the RA. Each change request must describe the scope of  
350 the change including the list of impacted ISO 20022 messages, the purpose of the change, the  
351 community of users interested by the change and the urgency and expected benefit/impact of  
352 the proposed change on current or future users. If the change is proposed to be implemented  
353 outside the yearly schedule, the change request must include the justification thereof. A [change  
354 request template](#) is available from the ISO 20022 website. A specific change request form must  
355 be completed for each particular change requested. If the requested change consists, for  
356 example, of adding new functionality which requires several changes which would not make  
357 sense if not performed all together, then all these related changes should be described on the  
358 same change request form<sup>8</sup>.

359 Change requests must be sent to the Registration Authority at [iso20022ra@iso20022.org](mailto:iso20022ra@iso20022.org). The  
360 RA checks each change request for completeness and conformance to the change request  
361 template and return to the submitter in case of invalidity.

362 When the change request is valid (that is, conforming to the change request template), the RA  
363 publishes the change request in the [Catalogue of Change Requests](#) and forwards it to the SEG  
364 which had approved the current version of the identified ISO 20022 messages, with a copy to  
365 the submitter. The purpose of the Catalogue of Change Requests is to give the possibility to  
366 users who intend to introduce a change request to check whether this change has already been  
367 requested or not.

368 Valid change requests must be received by the RA prior to June 1 to be considered for  
369 implementation in the next yearly maintenance cycle. The RA forwards valid change request  
370 forms to the convener, vice-convener and secretary of the relevant SEG on an ongoing basis.  
371 When the current version of the messages had been approved by several SEGs under the  
372 leadership of a Lead SEG, the RA forwards the change request to the Lead SEG and copies the  
373 other SEGs. All valid change requests received by the RA prior to June 1 are communicated to  
374 the SEG by June 7 at the latest.

### 375 **2.1.2 The SEG performs the initial evaluation of the change requests**

376 Change requests are evaluated by the SEG(s) which approved the current version of the  
377 impacted messages on behalf of the community of users. The purpose of the initial evaluation  
378 is to filter change requests and already reject those that are not justified. Change requests

---

<sup>8</sup> There is a specific template for '[Change Request for the update of an External Code List](#)' which follows a specific quarterly maintenance cycle.

379 which are not rejected will be analysed further later on to determine the actual impact of their  
380 implementation (see 2.1.4).

381 The SEGs should not wait until all change requests are received to start the initial evaluation.  
382 On the contrary, the SEGs are invited to look at the change requests as soon as received and to  
383 contact the requester at the earliest possible moment with any queries as to scope, purpose or  
384 other points of clarity. If an Evaluation Team was established by the SEG to evaluate the  
385 current version of the messages, the SEG may re-establish this Evaluation Team and ask for  
386 their expert opinion on the validity of each requested change. The SEG must also invite the  
387 submitting organisation that developed the current version of the messages to participate in the  
388 initial evaluation. When several organisations share the IPR of the current version of the  
389 messages, all of them are invited to participate in the initial evaluation.

390 The SEG updates the change request form with its recommendation either to reject the change  
391 request or to keep it for further consideration. If the request is accepted for further  
392 consideration, the SEG indicates whether it believes the implementation timing proposed by  
393 the requester (whether in or outside of the yearly cycle) is reasonable and, for changes to be  
394 implemented in the yearly cycle, the SEG gives its opinion on the priority of the change (high  
395 – medium – low). For reasons explained in section 4.3, the SEG may wish to wait until all  
396 change requests are received – or a sufficient number of them - to decide whether it makes  
397 sense to release a new version of the messages in the current yearly cycle or it is better to wait  
398 for the following cycle.

399 The SEG indicates the reason for the changes it recommends rejecting. In certain cases, the  
400 SEG may recommend that new messages be developed to accommodate the requested changes  
401 instead of developing a new version of the existing ISO 20022 messages. This can happen, for  
402 example, when the proposed updates change the scopes of the current ISO 20022 messages  
403 and/or are pertinent only for a new, distinct community of users. In such a case, the submitter  
404 of the change request will have to find a submitting organisation ready to undertake such  
405 development and introduce a Business Justification for the development of new messages (see  
406 Chapter 1).

