**Change Request**

**for the update of ISO 20022 financial repository items**

*Note: the purpose of this document is to give guidelines to parties who want to introduce a request to change an existing ISO 20022 message(s), or update other items of the ISO 20022 financial repository. Such change requests are subject to the approval of the ISO 20022 Standards Evaluation Group(s) in charge of the related message/item or to the approval of the Technical Support Group (TSG), if the requested change relates to the Business Application Header (BAH). Please consult the iso20022.org website for additional details on the* [*maintenance process*](http://www.iso20022.org/maintenance.page)*. Change requests are to be sent to* [*iso20022ra@iso20022.org*](mailto:iso20022ra@iso20022.org)*. All change requests conforming to this template received by June 1st will be considered for development in the following yearly ISO 20022 maintenance cycle which completes with publication of new message versions in April/May of the following year.*

1. **Origin of the request:**

*A.1 Submitter*: EPC – European Payments Council.

*A.2 Contact person:* Christophe Godefroi, [Christophe.godefroi@epc-cep.eu](mailto:Christophe.godefroi@epc-cep.eu), +32 2 739 16 93

*A.3 Sponsors*: The payment service providers (PSPs) community of SEPA (Single Euro Payments Area)

1. **Related messages:**

The message impacted by the present change request is the pain.013.001.09 CreditorPaymentActivationRequestV09.

Please refer also to “Remarks” under section C.

1. **Description of the change request:**

Introduce in the current pain.013.001.09 the possibility to request a payment payable in instalments, please refer to D. below.

To allow this, it is proposed to add an optional [0..1] element “RequestedExecutionDate” to the “CreditTransferTransaction” block. The type of this element would be “DateAndDateTime2Choice”.

As a consequence:

* the “RequestedExecutionDate” element at the upper level, under “PaymentInformation”, that currently is mandatory [1..1] should be made optional [0..1]
* and a new constraint should be added, “C24 RequestedExecutionDateRule” stating that “RequestedExecutionDate must be present either directly under PaymentInformation or under CreditTransferTransaction but cannot be present at both levels simultaneously”.
  + Side effect: The numbering of the constraints after “RequestedExecutionDateRule” (in alphabetical order) would need to be changed.

The proposed modifications are reflected below in green :

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Or | MessageElement/BuildingBlock <XML Tag> | Mult. | Type | Constr. No. |
|  | **PaymentInformation** <PmtInf> | [1..\*] |  | C5, C7, C8, C9, C10, C13, C14, C23, C6, C28 |
|  | PaymentInformationIdentification <PmtInfId> | [0..1] | Text |  |
|  | PaymentMethod <PmtMtd> | [1..1] | CodeSet |  |
|  | RequestedAdviceType <ReqdAdvcTp> | [0..1] |  |  |
|  | PaymentTypeInformation <PmtTpInf> | [0..1] | ± |  |
|  | RequestedExecutionDate <ReqdExctnDt> | **[0..1]** | ± | **C24** |
|  | ExpiryDate <XpryDt> | [0..1] | ± |  |
|  | PaymentCondition <PmtCond> | [0..1] |  |  |
|  | Debtor <Dbtr> | [1..1] | ± |  |
|  | DebtorAccount <DbtrAcct> | [0..1] |  | C19, C18 |
|  | DebtorAgent <DbtrAgt> | [1..1] | ± |  |
|  | UltimateDebtor <UltmtDbtr> | [0..1] | ± |  |
|  | ChargeBearer <ChrgBr> | [0..1] | CodeSet |  |
|  | **CreditTransferTransaction** <CdtTrfTx> | [1..\*] |  | C20, C21, C22, C27, C29 |
|  | PaymentIdentification <PmtId> | [1..1] | ± |  |
|  | PaymentTypeInformation <PmtTpInf> | [0..1] | ± |  |
|  | PaymentCondition <PmtCond> | [0..1] |  |  |
|  | **RequestedExecutionDate <ReqdExctnDt>** | **[0..1]** | **±** | **C24** |
|  | Amount <Amt> | [1..1] | ± |  |
|  | ChargeBearer <ChrgBr> | [1..1] | CodeSet |  |
|  | etc… |  |  |  |

Remarks:

The proposed modification:

* does not affect pain.014.001.09 where “RequestedExecutionDate” already exists only under “TransactionInformationAndStatus / OriginalTransactionReference”;
* does not need to be transposed into pain.001.001.11 CustomerCreditTransferInitiationV11 for the purpose of this change (see under D. below). Indeed, the customer-to-bank initiation of instalment payments is not managed with pain.001.

