



Standards

Standards MT/MX Release 2025

Discussion paper and Minutes Payments – CR2006 Implementation

Distribution: Payments Standards Working Group
Author: Dean Chard
Date Issued: Discussion Paper Issued 24th May 2023
Meeting Date: 5th September 2023
Version: 2.0 Final Minutes

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Overview of User Change requests	4
2.1	CR 002006: Allow simultaneous usage of unstructured AdrLine and structured address elements in Postal Address	4
3	Overview of SWIFT Change requests	9

1 Introduction

Standards working group members:

Hendrik Muus
Alexandra Karrer (Absent)
Sally Greer
Mel Gauci (Absent)
Geert Van Antwerpen (Absent)
Koen Wittevrongel
Jason Sweeney (Absent)
Virginia Di Fonzo (Absent)
Zhang Yan
Laurent Lafeuillade
Paula Roels
Harald Schmid
Patrick Yeh
Stephen O'Brien
Luca Frigerio
Andrea Cogerino (Absent)
Ryosuke Sakai
Tsuyoshi Monobe (Absent)
Mike Pruiksmas
Paul de Blok
Atle Fjereide
Terje Albert
Petunia Mashamba (Absent)
Enrique Mejjide (Absent)
Martin Walder
Roman Locher (Absent)
Mert Buyukyagcioglu (Absent)
Muhammet Kemal Aytemir
Chloe Jenkins
Christopher Brown
Michael Mangieri
Isabelle Bouille

Frank Van Driessche

Representing:

Austria SWIFT User Group
Austria SWIFT User Group
Australia SWIFT User Group
Australia SWIFT User Group
Belgium SWIFT User Group
Belgium SWIFT User Group
Canada SWIFT User Group
Canada SWIFT User Group
China SWIFT User Group
France SWIFT User Group
Germany SWIFT User Group
Germany SWIFT User Group
Hong Kong SWIFT User Group
Ireland SWIFT User Group
Italy SWIFT User Group
Italy SWIFT User Group
Japan SWIFT User Group
Japan SWIFT User Group
Netherlands SWIFT User Group
Netherlands SWIFT User Group
Nordic SWIFT User Groups
Nordic SWIFT User Groups
South Africa SWIFT User Group
Spain SWIFT User Group
Switzerland SWIFT User Group
Switzerland SWIFT User Group
Turkey SWIFT User Group
Turkey SWIFT User Group
United Kingdom SWIFT User Group
United Kingdom SWIFT User Group
United States SWIFT User Group
United States SWIFT User Group

Observer

2 Overview of User Change requests

2.1 CR 002006: Allow simultaneous usage of unstructured AdrLine and structured address elements in Postal Address

Origin of request	
Requesting Country:	
Requesting Group:	PMPG (Payments Market Practice Group)
Sponsors	
PMPG (Payments Market Practice Group) CGI (Common Global Implementation)	
Message type(s) impacted	
CBPR+ usage guidelines (UGs) for – pacs.008, pacs.008 STP, pacs.004, pacs.009COV, pacs.009ADV, pacs.009, camt.029, camt.056, camt.057, camt.060, pacs.002, pacs.010, pain.001, pain.002, camt.055, camt.058, camt.107, camt.108, camt.109, pacs.003, pain.008	
Complies with regulation	
RTGS operator (incl. T2, Chaps, Fed etc..) as well as the BIS (Bank for International Settlement) / CPMI (Committee for Payment Market Infrastructures) are mandating structured addresses in ISO 20022 in order to improve the efficiency and remove friction (delays, RFIs) in cross-border payments. Not adhering to the same standard in CBPR+ will cause friction and jeopardize the interoperability. Once this CR is approved, PMPG will engage with those stakeholders in order to align the standard in HPVS+, the basis for the RTGS specific Usage Guideline	
Business impact of this request	
HIGH The proposed change intends to ease the migration to structured addresses and to reduce the efforts of the impacted stakeholders. It takes into consideration the lack of globally standardized addresses and the inability of the end-user/client to unambiguously map all information from today's "address line" into the respective structured ISO20022 element, e.g. street name, building name, floor, room etc. It aims at improving the data quality required for sanction and embargo checks prior to payment processing by enforcing the use of a minimums set of structured data, such as country and town, while it supports the provision of all other information in the format available (structured or unstructured based on the initiating party's capability).	
Commitment to implement the change	
Commits to implement and when: PMPG (Payments Market Practice Group) - 2025	
Business context	
As per the current plan, the usage of unstructured AdrLine element will not be supported after November 2025. Without this Change Request, the PMPG sees the risk that the wider industry	

(corporates and financial institutions) will not be able to map all data of today's address information correctly into the appropriate structured address elements as defined by ISO20022. While elements like post code, Town Name and Country are often available in a structured format and could be provided with reasonable efforts in the respective ISO 20022 elements, information relating to "the last mile" of an address is often stored in unstructured text strings/"Address Lines" (e.g. street name, building number, building name, floor, room etc).

The current definition of inter-bank messages as per CBPR+ (and HVPS+) doesn't allow the simultaneous usage of unstructured Address Line and structured data elements, hence it is currently an "all-or-nothing" approach. This holds up many stakeholders to migrate to structured addresses and endangers the successful completion of the migration to ISO 20022 by November 2025.

After various iterations and multiple dialogues with stakeholders and industry groups such as the CGI, corporate community, and the financial sector, the PMPG concluded that only a reconsideration of the current strategy/approach for the postal address will allow the industry to successfully complete the migration to ISO 20022 and to retire the legacy FIN messages. This conclusion was reconfirmed by the outcome of the recent corporate survey to which more than 120 corporate and globally servicing ERP/TMS provider replied (key results under the tab 'Industry survey April 2023').



Survey summary
(infographic) V1.1 (1)

The proposed change still aims at improving the data quality and structure of the addresses as needed for the pre-payment processes (such as sanctions and embargo checks), while it reduces the complexity and efforts for all stakeholders in the migration to ISO 20022.

Nature of change

The PMPG proposes the following changes to the "Postal Address" data element for the CBPR+ portfolio of ISO 20022 UGs:

- 1) Allow the usage of structured address elements together with up to max. 2 occurrences of Address Line ('AdrLine') each with a maximum of 70 characters (max70text)
- 2) introduce a formal rule: If Postal Address is present, Town Name and Country must be provided as structured data elements, all other address attributes may be provided in structured data elements or address line. Duplication of Country and Town in Address Line must be avoided.
- 3) remove following rules :

Rule "CBPR_Structured_vs_Unstructured_FormalRule"
If PostalAddress is used and if AddressLine is present, then all other optional elements in PostalAddress must be absent.

Rule "CBPR_Town_Name_And_Country_FormalRule"

If "PostalAddress" is used, and if AddressLine is absent, then Country and Town name must be present.

Target implementation date: November 2025.

Examples

Standards Illustration

⚠️ CBPR_Co-existence_Postal_Address_TextualRule

- 1) If a payment is initiated by the Debtor's Agent in ISO 20022, effective with the start of the co-existence phase in November 2022, it is highly recommended to use a structured address of the Debtor and Creditor. Please note some MIs may reject an unstructured address from 2023.
- 2) If a payment is initiated on FIN or by an MI not on ISO20022 yet, and the postal address is unstructured, the outgoing ISO 2002 2 message will transport unstructured postal address, up to the Creditor Agent. End of 2023 is still highly recommended as a target by all communities as for the end-date for unstructured party information for any payment format, legacy, FIN and ISO 20022.
- 3) From November 2023 until November 2025, the same strong recommendation as stated under 1) above, applies.

4) Structured address will become mandatory from November 2025 (the unstructured Address Line element will be removed).

The screenshot shows the Swift MyStandards interface. The main content area displays the rule details for "CBPR_Co-existence_Postal_Address_TextualRule". The rule is highlighted with a red box. The rule description is also highlighted with a red box:

CBPR_Structured_vs_Unstructured_FormalRule
 If PostalAddress is used and if AddressLine is present, then all other optional elements in PostalAddress must be absent.
 More information

CBPR_Town_Name_And_Country_FormalRule
 If "PostalAddress" is used, and if AddressLine is absent, then Country and Town name must be present.
 More information

CBPR_Party_Name_Postal_Address_FormalRule
 If Postal Address is present then Name is mandatory.
 More information

Type
 PostalAddressS4
 • is_choice: false

SWIFT Comment

Working Group Meeting

Discussion

- SWIFT noted that the PSWG had already reviewed the CR at the PSWG meeting of the 27th June and deemed it valid with various conditions
- SWIFT noted the HVPS+ group too had reviewed the CR and deemed it valid with various conditions
- SWIFT walked the PSWG through it's proposed implementation of the CR (and conditions) within it's CBPR+ usage guidelines. This included the rules and data types planned
- There were no objections or concerns from the PSWG
- One community explained the need for other business domains such as Trade and Securities to be made aware of this CR and it's impacts. SWIFT confirmed that the Trade domain are already aware whilst they will work on briefing Securities



SR2025%20Postal%
20Address%20CR%2

Unstructured vs. Hybrid Address Line

- At the 27th June meeting of the PSWG it was agreed that the hybrid address would allow 2 lines of 70 characters for the unstructured data (Address Line)
- This differs from the fully unstructured address that allows 3 lines of 35 characters (Address Line)
- One community suggested that as of November 2025 both the hybrid and fully unstructured address should both use 2 lines of 70 characters
- The PSWG did not support this suggestion as it would no longer mean the November 2025 – November 2026 period was a 'grace period', institutions wanting to use a fully unstructured address would be forced into system development with such a proposal

Statements and Notifications

- One community requested SWIFT explain the planned impact to statements and notifications (CBPR+ camt.053, CBPR+ camt.054) as a result of this CR
- SWIFT explained the need for flexibility within the postal address component on statements and notifications
- Many institutions will likely copy/paste or source postal address data directly from the related payments when building a statement or notification. As such this data may come as fully structured, fully unstructured or hybrid as of November 2025
- Not all transactions/entries that are reported on CBPR+ camt.053s or CBPR+ camt.054s are in fact CBPR+ or HVPS+ payments. ACH systems, cheque clearings etc. may operate their own format today
- To offer maximum flexibility with reduced impact SWIFT's current proposal would be to allow up to 3 lines of 70 characters as of November 2025

- There would be no plan to reduce that as of November 2026

Impact on certain postal addresses

- One community asked for clarification on whether a hybrid address would be allowed for Charges Information – Agent, Related Remittance – Remittance Location, Structured Remittance Information Invoicer, Invoicee, Garnishee and Garnishment Administrator
- SWIFT clarified that a hybrid address would be allowed. However, as is the case for ultimate debtor, ultimate creditor and initiating party a fully unstructured address would not be allowed for invoicer, invoicee, garnishee and garnishment administrator during the one year 'grace period', November 2025 – November 2026. A fully unstructured address for these parties is not currently allowed on the live network today, moving to a lesser standard for a one year period makes no sense

Translation

- One community asked for translation rules/mapping to be provided for a hybrid address to MT
- SWIFT re-confirmed that the current strategy remains to deactivate the MT 1,2 and 9 messages as of November 2025 across the SWIFT network. However, SWIFT recognizes that a number of institutions will continue to run on-premise translation post November 2025
- SWIFT will revert to the group in due course with what could be provided to the industry in terms of translation rules / libraries / logic. Any service would likely be payable

Decision

- PSWG approved SWIFT's proposed implementation of the hybrid address within the CBPR+ usage guidelines.

3 Overview of SWIFT Change requests

None

End of document