407 The SEG forwards completed change request forms to the RA on an ongoing basis. All change  
408 request forms received by the SEG by June 7 and targeted for the upcoming yearly cycle must  
409 be completed and returned to the RA by July 7 at the latest. The RA updates the [Catalogue of  
410 Change Requests](#) with the SEG decision and posts the completed change request forms.

411 If the SEG has approved change requests for further consideration, it should already form the  
412 Evaluation Team that will undertake the evaluation of the forthcoming Maintenance Change  
413 Request (see 2.1.4). Whenever possible, SEG members should look for actual users of the  
414 current version of the messages to join this Evaluation Team.

### 415 **2.1.3 The submitting organisation prepares a 'Maintenance Change** 416 **Request'**

417 Although the submitting organisation in charge of the maintenance of the impacted messages is  
418 involved in the initial evaluation, the RA officially communicates all change requests approved

419 for further consideration by the SEG by July 7 to the submitting organisation in charge. Urgent  
420 change requests that are approved by the SEG for immediate consideration outside of the  
421 yearly maintenance cycle are communicated by the RA to the submitting organisation as soon  
422 as received from the SEG.

423 *Note:* in general, new versions of messages will be developed by the original submitting  
424 organisation, i.e., the organisation that developed the original version of the messages. If, for  
425 any reason, the original submitting organisation cannot perform all or part of the requested  
426 changes, the RA and the SEG will seek an alternative submitting organisation ready to  
427 maintain the messages. The SEG may also agree to postpone all or part of the requested  
428 changes.

429 The submitting organisation prepares a Maintenance Change Request which includes all the  
430 change requests approved for further consideration by the SEG and indicates, for each of them,  
431 how the submitting organisation proposes to implement the change and the impact on the ISO  
432 20022 messages. The impact analysis may reveal that a requested change has a bigger impact  
433 than expected or impacts more messages than those targeted by the submitter of the change  
434 request. The Maintenance Change Request also confirms whether or not the submitting  
435 organisation can dedicate required resources to the development of the changes in the  
436 requested timeframe. A [Maintenance Change Request template](#) is available from the ISO  
437 20022 website.

438 Valid Maintenance Change Requests for the following yearly maintenance cycle must be  
439 received by the RA by August 21. Maintenance Change Requests related to urgent change  
440 requests approved by the SEG for immediate consideration are expected to be received by the  
441 time agreed between the SEG and the submitting organisation during the initial evaluation. The  
442 RA checks the Maintenance Change Requests for completeness and posts each valid  
443 Maintenance Change Request in the corresponding 'Log History' spreadsheet of the [Status of](#)  
444 [Submissions](#). From this point on, the status of the Maintenance Change Request is tracked by  
445 the RA in the [Status of Submissions](#).

446 By September 1 at the latest, the RA forwards the Maintenance Change Request via e-mail to  
447 the Convener, Vice Convener and Secretary of the SEG which had approved the current  
448 version of the ISO 20022 messages mentioned in the Maintenance Change Request. When the  
449 current version of the messages had been approved by several SEGs under the leadership of a  
450 Lead SEG, the RA forwards the Maintenance Change Request to the Lead SEG and copies the  
451 other SEGs.

#### 452 **2.1.4 The SEG evaluates the Maintenance Change Request**

453 The SEG – or its Evaluation Team – has until October 1 to review the Maintenance Change  
454 Request and approve the proposed implementation of each change request. The submitting  
455 organisation participates in the evaluation to give any further clarification regarding the  
456 proposed updates.

457 The result of the review is an agreement regarding which changes will be implemented, how  
458 and when. The SEG takes into account the impact analysis performed by the submitting

459 organisation and its capacity to perform the proposed changes in the requested timeframe. If,  
460 for any reason, the submitting organisation cannot perform all or part of the requested changes,  
461 either the SEG may agree to postpone these changes, or the RA and the SEG will seek an  
462 alternative submitting organisation ready to maintain the messages within the requested time  
463 frame.

464 In approving or rejecting each change, the SEG or Evaluation Team will apply the same  
465 validation criteria as for initial approval of a message (see section 1.3.1 above).

466 By October 1, the SEG updates the Maintenance Change Request with its decision to approve  
467 or reject each of the proposed changes and forwards the updated document to the RA, which  
468 transmits it officially to the submitting organisation(s) and posts it in the 'Log History'  
469 spreadsheet of the [Status of Submissions](#).

#### 470 **2.1.5 The submitting organisation develops the new candidate ISO** 471 **20022 messages**

472 For the yearly maintenance cycle, the submitting organisation has until December 1 to develop  
473 a new ISO 20022 compliant version of the message models, which includes the changes  
474 approved by the SEG, and get it checked for compliance by the RA. For urgent unscheduled  
475 changes, the timeframe is agreed with the SEG during the evaluation of the Maintenance  
476 Change Request and is indicated in the approved Maintenance Change Request form.

477 The RA registers the candidate new version of ISO 20022 messages and all related new or  
478 updated items in the Repository and generates the evaluation documentation. The evaluation  
479 documentation includes a copy of the message models, the XML schemas and a preliminary  
480 Message Definition Report generated from the message models. It may include an updated  
481 MUG provided by the submitter, as agreed with the SEG.

#### 482 **2.1.6 The SEG verifies the documentation of the new candidate ISO** 483 **20022 messages**

484 The evaluation documentation is distributed to the SEG as soon as produced.

485 For the yearly maintenance cycle, distribution is done during December and the SEG - or its  
486 Evaluation Team – has until February 1 to verify that the new version of the messages actually  
487 reflects the approved changes, as agreed during the evaluation of the Maintenance Change  
488 Request. If it is not the case, the submitting organisation may be requested to correct the  
489 models or documentation as appropriate by March 1.

490 Upon approval of the SEG, the RA officially notifies the submitting organisation and the RMG  
491 of the newly approved version of 'ISO 20022 messages'. It is only after the approval by the  
492 SEG that the new candidate ISO 20022 messages can be called ISO 20022 messages (or ISO  
493 20022 compliant messages).

494 **2.1.7 The RA publishes the new version of the ISO 20022 messages**

495 Upon approval by the SEG, the submitting organisation prepares additional information to  
496 allow the RA to publish the full documentation of the new version of the messages. This  
497 includes contextual documentation to introduce the new transaction flow and/or illustrate the  
498 message usage, and, possibly, examples of XML message instances and an updated MUG. This  
499 additional information must be received by the RA no later than May 1.

500 In April/May, the RA publishes the new versions of the ISO 20022 messages on the ISO 20022  
501 website. This includes:

- 502 • Making available an HTML, XMI or RSM version of the approved models; publishing  
503 the full Message Definition Report, the XML schemas, and possibly XML instances  
504 and a MUG in the [Catalogue of ISO 20022 messages](#).
- 505 • Archiving the documentation of the previous version of the messages in the [ISO](#)  
506 [20022 Message Archive](#).
- 507 • Registering the new messages and all related message items in the Business Process  
508 Catalogue.
- 509 • Making a new extract of the ISO 20022 Repository (Business Process Catalogue and  
510 Data Dictionary) accessible through the [Simple Repository Search](#), [Advanced](#)  
511 [Dictionary Search](#) and [Advanced Catalogue Search functions](#). In case several  
512 Repository updates are expected to be approved within the same timeframe (eg in the  
513 same quarter), the RA will wait until the last set of messages is published to generate a  
514 new repository extract.

515

516 **3 Testing and Implementation**

517 Until the newly published messages have been tested or implemented, one cannot fully  
518 guarantee that:

- 519 – The new ISO 20022 messages are described accurately enough in the published  
520 documentation to allow users to implement the new version as intended and approved by  
521 the SEG;
- 522 – The approved messages can be implemented from a technical perspective with no or  
523 minimal adverse effects on communication infrastructures and/or applications (for  
524 example, excessive processing time).

525

526 As soon as the RA is informed that the new messages have been tested or implemented, it will  
527 indicate it in the Catalogue of Messages. The submitting organisation is also invited to review  
528 the published documentation and organise/encourage testing and implementation of the new  
529 messages.

530

531 The submitting organisation, testers or first implementers are invited to communicate to the  
532 RA any remarks they have on the published documentation. The remarks may include  
533 proposals for changes to clarify the documentation, eliminate ambiguity or correct errors that  
534 prevent implementation of the messages. They may include proposals to make the messages  
535 easier to implement or process, but may normally not include new business requirements,  
536 unless (1) they are in the scope of the approved Business Justification or Maintenance Change  
537 Request and (2) the SEG, the RA and the submitting organisation jointly agree that the  
538 proposed changes can and must be implemented as soon as possible to ensure adoption of the  
539 new messages.

540 If a correction of the messages and/or documentation is approved, the new publication is  
541 clearly announced on the ISO 20022 website and an 'errata' with the list of the changes is  
542 published by the RA for the convenience of implementers who would have started using the  
543 published version of the messages/documentation. If the XML message schemas have been  
544 'patched' to correct a mistake (the schemas did not reflect what the SEG had approved) or an  
545 error (the schema was invalid), the corrected schemas bear a new generation timestamp but  
546 keep the same version number. If any other change is made to a schema (improvement, new  
547 requirement), the message version number is increased.

548

## 549 **4 Annex A - Maintenance of the ISO 20022 Repository**

### 550 **4.1 Organisation and Publication of the ISO 20022 Repository**

#### 551 **4.1.1 Introduction**

552 The purpose of this section is to introduce some concepts that help understand how the  
553 Repository is maintained by the RA based on the current ISO 20022 standard (first edition,  
554 published on December 15, 2004 with a subsequent update to Part 2 published on 4 April  
555 2007). The detailed description of the organisation of the Repository can be found in the ISO  
556 20022 standard itself. The level of the description below is deliberately limited to what is  
557 relevant to understanding the maintenance aspects and how change requests should be  
558 managed by the ISO 20022 registration bodies.

#### 559 **4.1.2 Repository, Data Dictionary, Business and Message Concepts**

560 The ISO 20022 Repository consists of two parts, the Business Process Catalogue and the Data  
561 Dictionary.

562 The Business Process Catalogue contains, among others, the message models and the derived  
563 XML message schemas.

564 The Data Dictionary contains, among others, the 'business components' and the 'message  
565 components'.

566 The 'business components' are the business concepts used and processed to perform the various  
567 financial activities, such as 'Account', 'Trade', and 'Party'. Business components are usually  
568 characterised by a series of 'business elements'. For example, a 'Trade' will be characterised by  
569 business elements such as Trade Date, Trade Time, Trade Price and Trade Place. Business  
570 components are defined during the business modelling phase (Business Analysis).

571 In general, a 'Message component' is a 'subset' of business component as required in the  
572 specific context of a message<sup>9</sup>. The 'message components' are defined when the details of the  
573 required message set are analysed (Logical Design). Similarly to business components,  
574 message components are characterised by 'message elements'. For example, if a message uses  
575 the business component 'Trade', but needs to only communicate the business elements Trade  
576 Date and Trade Price, a specific message component "Trade1" will be defined, which contains  
577 message elements Trade Date and Trade Price only. This message component will be reused in  
578 all messages that only need to transport Trade Date and Trade Price. If a new message needs to  
579 transport Trade Date, Trade Price and Trade Place, a new message component "Trade2" will be  
580 created with these three message elements.

---

<sup>9</sup> There are other ways of defining message components which are not described here.

581 The names attributed to these message components (e.g., Trade1, Trade2, Trade3, etc.) may  
582 not look very user-friendly because they are not semantically meaningful. It is important to  
583 note however that, once used in a message, the message component name (i.e., Trade1, Trade2,  
584 etc) is replaced by a name that is more meaningful to the users of the particular message(s). For  
585 example, in a message where the only relevant trade info is the trade date and the trade price,  
586 the message component Trade1 will be (re-)used, but in the actual message instances on the  
587 wire, the set of these two message elements may be called 'TradeInfo'. The link between the  
588 name 'TradeInfo' and the message component 'Trade1' will be given in the XML schema and  
589 the Message Definition Report.

590 In summary, one business component may have several derived message components which  
591 are clearly 'traced' back to their original business component<sup>10</sup>. If an existing message  
592 component is inadequate for a new message, instead of modifying the message component –  
593 which would impact all messages using this component - a new message component will be  
594 created.

### 595 **4.1.3 Versioning of the Repository and Repository items**

596 The RA maintains the Repository on a continuous basis and publishes an updated static copy  
597 of the Repository on [www.iso20022.org](http://www.iso20022.org) on a regular basis for general consultation. There is  
598 only one, current copy of the Repository available on the website at a time. As said above, the  
599 Repository includes a Business Process Catalogue and a Data Dictionary.

600 The Business Process Catalogue contains all the current versions of the models and messages  
601 (identified by a specific version number). Previously registered versions of the models and  
602 messages remain available in the [Message Archive](#) on the ISO 20022 website.

603 The Data Dictionary contains all 'registered' items used in current and previously registered  
604 versions of models and messages. It also contains the 'provisionally registered' items used in  
605 new versions of models and messages currently in development. The Data Dictionary items  
606 have a unique name. They are not versioned since the Dictionary always contains all the items  
607 that are in use in all currently used versions of the messages – current versions shown in the  
608 Business Process Catalogue or previous versions shown in the Message Archive. If changes are  
609 made to a dictionary item, for example, to update the definition of the item or its status from  
610 'provisionally registered' to 'registered', such changes are logged in a 'change history record',  
611 which is associated with each item and available on the website.

612 If a new version of a message is created and requires the update of one of its message  
613 components, a new message component will be created and the 'change history record' of this  
614 new message component will refer to the component it replaces. The replaced message  
615 component is kept in the dictionary as long as the previous version of the message is in use  
616 (see below).

---

<sup>10</sup> The 'tracing' from a message component to its parent business component is achieved via a specific 'association' shown in the models with a stereotype 'SWSTrace', which translates, in the Dictionary Search functions on [www.iso20022.org](http://www.iso20022.org) into a specific indication 'Is based on:' followed by the (clickable) name of the business component. Also, in the business component view, all the derived message components are listed.

617 In the Dictionary, there is normally one business component to express each business concept,  
618 such as Trade, Account, etc. If a business component needs to be updated and this update does  
619 not impact existing derived message components (e.g., addition of a business element), then  
620 the existing business component is updated and the change is logged into the 'change history  
621 record' associated with the component. On the other hand, if a business component needs to be  
622 updated and this update impacts one or more of its registered derived message components  
623 (e.g., deletion of a business element), then a second version of the business component will be  
624 created with a new name that will indicate the new version. The 'change history record' of the  
625 new business component will indicate the business component it replaces. The previous  
626 version of the business component will be kept as long as its derived message components are  
627 in use.

628 If a community of users states that they have discontinued using a (previous) version of a  
629 message, this message version will be marked as such in the [ISO 20022 Message Archive](#) with  
630 a 'removal date' set to a date one year in the future when the message version will actually no  
631 longer be part of the set of used ISO 20022 messages. This is to allow possible unknown users  
632 to make themselves known by this removal date, in which case the 'removal date' of the  
633 message will be withdrawn until these users confirm that they are no longer using the message.

634 When a 'removal date' is set for a message, all of its message components that are not used in  
635 other still used messages, will be marked as obsolete with the same removal date. If all the  
636 message components of a business component are marked as 'obsolete', then the business  
637 component will be marked as obsolete as well, with the same removal date. When the removal  
638 date of the related message is reached and no users have turned up, the message is declared  
639 obsolete and no longer part of the set of used ISO 20022 messages. The obsolete message is  
640 kept in the Message Archive but all message and business components used solely in this  
641 message are removed from the Dictionary, to keep the size of the current Dictionary  
642 manageable.

643 If a provisionally registered item of the Dictionary is eventually not used (i.e., never gets to  
644 status 'registered'), it will be removed from the Dictionary without going through a removal  
645 period with the status 'obsolete'.

646 All removals from the Dictionary are logged in the 'change history record' of the Dictionary  
647 itself.

#### 648 **4.1.4 Versions and variants**

649 It is important to understand the difference between the concepts of 'variants' and 'versions'.

##### 650 Variants

651 When there is a need to accommodate specific market practices of different communities of  
652 users, various levels of automation of users or other similar situations, it may be appropriate to  
653 define distinct 'variants' of the message which each exactly matches the business needs of the  
654 targeted community, *on top of the global message that will include the business needs of all*  
655 *communities*. The 'variant' is a restricted version of a global message. For example, a variant  
656 may force the use of BICs only, where the global message will propose use of BICs or full  
657 name and addresses. The concept of variants allows community of users to be very specific in

658 the description of the messages which facilitates their documentation, increases the level of  
659 STP and may help implementation through sharper XML schemas. Thanks to variants, users  
660 will not have to implement sets of conditional rules to obtain the same message instances from  
661 the global message format (e.g., "if STP message, then use BIC"). The global message,  
662 however, may be used to build applications that can process all message instances generated  
663 either through the global message schema or through the schema of any of its derived variants.

664 To facilitate the use of this concept, each ISO 20022 message has a 'variant number'. The  
665 global message will always bear variant number '1', as will a message with no variants (i.e., all  
666 users use the same message).

667 N.B. In November 2009, the RMG agreed that the concept of variant be used by communities  
668 of users to express how a global ISO 20022 message is to be used by a specific community.  
669 However, the RMG agreed not to explicitly identify these variants in the Message Identifier, as  
670 explained in this section. As a result, only global messages (with variant number '1') are  
671 approved as ISO 20022 messages. However, the RA will publish in the Catalogue of ISO  
672 20022 messages Excel spreadsheets of global messages that will allow communities of users  
673 to define the restrictions that are applicable in their communities while remaining strictly  
674 compliant to the global message. The customised spreadsheets defined by communities will be  
675 published in the Catalogue of ISO 20022 messages together with the global message.

676

#### 677 Versions

678 When there is a need to update a message, the old 'version' is replaced by a new 'version' of the  
679 same message. All messages have a 'version number'.

680 Timing is of the essence: variants run in parallel while versions replace each other. Families of  
681 variants exist concurrently to cope with the particular business requirements of specific  
682 communities or categories of users. Versions allow the switch from one (old) way of using a  
683 message to a new way of using it, based on the evolution of the business (or technical)  
684 requirements. Migration from one version to the next involves all users of the current version,  
685 while a specific user may never use a specific variant developed for another community of  
686 users.

687 Creating a new version of a variant may or may not require the creation of a new version of the  
688 global message, depending on whether the new variant version introduces features that were  
689 already available or not in the global message. Similarly, a new version of a global message  
690 may or may not impact a derived variant. Certain updates within the global message may lead  
691 to the withdrawal of an existing variant (e.g., all users decide to use the BIC only).

692

#### 693 Identification of variants and versions

694 All messages have a 'Message Identifier' attributed by the RA which includes a variant number  
695 and a version number.

696 For example, the 'CustomerCreditTransferInitiationV03' message has the Message Identifier  
697 'pain.001.001.03' where:

- 698 - 'pain' – is an alphabetic code in four positions (fixed length) identifying the business area  
699 (in this case, payment initiation) . The list of [ISO 20022 Business Areas](#) is available on the  
700 website.
- 701 - '001' – is an alphanumeric code in three positions (fixed length) identifying the message  
702 functionality (in this case, credit transfer initiation)
- 703 - '001' – is a numeric code in three positions (fixed length) identifying a particular variant  
704 of message functionality (in this case, there is no variant but a single global message)
- 705 - '03' – is a numeric code in two positions (fixed length) identifying the version

706 Backward compatibility

707 The new version of a message is said to be 'backward compatible' when the receivers of the  
708 message who are still using the old version can still receive and process this new version  
709 correctly. Although every effort should be made to preserve backward compatibility, it is very  
710 rare that the business requirements for a new version offer this possibility. It happens, for  
711 example, when making an optional message item mandatory or removing an optional message  
712 item. In both of these cases, the receiver who has not yet implemented the new version, can, in  
713 theory, still receive and process all instances of the new version.

714 Requests for new versions are, however, generally driven by business evolution and the need to  
715 'extend' the message to cope with new business functionality. An 'extension' of a message, even  
716 if as minor as adding an optional code, is not backward compatible since the receiver will not  
717 be able to read the instances where the new code is used.

718 It should also be considered that, as the version number is part of the Message Identifier, a  
719 'backward compatible' new version of a message will not bear the same message identifier as  
720 its predecessor, which may require receivers of the old version to at least make the changes  
721 required to accept this new message identifier in their (old) application.

722 There is, however, always compatibility between all the variants of a message and their parent  
723 global message. Consequently, the introduction of a new variant – and even the introduction of  
724 a new version of a variant that doesn't impact the current version of the global message –  
725 impacts only the users of this variant. Similarly, changes to an external code list, registration  
726 of additional Data Source Schemes and addition of information in a supplementary data  
727 component do not impact the current version of the global message and, therefore, impacts  
728 only the users that required these changes (see 1.3.2).

729 **4.1.5 Publication of the Repository**

730 The RA updates the Repository any time there are updates to be made. The updates may be  
731 either a provisional registration of items resulting from an approved development or change  
732 request, or the official registration upon final SEG approval.

733 The publication of a new static copy of the Repository on the ISO 20022 website is currently  
734 labour intensive and will generally coincide with the publication of new approved ISO 20022  
735 messages. The published copy of the Repository is identified by a version number and the date  
736 of publication of this version. The full list of updates between two versions of the Data

737 Dictionary and Business Process Catalogue is accessible through the ‘Advanced Search’  
738 functions on the ISO 20022 website.

## 739 **4.2 Intellectual Property Rights**

740 The [Intellectual Property Rights \(IPR\) policy](#) of ISO 20022 keeps the Intellectual Property of a  
741 message version with the submitting organisation(s) that contributed it. It is expected that new  
742 versions will generally be proposed by the original submitting organisation, especially if it had  
743 indicated in the original Business Justification that it committed to initiate or participate in the  
744 maintenance of the message.

745 If a new version of a message is developed by an organisation that is not the original  
746 submitting organisation, the IP of the new version will be shared by the original submitting  
747 organisation and the new contributor(s).

## 748 **4.3 Release cycles**

749 This section is about the cycle of publication of new versions of ISO 20022 messages on the  
750 ISO 20022 website. It is important to note that the publication of a new version does not  
751 mandate users to implement it. Actual implementation of new versions and the migration  
752 conditions ('big bang' or migration preceded by a period of coexistence) are not governed by  
753 ISO, but by the communities of users.

754 However, frequent publication of new versions of the same set of messages should be avoided  
755 to ensure the stability expected by users and implementers. If a message is updated  
756 continuously, potential users will wait until it is stabilised to invest in its implementation. A  
757 user wants to invest in a version that will be implemented by all its counterparts. Frequent  
758 updates make it difficult for new communities of users to ensure they will all implement the  
759 same version.

760 On the other hand, some changes may be mandatory (e.g., regulatory changes) or absolutely  
761 necessary to ensure that current users keep using the messages.

762 The [change request template](#) requires the requester to explain the urgency of the maintenance  
763 and the expected availability of the new message version (next yearly maintenance cycle or  
764 earlier). The SEG that validates the change request should carefully examine the proposed  
765 timing, taking into account:

- 766 - The priority of the change for the community of users. As representative of the users, the  
767 SEG is the appropriate body to check the appetite of the users for a new version.
- 768 - The last time the messages were changed. If there is no particular pressure, it is  
769 recommended to wait for more significant changes to develop and publish a new version.
- 770 - Any other expected updates that will need to be made to the messages in the foreseeable  
771 future. For example, if a regulatory update is approaching, it may be better to wait and  
772 package the two updates in the same new version.

- 773 - The possibility to use the supplementary data component to add required information in the  
774 same version of the message, without impacting communities of users that are not  
775 interested in this information.
- 776 - The availability of the RA and SEG resources and the priority of the maintenance request  
777 with regards to other projects already assigned. Here also, packaging several changes to the  
778 same message set in a single maintenance is more efficient and may save significant RA  
779 and SEG resources.
- 780 - The resources of the submitting organisation. The submitting organisation may not have  
781 much flexibility to develop new versions.
- 782 In other words, the timing of a new version will generally have to be agreed upon between the  
783 various parties involved on a case by case basis.  
784

785 **5 Annex B**

786 **5.1 RMG Voting and RMG voting module**

787 The RMG voting module is available to the specific RMG voting member Principal or  
788 Alternate or 2nd Alternate from RMG participating P-member countries and Category A  
789 Liaison Organisations.