1. **Purpose of the change:**

A change request was submitted in relation to the SEPA Request-to-Pay (SRTP) scheme to allow a payment request for instalment payments. This means that under one unique “PaymentInformation” block there is a need to have several “CreditTransferTransaction” blocks with different requested execution dates. This is currently not possible because “RequestedExecutionDate” exists only at “PaymentInformation” level. In order to allow for instalment payments, “RequestedExecutionDate” should hence be added under “CreditTransferTransaction”, where it currently does not exist.

The use of the “RequestedExecutionDate” would then be as follows:

* For a payment request with a one-time payment, the “PaymentInformation” block would continue to be used with “RequestedExecutionDate” directly in this block.
* For a payment request with instalment payments mandated by the Payee, the “PaymentInformation” block would be used without “RequestedExecutionDate” but with several occurrences of the “CreditTransferTransaction” block, each of them with a different “RequestedExecutionDate” according to the instalment periodicity.
* For a payment request whereby the Payer is given the choice to either pay via a one-time payment or via instalment payments, the Payee would use two occurrences of the “PaymentInformation” block with the same “PaymentInformationIdentification”:
  + One occurrence where “PaymentInformation” contains “RequestedExecutionDate” and one occurrence of “CreditTransferTransaction” with the full amount to be paid.
  + Another occurrence of “PaymentInformation” without “RequestedExecutionDate” but with several occurrences of the “CreditTransferTransaction” block, each of them with the requested split amount and the respective “RequestedExecutionDate” according to the instalment periodicity.

In the latter case, the SRTP scheme usage rule would then provide guidance on how to link both “PaymentInformation” occurrences, e.g. by using the same “PaymentInformationIdentification” for both, thus allowing to (automatically) detect that they refer to the same payment request and imply a choice between them.

1. **Urgency of the request:**

The change request should be approved for publication as soon as possible as the possibility of instalment payments in the SRTP scheme is requested by the stakeholders for version 3 of the Rulebook to be published in November 2022. Consequently, the possibility to introduce the ISO change request in a fast track procedure would be highly welcomed. Indeed, the EPC Implementation Guidelines on the use of the ISO 20022 messages for the purpose of the SRTP can only be completed once the definitive version of the ISO message is known. Waiting for the annual publication cycle in January/February 2023 would delay the publication and implementation of the EPC SRTP Implementation Guidelines version 3 and thus hamper the take-off of SRTP.

1. **Business examples:**

“Buy Now Pay Later” use cases (e.g. for purchasing furniture, household appliances etc.), combined with instalments to allow the splitting of a payment over a longer period of time.

1. **SEG/TSG recommendation:**

*This section is not to be taken care of by the submitter of the change request. It will be completed in due time by the SEG(s) in charge of the related ISO 20022 messages or the TSG for changes related to the BAH.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Consider** | | X | **Timing** |
|  | | - **Next yearly cycle: 2022/2023**  (the change will be considered for implementation in the yearly maintenance cycle which starts in 2022 and completes with the publication of new message versions in the spring of 2023) | | X |
|  | | - **At the occasion of the next maintenance of the messages**  (the change will be considered for implementation, but does not justify maintenance of the messages in its own right – will be pending until more critical change requests are received for the messages) | |  |
|  | | - **Urgent unscheduled**  (the change justifies an urgent implementation outside of the normal yearly cycle) | |  |  |
|  | | - **Other timing:** | | |  |

Comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reject** |  |

Reason for rejection: