# Change Request for the update of an External Code Set

Note: this document is to be completed by parties that request to either add new codes or clarify the definition of existing codes or replace existing codes by new one(s) or expire existing codes in one of the [*External Code Sets*](http://www.iso20022.org/external_code_list.page) used in ISO 20022 messages. All change requests conforming to this template that are received prior to the end of a quarter (31 March, 30 June, 30 September, 31 December) will be evaluated by the SEG and, if approved, incorporated in the following quarterly publication cycle of the External Code Sets (respectively, by end of May, August, November and February), unless otherwise specified by the SEG.

# Origin of the request:

## A.1 Submitter:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the company, organization, group, initiative or community that submits the change request. | Berlin Group as a European Standardisation Initiative, in the name of BITS, Dutch Payment Association, Nexi, CBI Italy, Worldline, MasterCard, EuroKartensysteme, Firstdata, German Banking Industry Committee, PAN Nordic Card Association, Payment Services Austria, Redsys, SIBS, STET, Trionis, and many other bank associations, banks or processors from the European region and beyond. |

## A.2 Contact person:

Person that can be contacted for additional information on the request

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A.2.1. First name, Last name | Ortwin, Scheja |
| A.2.2. Email address | ortwin.scheja@src-gmbh.de |
| A.2.3. Telephone | +49 228 2806109 |

## A.3 Sponsors:

If the submitter acts on behalf of or has gained support from other organisations, groups, initiatives or communities, these should be listed as sponsors.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# Description of the change request:

Specify the request type: creation of new code set, update of existing code set, deletion of existing code set.

For the creation of a new code set or for updating an existing code set, also complete the table in section H below. For the addition of new codes, all the details must be specified, including a proposed code, a proposed code name, a clear definition, and any other indications, such as an example or format to be published with the code set.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Request type: creation, update, deletion | update |

# Related External Code Set:

For updating or deleting an existing code set, indicate the exact name of the code set as indicated in the [*External Code Sets*](http://www.iso20022.org/external_code_list.page)documents on iso20022.org. For creating a new code set, indicate a proposed name for the new code set.

A specific change request form must be completed for each code set to be updated.

|  |
| --- |
| ExternalPaymentTransactionStatus1Code |

# Purpose of the change:

Background, business context, community of users interested by the change and expected benefits/savings.

This section must explain why the existing code set needs to be changed. The reason for the update may be a business reason (e.g., evolution of market practice, or creation of new financial instruments), a technical reason (e.g., automation of the business process, or switch from a batch to a real time process), a regulatory reason (introduction, generally mandatory, of new rule/law) or the extension of the user community (newly identified business requirements).

|  |
| --- |
| The Berlin Group has published the openFinance API Framework which is covering Open Banking items resulting from the European Payment Service Directive 2 (PSD2) or similar regulations as the former NextGenPSD2 API Framework has done. In addition, this new openFinance API Framework is also dealing also with many premium services for account to account payments, which are e.g. addressed in the SEPA Payment Account Access Scheme (SPAA) established by the European Payment Council (EPC). The API clients in this case is a TPP (Payment Initiation Service Provider - PISP), which may initiate payments through the dedicated premium interface of the bank on a Payment Service User's (PSU) payment account.  The Berlin Group openFinance API is based on the ISO20022 dictionary. The API heavily depend on the data element Transaction Status of the ISO20022 to report results   * about the processing status of the payment regarding e.g. formal, semantic and risk management checks of the bank, * about the authorisation process of the PSU.   Different to message based file transfer protocols, REST based APIs are managing the payment initiation in a more granular way through micro services. REST based APIs have a resource oriented approach, where e.g. a payment initiation resource supports to communicate e.g. status changes from the bank to the TPP during the whole life cycle of a payment. Due to this different technical approach, more detailed transaction status reporting is needed than for file transfer based protocols.  In addition, the fore mentioned premium payment services are mapping card like business functions to account to account payments, offering more flexibility for payment initiation related processes than in existing file transfer or API based protocols.  With this background, the ISO20022 is kindly asked to add the following codes in the ExternalPaymentTransactionStatus1Code list: ACFR: AcceptedFundsCheckedConfirmationRequired Technical/Procedural Reason:  In several business situations, a PSU might have authorised already a payment to a creditor with a fixed account and a maximal amount via a REST API. All authentication, customer profile and funds checks have been performed already successfully. In premium services, the Payer bank will allow TPPs then to initiate payments in a flexible way after this authorisation step – this might be processed in one or several initiations depending on the use case, where the sum of all instructed amount will be less equal to the authorised amount. For every initiation, the payer bank might offer a one or two-step approach. A two step approach might be needed, if the underlying business service does not come with an earlier funds blocking. Then the actual initiation request will only check the availability of funds, while a request for the actual execution is mandated from the TPP in a second step. This two step approach is fulfilling e.g. related needs from checkout processes of merchants.  In REST APIs, all business statuses of the payment initiation resource should be reflected, such that the actual status is always available for the TPP. For this reason this new status code is requested to differentiate the one and two step initiations in a well defined way. |

# Urgency of the request:

By default, valid change requests, subsequently approved by the SEG will be included in the following quarterly publication of External Code Sets, unless decided otherwise by the SEG.

If there is a need to have the new version of the related code set published earlier, the reason for the urgency and the expected consequences of a delay should be described here. Acceptance of such an unscheduled publication is subject to approval by the SEG.

|  |
| --- |
| The request for the code is very urgent, since first implementations of premium account to account payment based on the openFinance API Framework are already running in the European market. |

# Business examples:

Provide examples illustrating usage of the code set and indicate messages where the code set may be used.

|  |
| --- |
| Applicable in premium services for account to account payments. |

# SEG recommendation:

This section will be completed by the SEG in charge of the related External Code Set.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Accept | | X | Timing |
|  | | Next possible quarterly release | | X |
|  | | Urgent request | |  |

Comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reject |  |

Reason for rejection:

# DESCRIPTION OF THE CHANGE REQUEST

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | Code Value | Code Name | Code Definition | Replaced By | Additional Information |
| Addition | ACFW | AcceptedFunds CheckedWaitingConfirmation | Preceding check of technical validation and customer profile was successful and an automatic funds check was positive, but an explicit confirmation by the initiating party is outstanding. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |