# Working assumptions of the RTPG Drafting Group

* A similar approach is to be taken to the Common Global Implementation Market Practice Group, where consultation, collaboration and agreement on common implementation templates for relevant ISO 20022 financial messages, lead to their subsequent publication and promotion in order to attain widespread recognition and adoption;
* The scope of the work of the RTPG is focused on the usage of ISO 20022 messages and therefore is agnostic to precise details of implementation, for example the time parameter that a market would define for the operation of a real-time system. Similarly whilst real-time payments do introduce performance and availability considerations, these considerations are implementation decisions that are not in scope of this activity. The messages used will remain sufficiently agnostic to this.
* The documentation produced will be based on the latest version of the messages. However, any implementation guide will be agnostic and will document meaningful differences between versions where appropriate;
* Any implementation guide the RTPG produces should be based on low value, interbank, account to account credit transfers;
* All effort will be made to reuse existing ISO 20022 messages, taking into consideration that for some functionality, particularly in the query/response/request for information space, new messages may need to be developed;
* Code sets may need to be defined, using the ISO 20022 methodology, particularly when identifying clearing systems. Code sets are recommended over proprietary usage or free text. Proprietary should only be used if there is a scheme or code. Harmonisation around code sets would be beneficial to greater align between ISO 20022 code sets and proprietary code sets. It is anticipated that over time this process would expose a view of market practice code lists;
* Remittance data within the message should be permitted, although unstructured remittance data is undesirable. Remittance data travelling with the core payment should be limited and where there is complex or extensive data this should be considered, as far as possible, to be stand-alone from the core message. Three use cases for remittance data have been identified (i) limited remittance in a message (1 instance of 140 characters), (ii) structured remittance in a message (10 repeats) and (iii) standalone remittance. The recommendation in implementation is that more complex remittance information should be conveyed outside the message and referenced. If the ‘Unstructured’ field is used it is recommended that only one instance be populated. If the ‘Structured’ field is used then it is recommended that this is limited to 10 instances. It is recommended that the ‘AdditionalRemittanceInformation’ field is not used;
* Further investigation needs to be done into how to cater for settlement within ISO 20022, currently there are no clear messages within the ISO 20022 repository that cater explicitly for settlement. pacs.009 (Financial Institution Credit Transfer) is in scope for consideration as a possible message for settlement. Submissions that define the usage of the pacs.009 with a real-time system are welcomed. The assumption at this early stage is that the pacs.009 will not cover all the necessary requirements of a real-time system for settlement based on the implementation contributions that the drafting group has received. The pacs.009 will indeed be reviewed as part of the work program as will the pacs.010 (Financial Institution Direct Debit).
* There should be as much consistency as possible at the header level;
* Associated to the Business Application Header (BAH) and technical header the assumption is that for real time there is no batching of payments within a single header. So one header per single payment.
* There is currently no ISO 20022 technical envelope and so these are proprietary non-standardised at present. In addition, there is no logical way to link the Business Application Header and the payload. The Business Application Header is not particularly attuned for real-time payments processing and does not have all the necessary technical elements that could be envisaged. There is a need for additional business information outside of the payload.
* There is no concept of risk indication in a pacs.008 and the recommendation is that this should be catered for outside of the message content, possibly in the header. Further analysis will be needed.
* The evaluation of the usage of existing reference identifications in conjunction with real time payments is a necessary component of the RTPG work. This includes references initiated by the customers (end to end) but also intermediary references between Sending/Receiving Banks, RTP Switch and possible Settlement Agent.
* Further investigation needs to be done into how to cater for Query/Response/Request for Information messages within ISO 20022;
* Full schema will be documented and not redacted or short versions;
* Internal payment processing e.g. AML, Fraud, Limit checks, routing are deemed out of scope.
* A tooling approach will be used by the drafting group to produce documentation expediently, but will publish using other formats, such as Word and PDF. The group may also offer machine readable content as well.