



Standards

Standards MT Release 2024

Discussion paper and Minutes

Trade Finance

Distribution: Trade Finance Standards Working Group
Author: Mukta Kadam
Date Issued: 29-June-2023
Meeting Date: 30-Aug-2023
Version: 1.0 Final Minutes

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Overview of User Change requests	5
2.1	CR 002004: Increasing field length for parties.....	5
2.2	CR 002008: Revised code name for field :71N: "Amendment Charge Payable by" in MT 707	9
2.3	CR 002013: Add a charge field in MT 765.....	12
2.4	CR 002016: Enhance message type MT 760 with purpose of undertaking for an IRU in addition to current DGAR and STBY purposes.	15
2.5	CR 002017: Revise field definition :71D: "Charges"	19
2.6	CR 002021: Add a rule on tag23 in MT 760	23
2.7	CR 002022: Add a rule on tag23 in MT760 (Duplicate of CR #2021)	26
2.8	CR 002030: Add a charges field in MT765 (Duplicate of CR #2013).....	28
2.9	CR 002031: Update Network Validated Rule (NVR) in field 40C of MT 760	30
3	Overview of SWIFT Change requests	33
3.1	CR 002045: Change the format of fields 44A, 44B, 44E, 44F	33

1 Introduction

Standards Illustrations in this document

Standards illustrations are provided by Swift Standards. They are not part of the original request.

Any standard illustrations (rules, codes, qualifiers, wordings) are **only for illustration purposes**. It does not mean Swift Standards is in agreement with the maintenance request or that the final standards solutions (for accepted maintenance requests) will be as shown in this document.

The MT Standards Release Guide (+ potential erratum) and the ISO 20022 message definition reports are the **ONLY** source of reliable information based on which implementation of changes should be made. Any other documentation (including this one) is subject to change.

SR 2024 change requests

This document contains all Trade Finance MT CRs for MT category 7 messages investigated this year for implementation in SR 2024 along with CRs approved and postponed in the last SR cycle but not yet implemented.

The requests originator is indicated as follows:

- Requesting Country: Country code of requesting UG or National Member User Group
- Requesting Group: a SWIFT User Group with the acknowledgement of the UGC or a Recognized industry group

CR Title Colour notation (for minutes^[1] only)

In **GREEN** are items that are approved or approved with comments or approved with alternative solution.

In **RED** are items that are rejected, withdrawn, or linked to agreed items

In **GREY** are items that are postponed for review, they will be discussed at the next release to decide on implementation.

Contact person regarding this document

Mukta Kadam – SWIFT Standards; mukta.kadam@swift.com

Maintenance working group members	Representing	Response via
Mr. Sam Jebamony	US SWIFT User Group	Email + Meeting
Ms. Ma Shen	CN SWIFT User Group	Email
Mr. Chris Brown	GB SWIFT User Group	Email + Meeting
Mr. Patrick Boiteau	FR SWIFT User Group	Email
Mr. Francesco Lucchese	IT SWIFT User Group	Email + Meeting
Mr. Roland Hasenaecker	DE SWIFT User Group	Email + Meeting
Mr. Venkat Raman	HK SWIFT User Group	Email + Meeting
Mr. Senthil Kumar	UAE SWIFT User Group	Absent (No response)
Mr. Rakesh Behal	IN SWIFT User Group	Email
Mr. Chuan Huey Ferg	SG SWIFT User Group	Email + Meeting
Mr. Akmal Hossain	BD SWIFT User Group	Email + Meeting
Mr. Seungwon Kim	KR SWIFT User Group	Absent (No response)
Ms. Que Truong	VN SWIFT User Group	Email
Ms. Zeynep Ersamut	TR SWIFT User Group	Email
Ms. Marta Rilo	SP SWIFT User Group	Email + Meeting
Mr. Chris Hall	JP SWIFT User Group	Absent (No response)
Mr. Ahmed Abdel-Latif	EG SWIFT User Group	Email

Attendees from Swift – Karin De Ridder, Dean Chard, Mukta Kadam

2 Overview of User Change requests

2.1 CR 002004: Increasing field length for parties

Origin of request	
Requesting Country:	AE United Arab Emirates
Requesting Group:	
Sponsors	
Message type(s) impacted	
MT 700, MT 705, MT 707, MT 710, MT 720, MT 740, MT 760, MT 767	
Complies with regulation	
None	
Business impact of this request	
HIGH Increase the number of characters from 4*35 to 4*70 for party fields	
Commitment to implement the change	
Number of messages sent and received: 50000 Percentage of messages impacted: 100 Commits to implement and when: all groups using swift. 2024	
Business context	
Accurate data capture and usage. Compliance issues and fine tuning.	
Nature of change	
Increase the number of characters from 4*35 to 4*70 for party fields. If the party name is more than 35 characters, the same is continued in the address column. On account of this, data is not accurate and divided into 2 fields.	
Examples	
MT 700, Field 50: Applicant name is read as "ABU DHABI XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX", we update the name in two parts like first line as " Abu Dhabi XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX" and continue in address field the remaining part of the name "XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX"	

SWIFT Comment

Swift thinks it is not a good timing to extend these fields now. Once the ongoing migration of Payments MTs to ISO 20022 format is complete, it will be a good opportunity to align with CBPR+ based on the learnings from the migration. Data should, then, be easy to flow between trade finance and payments messages, without any truncation or mapping issues. A change at this point may overburden the corporates and bank's internal systems. Swift also thinks that the change not only impacts trade finance category 7 messages but also FX, Securities etc. and post migration, the industry will have a better visibility.

Working Group Meeting

Discussion

Response by email:

BD – Yes

CN – No.

We agree with SWIFT.

1. Current the fields length can meet our essential business requirement, but such a change at this point would overburden bank's system. We estimate that this CR would impact much on our system, including structures of database of parties involved information, auto-wrap logic and validate rules. In a long run, after completion of migration to ISO20022, it will be more convenient to find solution on the field length and structured subfield.

2. Although we wish that this CR can be realized at last, but we are not in favour of the proposal from SWIFT Payments Standards Working Group either. As for our developing the internal systems, the implementation step-by-step could not reduce overall workload, even more cost. Especially, considering that quite a lot of received messages (such as incoming msg in form of MT700) have to be converted into outgoing messages (such as MT710 or 720) automatically, it will be simple to deal with the transaction in case of same structured receiving and sending message, in order to avoid confusion and mistakes.

DE - No

We agree with the submitter, that in a lot of transactions the current party field specification (4*35) is too small to cover all details necessary.

However, just enlarging the field to (4*70) is not sufficient as per our point of view.

With respect to other communities also discussing the party fields, we should aim for a more conceptual/strategic approach for "our" message category (i.e. 4 & 7), including a structured (semi-structured) option of the party fields.

EG – Yes

FR – No

But ok in SR 2025, with alignment on all MT categories (for MX mapping)

GB – No
Agree with the recommendation from SWIFT to progress with this CR at a later date and not as part of SR2024.
HK – No
Agree with SWIFT comments, not in favour of the change since the associated system costs will be large.
IN – Yes
In certain cases, the bank requires additional fields for filling in the information like FED Wire routing number, Name of the client followed by alias name which current fields unable to cater. Thus, the changes should be included.
IT – No
According to Swift comment "Swift thinks it is not a good timing to extend these fields now..." Also, it would be a high impact change, with no big benefits.
JP – Absent
KR – Absent
SG – No
Align with SWIFT's comment
SP – No
TR – Yes
UAE – Absent
US – No
Agree with SWIFT & DE comments
VN – No
It is not a good timing to extend these fields because:
(i) the change not only impacts trade finance category 7 messages but also FX, Securities and payment (which are in change from MT to MX).
(ii) the change forced banks to upgrade their internal processing systems
Discussion in SWG meeting (30.08.2023)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The members agree to spend time and efforts on the ongoing payments migration. • The members agree to apply the decisions and learnings from the payments space into trade finance. Payment's industry is currently discussing on how to handle structured/unstructured/hybrid postal address information. Swift will keep the group updated on the decisions from the Payment's SWG. • For Trade Finance Category 7 messages, the need is to have lengthier party fields. • The members agree to have a detailed discussion on this subject. • Swift to arrange for regular meetings starting October 2023. • Based on the outcome of the meetings, a new CR will be submitted for SR 2025.
Total members = 17

In favour = 4

Not in favour = 10

Absent = 3

Decision

Rejected

2.2 CR 002008: Revised code name for field :71N: “Amendment Charge Payable by” in MT 707

Origin of request	
Requesting Country:	DE Germany
Requesting Group:	
Sponsors	
Message type(s) impacted	
MT 707	
Complies with regulation	
None	
Business impact of this request	
LOW Revised code name for field :71N: “Amendment Charge Payable by” in MT 707	
Commitment to implement the change	
Number of messages sent and received: 100000	
Percentage of messages impacted: 20	
Commits to implement and when: German Trade Finance Banks	
2024	
Business context	
Currently the code 'OTHR' in field :71N: "Amendment Charge Payable by" is defined as: "other party". However, the amendment charge is either paid by the Applicant or by the Beneficiary, but not by a third party. For both parties (i.e. Applicant and Beneficiary), codes are available. Nevertheless, there are transactions with specific terms how the amendment charge shall be split between the two parties. Therefore, the code should be changed to "other arrangement" instead of "other party".	
Nature of change	
Please change the code 'OTHR' from "other party" into "other arrangement".	
Examples	

<p>This is good to have. Where 'Other party' is used the actual details have to be input in text, so instead of naming the other party, you can just put the 'Other details', so actually doesn't really add anything. Don't see any need for this.</p>
<p>IN – Yes</p> <p>Agree with community that as per contract terms there are certain cases where the charges are on the basis of the contract, part beneficiary or part on applicant. In these type of cases, it doesn't signifies that charges are borne by other party despite it signifies that charges are charged as per other agreement.</p>
<p>IT – Yes</p>
<p>JP – Absent</p>
<p>KR – Absent</p>
<p>SG – Yes</p>
<p>SP – Yes</p>
<p>TR – Yes</p>
<p>UAE – Absent</p>
<p>US – Yes</p> <p>No objection but not a must have.</p>
<p>VN – Yes</p> <p>The members discussed and agreed to have the CR implemented in SR 2025. Although approved for SR 2025, the CR will be sent for country vote this year.</p> <p>Total members = 17</p> <p>In favour = 13</p> <p>Not in favour = 1</p> <p>Absent = 3</p>
<p>Decision</p>
<p>Approved for implementation in SR 2025</p>

2.3 CR 002013: Add a charge field in MT 765

Origin of request	
Requesting Country:	
Requesting Group:	French Banking community
Sponsors	
Message type(s) impacted	
MT 765	
Complies with regulation	
None	
Business impact of this request	
HIGH Add charge field(s) in MT 765. A dedicated field for charges will avoid banks to capture these charges in other fields not used for that purpose. So, impact is positive.	
Commitment to implement the change	
Number of messages sent and received: 10000 Percentage of messages impacted: 20 Commits to implement and when: Switzerland, France 2024	
Business context	
Today, we notice the Demand message MT 765 added in 2021 is still not used in some cases and replaced by a free format MT 799. One reason identified is that there is no charge field in this message, whereas sender would like to indicate charges in case of payment.	
Nature of change	
To add a dedicated Charge field in the message MT 765 to indicate charges related to the claim and a field for the Total Amount Claimed. This could be completed with a field Account Identification and Beneficiary Bank details for the payment. These tags would be optional (and conditional for the Total Amount claimed).	
Examples	

Standards Illustration

Add below field in MT 765

:73A: Charges Added

Definition

This field specifies the charges which have been added to the amount of the drawing.

Presence

Optional

Format

Option A 6*35z (Narrative)

In addition to narrative text, the following line formats may be used:

Line 1	/8a/[3!a13d] [additional information]	(Code)(Currency)(Amount)	(Narrative)
Lines 2-6	[/8a/[3!a13d][additional information]]	(Code)(Currency)(Amount)	(Narrative)
	or		or
	[//continuation of additional information]		(Narrative)

Usage Rules

The structured format may be used with bilaterally agreed codes.

Any code used in this field must be between slashes and must appear at the beginning of a line.

Narrative text must not begin with a slash and, if used, must begin on a new line and be the last information in the field.

SWIFT Comment

In addition to fields 32B (Demand Amount) and 78 (Additional Amount Information), this new field (73A) shall allow to input charges in MT 765.

Working Group Meeting

Discussion

Response by email:

BD – **Yes**

CN – **Yes**

Most of member banks agree with this CR, while 3 members disagree.

<p>Top 2 Guarantor banks in our community- ICBC and BOC are not in favour of it.</p> <p>1.Comment from ICBC (Industrial and Commercial Bank of China): Adding new fields to accomplish this appears to be unnecessary. We already have 32B Demand amount and 78 additional amount information.</p> <p>2.Bank of China: We have noted that in DEFINITION of both fields of 32B (Demand Amount) and 78 (additional Amount Information), these words are indicated: "The total demand amount might include additional amounts, for example, interest, fees, etc." Field 32B contains the sum of drawing amount under L/G or SBLC and additional charges, tax, etc beyond the drawing.</p> <p>So, we think that it is enough to show any charges added in the existing fields and wonder what is the relationship between the existing field 32B and proposed field 73A.This CR might result to disputes due to difference in understanding and operation among all parties involved, unless SWIFT could modify the existing fields.</p> <p>Meanwhile, we wonder why this CR states "the structured format may be used with bilaterally agreed codes" under Usage Rules in Standards Illustration, without any proposed code.</p>
<p>DE – Yes</p> <p>Neutral position; not considered as a MUST HAVE change.</p>
<p>EG – Yes</p>
<p>FR – Yes</p> <p>Better with a list of codes, like for 71B or 71D of existing Trade messages.</p>
<p>GB – Yes</p>
<p>HK – No</p> <p>Given low claim rates, this seems a 'nice to have'. Don't support.</p>
<p>IN – Yes</p> <p>Although there is no such need of additional charge field as 799 already suffice, but embedding of this change will help better understanding of charges being deducted to maintain transparency.</p>
<p>IT – No</p> <p>No added value. We can use tag79</p>
<p>JP – Absent</p>
<p>KR – Absent</p>
<p>SG – Yes</p>
<p>SP – Yes</p>
<p>TR – Yes</p>
<p>UAE – Absent</p>
<p>US – Yes</p> <p>Support - not a must have at this time.</p>
<p>VN – No</p> <p>The members discussed and agreed to have the CR implemented in SR 2025. Although approved for SR 2025, the CR will be sent for country vote this year.</p>

Total members = 17
In favour = 11
Not in favour = 3
Absent = 3
Decision
Approved for implementation in SR 2025

2.4 CR 002016: Enhance message type MT 760 with purpose of undertaking for an IRU in addition to current DGAR and STBY purposes.

Origin of request	
Requesting Country:	ZA South Africa
Requesting Group:	
Sponsors	
Message type(s) impacted	
MT 760	
Complies with regulation	
None	
Business impact of this request	
MEDIUM There is no defined message type for an Irrevocable Reimbursement Undertaking (IRU). Enhance message type MT760 with purpose of undertaking for an IRU in addition to current DGAR and STBY purposes.	
Commitment to implement the change	
Number of messages sent and received: 2051 Percentage of messages impacted: 25 Commits to implement and when: South Africa UGC 2024	
Business context	
All global trade operations team will benefit from the change. Currently, there is a misuse of the MT 760 and MT 799 Message types where Irrevocable Reimbursement Undertakings (IRUs) are being used by Financial Institutions for this instrument due to no specific MT defined for IRUs. The automation of IRUS is therefore compromised due to no specifically defined MT. We prefer that an MT 760 is enhanced due to its structured format and is more commonly used in	

the market. The recommendation by SWIFT was to enhance the MT759 field 23H for IRU however this MT is unstructured and will not facilitate STP.

Nature of change

Enhance message type MT760 with purpose of undertaking for an IRU in addition to current DGAR and STBY purposes.

Examples

IRUs are being issued in the market as MT760 or MT799 due to no specific MT that has been defined by SWIFT.

Standards Illustration

Field 22D: Form of Undertaking

Format
Option D 4!c (Form)

Presence
Mandatory in mandatory sequence B

Definition
This field specifies the form of the independent and irrevocable undertaking.

Codes
Form must contain one of the following codes (Error code(s): T71):
 DGAR Demand guarantee
 STBY Standby letter of credit
 IRRU Irrevocable Reimbursement Undertaking

SWIFT Comment

Swift recommends using codes available in MT 759 field 23H for the purpose of IRUs.

Working Group Meeting

Discussion
Response by email:
BD – Yes
CN – No
We agree with SWIFT on this CR. MT760 is designed for purpose of demand guarantee or standby LC, but IRU is typically available under L/C. The format of MT760 including fields and

elements is not perfectly matched with common text of IRU. The function of IRU is not inconsistent with that of MT760. It would be more convenient to set up specific code for IRU in MT759 for sorting and distribution of incoming SWIFT messages within our internal system.

DE – No

We suggest to add an additional code in MT 759 instead of or create a new MT to take care of IRUs.

EG – No

We recommend using codes available in MT 759.

FR – No

But ok for a new code IRU in the MT759, to cover the use case.

GB – Yes

Although need to discuss SWIFTs recommendation.

HK – No

IRU usage is very less. UK-Africa corridor has few cases. For Guarantees we don't issue IRUs. No real demand. Don't support.

IN – Yes

IT – No

No/few added value, small volumes. Moreover, it would be necessary to define the rules/suggestions for populating the other tags of MT760, in case of IRU.

JP – Absent

KR – Absent

SG – No

SP – No

TR – Yes

UAE – Absent

US – No

IRU is not a SBLC/Demand guarantee related product. It does not belong in 760.

VN – No

Don't agree with adding "IRU" code to MT760 because this may lead to below changes:

- Need to change Message name and scope because MT760 is currently used for Demand Guarantee/SBLC only
- Need to add a new code to field 40C Applicable Rule which is applied to IRU (such as URR)

Total members = 17

In favour = 2

Not in favour = 12

Absent = 3

Decision

Rejected

2.5 CR 002017: Revise field definition :71D: “Charges”

Origin of request	
Requesting Country:	DE Germany
Requesting Group:	
Sponsors	
Message type(s) impacted	
MT 700, MT 707, MT 710, MT 720	
Complies with regulation	
None	
Business impact of this request	
LOW Revise field definition for :71D: “Charges” in MT 700, MT 707, MT 710, MT 720.	
Commitment to implement the change	
Number of messages sent and received: 100000	
Percentage of messages impacted: 95	
Commits to implement and when: German Trade Finance Banks 2024	
Business context	
<p>The existing field definition (i.e. "This field may be used only to specify charges to be borne by the beneficiary.") does not exactly mirror today's practice.</p> <p>In fact, it is used to specify the party(s) and/or the charges arrangements for the documentary credit as per the following examples:</p> <p>:71D:ALL BANK CHARGES INSIDE PAKISTAN ARE ON APPLICANT'S ACCOUNT AND ALL BANK CHARGES OUTSIDE PAKISTAN ARE ON BENEFICIARY'S ACCOUNT</p> <p>:71D:ALL CHARGES OUTSIDE BANGLADESH INCLUDING REIMBURSEMENT CHARGES ARE ON ACCOUNT OF THE BENEFICIARY AND ALL CHARGES WITHIN BANGLADESH SHALL BE TO THE ACCOUNT OF APPLICANT.</p>	

:71D:ALL YOUR CHARGES EVEN IN CASE OF AN
EVENTUAL NON-UTILISATION ARE TO BE
FOR THE BENEFICIARYS ACCOUNT

:71D:ALL BANKING CHARGES OUTSIDE SOUTH
KOREA AND REIMBURSEMENT/REMITTANCE
CHARGES ARE FOR
BENEFICIARY'S ACCOUNT.

:71D:ALL BANKING CHARGES INCLUDING
REIMBURSEMENT COMM. OUTSIDE JAPAN
ARE FOR BENEFICIARY'S ACCOUNT.
THE CONFIRMATION FEE IS FOR THE
ACCOUNT OF BENEFICIARY

:71D:ALL BANKING CHARGES AND COMMISSIONS
OUTSIDE TURKEY ARE ON BENEFICIARY'S
ACCOUNT WHETHER L/C UTILIZED OR
NOT. (ART 37C OF UCP 600 NOT
APPLICABLE)

Nature of change

Revise field definition for field 71D to "This field may be used to specify the party(s) responsible for the documentary credit charges". Current definition is - "This field may be used only to specify charges to be borne by the beneficiary."

Examples

SWIFT Comment

Update the definition from "This field may be used only to specify charges to be borne by the beneficiary." to "This field may be used to specify the party(s) responsible for the documentary credit charges".

Working Group Meeting

Discussion
Response by email:
BD – Yes
CN – Yes Clear explanation on the party and relevant charges arrangement will reduce confusion caused by incomplete information.
DE – Yes Neutral position; not considered as a MUST HAVE change.
EG – Yes
FR – Yes
GB – Yes
HK – Yes Change to definition makes it clearer, and there is no system impact/costs to be borne.
IN – Yes
IT – Yes
JP – Absent
KR – Absent
SG – Yes
SP – Yes
TR – Yes
UAE – Absent
US – Yes No objection but not a must have.
VN – Yes The members discussed and agreed to have the CR implemented in SR 2025. Although approved for SR 2025, the CR will be sent for country vote this year.

Total members = 17

In favour = 14

Not in favour = 0

Absent = 3

Decision

Approved for implementation in SR 2025

2.6 CR 002021: Add a rule on tag23 in MT 760

Origin of request	
Requesting Country:	IT Italy
Requesting Group:	
Sponsors	
Message type(s) impacted	
MT 760	
Complies with regulation	
None	
Business impact of this request	
LOW The change is useful to clarify the meaning of tag 23 inside MT 760, and to make MT 760 compliant with MT 767.	
Commitment to implement the change	
Number of messages sent and received: 1 Percentage of messages impacted: 1 Commits to implement and when: Italian National Member and User Group (Gruppo Italia SWIFT) 2024	
Business context	
The change is useful to clarify the meaning of tag 23 inside MT760, and to make MT 760 compliant with MT 767.	
Nature of change	
Add a rule on tag23 in MT 760 in order to make the MT 760 compliant with the MT 767. Current NVR in MT 767 states - "In sequence A, if field 22A is ACNF or ADVI, then field 23 may be present, otherwise field 23 is not allowed (Error code(s): C20)."	
Examples	

SWIFT Comment

Add a conditional rule in field 23 of MT 760 – “In sequence A, if field 22A is ACNF or ADVI, then field 23 may be present, otherwise field 23 is not allowed (Error code(s)).”

Working Group Meeting

Discussion
Response by email:
BD – Yes
CN – Yes Clear explanation on the party and relevant charges arrangement will reduce confusion caused by incomplete information.
DE – Yes Neutral position; not considered as a MUST HAVE change.
EG – Yes
FR – Yes
GB – Yes
HK – Yes Supported as brings clarity and aligns usage. System impact should be minimal impact given it is only NVR change.
IN – Yes Rule will assist to inter-relate the two messages i.e., issuance and amendment.
IT – Yes
JP – Absent
KR – Absent
SG – Yes
SP – Yes
TR – Yes
UAE – Absent
US – Yes No objection but not a must have.
VN – Yes

The members discussed and agreed to have the CR implemented in SR 2025. Although approved for SR 2025, the CR will be sent for country vote this year.

Total members = 17

In favour = 14

Not in favour = 0

Absent = 3

Decision

Approved for implementation in SR 2025

2.7 CR 002022: Add a rule on tag23 in MT760 (Duplicate of CR #2021)

Origin of request	
Requesting Country:	IT Italy
Requesting Group:	
Sponsors	
Message type(s) impacted	
MT 760	
Complies with regulation	
None	
Business impact of this request	
LOW	
Commitment to implement the change	
Number of messages sent and received: 1 Percentage of messages impacted: 1 Commits to implement and when: National Member and User Group 2024	
Business context	
The change is useful to clarify the meaning of tag 23 inside the MT760, and to make the MT760 compliant with the MT767.	
Nature of change	
Add a Network Validated Rule in MT760 - same rule already present on the MT767: In sequence A, if field 22A is ACNF or ADVI, then field 23 may be present, otherwise field 23 is not allowed (Error code(s): C20). Duplicate of CR #2021	
Examples	

SWIFT Comment

Duplicate of CR #2021

Add a conditional rule in field 23 of MT 760 – “In sequence A, if field 22A is ACNF or ADVI, then field 23 may be present, otherwise field 23 is not allowed (Error code(s)).”

Working Group Meeting

Discussion
Decision
Duplicate of CR #2021

2.8 CR 002030: Add a charges field in MT765 (Duplicate of CR #2013)

Origin of request	
Requesting Country:	FR France
Requesting Group:	
Sponsors	
Message type(s) impacted	
MT 765	
Complies with regulation	
None	
Business impact of this request	
MEDIUM Today, we notice the Demand message MT765 added in 2021 is still not used in some cases and replaced by a free format MT799. One reason identified is that there is no charge field in this message, whereas sender would like to indicate charges in case of payment.	
Commitment to implement the change	
Number of messages sent and received: 10000 Percentage of messages impacted: 20 Commits to implement and when: French User Group 2024	
Business context	
Today, we notice the Demand message MT765 added in 2021 is still not used in some cases and replaced by a free format MT799. One reason identified is that there is no charge field in this message, whereas sender would like to indicate charges in case of payment.	
Nature of change	
To add a dedicated Charge field in the message MT765 to indicate charges related to the claim and a field for the Total Amount Claimed. This could be completed with a field Account Identification and Beneficiary Bank details for the payment. These tags would be optional (and conditional for the Total Amount claimed). Duplicate of CR #2013.	
Examples	

SWIFT Comment

Duplicate of CR #2013.

In addition to fields 32B (Demand Amount) and 78 (Additional Amount Information), this new field (73A) shall allow to input charges in MT 765.

Working Group Meeting

Discussion
Decision
Duplicate of CR #2013

2.9 CR 002031: Update Network Validated Rule (NVR) in field 40C of MT 760

Origin of request	
Requesting Country:	
Requesting Group:	MT 798 Working Group
Sponsors	
Message type(s) impacted	
MT 760	
Complies with regulation	
None	
Business impact of this request	
HIGH	
This is a change to an already existing NVR in field 40C of MT 760.	
Commitment to implement the change	
Number of messages sent and received: 1000000	
Percentage of messages impacted: 100	
Commits to implement and when: MT 798 Working Group 2024	
Business context	
<p>The documentation for the use of code 'OTHR' in field 40C states -</p> <p>"The undertaking is subject to another set of rules, or the undertaking is not subject to the version of the rules that is in effect on the date of issue, these must be specified in Narrative (2nd subfield)".</p> <p>That is - subfield 'Narrative' MUST be used when the rule is set to code 'OTHR'.</p> <p>However, the NVR for field 40C states -</p> <p>"If Type is OTHR, then Narrative may be present, otherwise Narrative is not allowed (Error code(s): D81)."</p> <p>The word 'MAY' in the NVR creates an ambiguity, which results in confusion.</p>	
Nature of change	
The change will update the NVR to -	

"If Type is OTHR, then Narrative must be present, otherwise Narrative is not allowed (Error code(s): D81)."

Examples

SWIFT Comment

Working Group Meeting

Discussion

Response by email:

BD – No

CN – Yes

DE – Yes

Neutral position; not considered as a MUST HAVE change.

EG – Yes

FR – Yes

GB – Yes

HK – Yes

Agree that the definition change brings more clarity. The NVR should already be in place and would not need to be amended. So, the system cost should be minimal. IT to comments on system impact.

IN – Yes

IT – Yes

JP – Absent

KR – Absent

SG – Yes

SP – Yes

TR – Yes

UAE – Absent

US – Yes

VN – Yes

The members discussed and agreed to have the CR implemented in SR 2025. Although approved for SR 2025, the CR will be sent for country vote this year.

Total members = 17

In favour = 13

Not in favour = 1

Absent = 3

Decision

Approved for implementation in SR 2025

3 Overview of SWIFT Change requests

3.1 CR 002045: Change the format of fields 44A, 44B, 44E, 44F

Origin of request	
Requesting Country:	
Requesting Group:	Swift
Sponsors	
Message type(s) impacted	
MT 700, MT 705, MT 707, MT 710, MT 720	
Complies with regulation	
None	
Business impact of this request	
HIGH Change the format of fields 44A, 44B, 44E, 44F	
Commitment to implement the change	
Number of messages sent and received: 100000 Percentage of messages impacted: 100000 Commits to implement and when: Swift 2024	
Business context	
This change relates to CR #1856 submitted and approved for SR 2023. CR #1856 requested to increase the length of fields 44A, 44E, 44B, 44F to 140z characters. However, field 77E in MT 798 allows only for 78z characters per line. Therefore, this CR is to change the format of fields 44A/B/E/F from 1*140z to either 4*35z or 2*70z (to align with the payments initiation process).	
Nature of change	
This change relates to CR #1856 submitted and approved for SR 2023. CR #1856 requested to increase the length of fields 44A, 44E, 44B, 44F to 140z characters. However, field 77E in MT 798 allows only for 78z characters per line. Therefore, this CR is to change the format of fields 44A/B/E/F from 1*140z to either 4*35z or 2*70z (to align with the payments initiation process).	
Examples	

Standards Illustration

As of SR 2023 –

44A	Place of Taking in Charge/Dispatch from .../Place of Receipt	140z
44E	Port of Loading/Airport of Departure	140z
44F	Port of Discharge/Airport of Destination	140z
44B	Place of Final Destination/For Transportation to .../Place of Delivery	140z

Change the length of these fields to –
Either 4*35z or 2*70z characters

SWIFT Comment

Working Group Meeting

Discussion
Response by email:
BD – No
CN – Yes
DE – No
We suggest to make the change of field 77E in MT 798 (new format 145z) - see KB tip # 5026164 - a permanent change instead of temporary change for SR 2023 only. Therefore, we could avoid to change the shipping fields again.
EG – Yes
FR – Yes
Best option is 4 lines of 35 digits, as 70 digits is already more than the maximal size of SWIFT lines today.
GB – No

<p>HK – No</p> <p>MT7xx series messages are bank to bank messages. Changing these to align with MT798 (application) does not make sense.</p>
<p>IN – Yes</p> <p>We may accept this change to resolve the ambiguity and to reduce the document related discrepancies.</p>
<p>IT – No</p> <p>No/few added value, the length of the MT798 can also remain unchanged. It is not clear if it is a problem to keep the current format (140), since the length of the MT798 has already been changed</p>
<p>JP – Absent</p>
<p>KR – Absent</p>
<p>SG – No</p> <p>SP – No</p>
<p>TR – Yes</p>
<p>UAE – Absent</p>
<p>US – No</p> <p>While this is ok, is it needed now? Can't it wait until CR002004 / ISO2022? i.e. implement all field size changes at the same time.</p>
<p>VN – No</p> <p>Suggest CR #1856 should be postponed, not apply in SR2023 until Swift finds an appropriate solution for the length of fields 44A/B/E/F in MT700/705/707/710/720 and field 77E in MT 798 to be consistent.</p>
<p>Discussion in SWG meeting (30.08.2023)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The members agree to wait for another year to analyze whether fields 44A/B/E/F indeed need a length of 140z characters. • The change made to field 77E in MT 798 to accommodate the 140z characters from fields 44A/B/E/F to be continued until next year. That is, field 77E will continue to allow 145z characters. • The members to re-discuss the change early next year and a new CR might be submitted depending on the discussion in the group. <p>Total members = 17</p> <p>In favour = 5</p> <p>Not in favour = 9</p> <p>Absent = 3</p>
<p>Decision</p>
<p>Rejected</p>

End of document