790 The voting module is accessed by user name and password for RMG official voting and the  
791 voting member database is not used as a general email distribution system. The voting module  
792 is used for the two-step business justification approval process: a commenting period followed  
793 by a voting period.

794 **5.1.1 Business Justification for Comment**

795 When a new BJ is received by the RMG Secretary from the RA, a folder is created on the  
796 RMG website and the document is posted to this folder. The BJ is also posted on the ISO  
797 20022 website in the "Log History" spreadsheet attached to the submission in the [Status of](#)  
798 [Submissions](#) table.

799 An automatic email notification is sent to the RMG members and to the Convener, Vice  
800 Convener and Secretaries of the SEGs informing them of the new BJ, the deadline for the  
801 commenting period, and instructions on where to post any comment documents. At the end of  
802 the commenting period, any comments received are zipped together and sent to the submitting  
803 organisation and they are notified that they have three weeks to submit a corrected (if  
804 necessary) document to the RA.

805 **5.1.2 Business Justification Approval**

806 The RA reviews the corrected BJ (if necessary) and then forwards it to the RMG Secretary for  
807 the RMG balloting cycle.

808 The RMG Secretary creates an RMG ballot in the voting module on the RMG website with a  
809 close date of either the 15th or the end of the month giving at least 4 weeks for ballot on BJ  
810 with comments or 2 weeks for BJ's without comments. The BJ document is posted with the  
811 ballot.

812 An email is sent to the RMG informing them of the new BJ ballot as well as information of the  
813 conference call schedule with the BJ submitter to discuss resolution of comments from the  
814 commenting period. The conference call information is provided by the RA.

815 The BJ document is posted to ISO Livelink in the BJ folder and on the ISO 20022 website in  
816 the "Log History" spreadsheet attached to the submission in the [Status of Submissions](#) table.

817 Automatic reminders to vote are sent to RMG members one and three weeks out from the  
818 voting close date. At the end of the ballot period, the ballot results are sent to the RA along  
819 with any comments received.

820 The voting ballot results are posted to the RMG members on ISO Livelink in the BJ folder.

### 821 **5.1.3 Voting Report Card**

822 The voting module is programmed to provide a report consisting of; ballots issues over a  
823 particular period of time, voting members and whether the member voted. This module was  
824 programmed at the request of the RMG to ensure that RMG members were replying to balloted  
825 BJs.

## 826 **5.2 Use of the ISO Livelink Drop In Box**

827 The ISO Livelink Drop In Box may be used to provide Documents and Reports such as the  
828 country or liaison reports to RMG meetings.

829 Such documents, reports and requests submitted to the RMG secretary shall be issued to the  
830 RMG Secretary via ISO Livelink's "Drop-in box for members".

831 This drop in box will allow RMG secretary to ensure the document is submitted to the correct  
832 committee and help prevent lost email. Those reports or documents dropped in should be  
833 clearly identified as to the action that is to be taken or contain a cover note with the instructions  
834 for the RMG secretary to take.

835 The drop in box folder will be checked daily during normal business hours.

836 All requests dropped in shall be taken on a first in basis.

837 Following are instructions on how this drop in box folder works.

838 Instructions on use of ISO's Livelink Drop In Box (folder):

839 1- Login to ISO Livelink using your user name and password.

840 2- Click on the RMG for ISO 20022 "folder" (note there is a drop in box folder on each  
841 committee so please do not use the TC68 when you intend to use the RMG)

842 3- Select or click on the drop in box for members

843 4- You will arrive at a grey page

844 5- In the right hand corner of the grey page select the drop down box ADD NEW ITEM  
845 select "DOCUMENT"

846 6- Selecting "Document" takes you to the screen below. At a minimum complete the name  
847 of the document and "upload the document" via the "file" area which takes you into your  
848 computer browser to add or "upload" the document.

849 7- When you click ADD ITEM, the system will take you to a numbering page – you can  
850 give the document a number – use 001 if you like and then click "DONE". Note that RMG  
851 Secretary will not use the number you give the document as we number separately. You may  
852 also click DONE without adding a document number and your document to the RMG  
853 Secretary will load with no problem.

854