Swift Compatible Applications

Trade Finance for Corporates

Technical Validation Guide 2024

Version 1.1

February 2024

Public

Table of Contents

1 Preface 3
1.1 Introduction 3
1.2 Purpose 3
1.3 Target Audience 3
1.4 Related Documents 3

2 Technical Validation Process 4
2.1 Integration with Alliance Interfaces 4
2.1.1 Direct Connectivity 4
2.1.2 Confirmation of Test Execution & Evidence Documents 6
2.1.3 Verification of the Test Results 6
2.1.4 Qualification Criteria Verified 6
2.2 Message Validation and Standards Support 6
2.2.1 FIN support 7
2.2.2 Qualification Criteria Verified 8

3 Summary of Technical Validation 9

4 Test Scenario 10
4.1 Test Scenarios for FIN Messages 10

5 FAQ 15

Public

1 Preface

1.1 Introduction

Swift initiated the Swift Compatible Application label programme to help application vendors into offering products that are compliant with the business and technical requirements of the financial industry.

Swift validates selected third-party business applications offered by Swift registered providers to ensure that they are aligned with well-defined requirements that are relevant to Swift standards, messaging, and connectivity.

Swift has engaged with Wipro (referred hereinafter as the “Validation Service provider”) for performing the technical validation of the products applying for a Swift Compatible Application label.

1.2 Purpose

The compatibility for the Swift Compatible Application Trade Finance for corporates label is based on a set of pre-defined qualification criteria which will be validated by means of a technical, functional and customer validation process.

The set of pre-defined qualification criteria is defined in the Swift Compatible Application for Trade Finance for Corporates label criteria 2024.

This document focuses on the approach for the technical validation that a vendor application must follow to complete the technical validation against the Swift Compatible Application for Trade Finance for corporates criteria.

In the document a distinction is made between a **New Application** (vendors who apply for the compliance validation for the first time for a specific product) and an **Application Renewal** (for product releases that already received the Swift Compatible Application label in the past).

1.3 Target Audience

The target audience for this document is application vendors considering the compatibility of their business application for Swift Compatible Application for Trade Finance for Corporates label. The audience must be familiar with the Swift from a technical and a business perspective.

1.4 Related Documents

1) The Swift Compatible Application Programme provides a synopsis of the Swift Compatible Application programme, including the benefits to join for application vendors. It also explains the Swift Compatible Application validation process, including the technical, functional and customer validation.
2) The Swift Compatible Application for Trade Finance for Corporates label criteria provide an overview of the criteria that a corporate application must comply with to be granted Swift Compatible Application label.
3) Swift for Corporates – Resource Centre
4) Swift for Corporates – Standards MT Implementation Guide – Volume 1 (ZIP)
5) Swift for Corporates - Standards MT Implementation Guide – Volume 2 (ZIP)
6) SWIFTNet FileAct Implementation Guide for SCORE
7) Swift User Handbook Online – *Message Reference Guides*

Public

2 Technical Validation Process

In this document a distinction is made between new Swift compatible applications and label renewal applications in terms of number of criteria verified and tests executed by the vendor. The Technical validation focuses on the message validation, standards support, connectivity to Alliance Interfaces and Reference Data Directory integration. The remaining label criteria are subject to validation during the functional validation.

The following matrix explains the tests that will be performed by the vendor application.

Label Type	Depth of Testing	Message Validation	Standards Support	Integration with Alliance Interfaces	Reference Data
New Label	Comprehensive	✓	✓	✓	X
Label Renewal	Delta	X	X	✓	X

New Applicants will go through a complete technical validation against the criteria laid down in the Swift Compatible Application for Trade Finance for corporates criteria document.

The criteria that are verified include:

- Integration with Alliance interfaces
- Support of messaging services
- Support of Swift Standards

For label renewal, Alliance Access connectivity will be tested for 2024.

Validation Test Bed

The vendor will need to set up and maintain 'a Swift test lab' to develop the required adaptors needed for validation and to perform the qualification tests. The Swift lab will include the Alliance Access Interface as the direct connectivity to the Integration Test bed (ITB) (including SWIFTNet Link, VPN Box, RMA security and HSM box) and the subscription to the FIN and SWIFTNet FileAct messaging services.

The installation and on-going maintenance of this Swift lab using a direct ITB connectivity is a pre-requirement for connectivity testing.

2.1 Integration with Alliance Interfaces

Requirement: The vendor will demonstrate the capability of the product to integrate with Swift Alliance Interfaces. When integrating with Alliance Access, support for Release 7.7 or higher is mandated for the Swift Compatible Application label criteria in 2024.

Note: New label criteria applicant vendors and vendors renewing their label application must exchange test messages using AFT or MQHA or SOAP.
Swift will only publish information for which evidences have been provided during the technical validation. In case vendor application supports several of the above adapters, vendor is required to provide the appropriate evidences for all of them.

2.1.1 Direct Connectivity

The vendor needs to demonstrate compliance with Alliance Access 7.7 or higher

The table below specifies the adaptors and formats that must be supported.

Public

Label Type	Alliance Access 7.7 or higher	
	Adaptor	Format
New and Renewal	AFT	RJE or XML v2
	MQHA	RJE or XML v2
	SOAP	XML v2

The vendor needs to successfully connect to and exchange test messages with the Integration Test Bed (ITB).

The vendor must demonstrate the capability of their product to support FIN protocol, FileAct (both real-time and store-and-forward) and associated features (example: message validation).

2.1.1.1 Alliance Access Integration

- Testing for connectivity to Alliance Access Interface will be verified on the Swift Integration Test Bed (ITB) using Alliance Access Release 7.7 or higher.
- The vendor should demonstrate the capability of the product to integrate with the Alliance Access with one of the following adaptors:
  - Automated File Transfer mode (AFT)
  - WebSphere MQ Host Adaptor (MQHA)
  - SOAP Host Adaptor (SOAPHA)

In Summary:

Messaging service	Standards	Interface	Mandatory adapter
FIN	MT	Alliance Access 7.7 or higher	AFT or MQHA or SOAP
FileAct RT (real-time)	Any	Alliance Access 7.7 or higher	AFT or MQHA or SOAP
FileAct SF (store-and-forward)	Any	Alliance Access 7.7 Or higher	AFT or MQHA or SOAP

The vendor must connect to the Swift ITB and receive Swift network ACK / NAK notifications.

The Technical Validation documents for the AFT, MQHA and SOAPHA adaptors are available separately on swift.com (Partner section). .

Notes for vendors having ITB connectivity

- The vendor must inform Swift and the Validation Service provider before starting the test execution through ITB.
- The testing on ITB can start any time before the validation window allocated to the vendor. However, the entire testing on the ITB must be completed within the time window allotted to the vendor.
- The vendor application should generate the following outbound test messages in the corporate-to-bank flow message flow as Input Message to Swift
  - One MT 798<700> and MT 798<700> + MT <701>
  - FileAct files comprising
    - Letters of Credit using FIN Cat 7 (Request Type - tsrv.fin.mt7xx.lettersofcredit)
    - Guarantees or Standbys using FIN Cat 7 (Request Type - tsrv.fin.mt7xx.gteesstandbys)
- The test messages must be compliant to Standards Release 2024.
- The vendor must request for delivery notification.
- The vendor application must exchange SWI Swift FT messages using Alliance Access RJE or XML v2 format.
- The sender destination used in the messages is the PIC (Partner Identifier Code) that was used by the application provider to install and license Alliance Access. The receiver destination of messages must be the same PIC. Or simply stated messages should be sent to own vendor PIC.

Public

- The vendor must connect to Swift ITB, send MT messages and FileAct files, receive Swift ACK/NAK, Delivery Notification and properly reconcile them by updating the status of sent messages.
- The vendor must inform Swift and the Validation Service provider about the completion of the test execution and provide evidence of testing though application event logs transmitted messages and received messages.

2.1.2 Confirmation of Test Execution & Evidence Documents

After successful exchange of the test messages, the vendor should send the following test evidences by email to the Validation Service:

- A copy of the MT test messages in RJE / XML v2 format generated by the business application
- Copy of the parameter file and business payload data for FileAct files

- Application log / Screenshots evidencing the
  - processing of Swift messages
  - reconciliation of delivery notifications and acknowledgements
- Alliance Access Event Journal Report and Message File spanning the test execution window
- Message Partner Configuration details

2.1.3 Verification of the Test Results

In order to issue the scorecard and necessary recommendation, the Validation Service provider will analyse the log files, event journal, the screenshots produced by the vendor to ascertain that:

- All messages are positively acknowledged by the Swift Network by reviewing the log files.
- Test messages have been exchanged by the vendor over ITB.
- Test messages adhere to the Swift format (RJE /XML v2 formats / FileAct).
- Application is able to reconcile technical messages.

2.1.4 Qualification Criteria Verified

Sl. No	Swift Compatible Application Label Qualification Criteria		Pass / Fail Status
	Section Ref Number	Label Requirement	
1.	3.4	Alliance Access Integration – AFT / MQHA/SOAPHA	
2.		Alliance Access Integration Support – Release 7.7 or higher	
3.		Alliance Access Integration – RJE / XML v2 Format	
4.		Alliance Access Integration – FileAct support	
5.	3.5	Standards FIN Support for Outgoing Messages	
6	3.5	Standards Release 7.7 or higher	

2.2 Message Validation and Standards Support

Requirement: The vendor must demonstrate the application's capability to support

- FIN messages, the rules and guidelines set out in MFVR for SR 2024.

Note: Testing for message validation, standards support for FIN messages is applicable for both new and renewal label applicant vendors.

Public

2.2.1 FIN support

The vendor must demonstrate the capability of their product to support the new usage of MT 798 envelope message. MT 798 envelope message was made available in November 2008 in SCORE (Standardized Corporate Environment) for the bank-to-corporate (B2C) and the corporate-to-bank (C2B) usage. The main difference between the bank-to-bank (B2B) use and the C2B use of the message is that in the latter case, the contents of the envelope is highly structured. For additional information the vendor may refer to Section 5 – Swift for Corporates - Standards MT Implementation Guide – Volume II.

The messages in the bank-to-corporate (B2C) direction must be treated as inbound flow to the bank and the message in the corporate-to-bank (C2B) direction must be treated as outbound message flow from the bank.

The vendor application must support straight-through-processing, Swift usage guidelines and business workflow for the MT 798 and the related sub-messages in the bank-to-corporate (B2C) and corporate-to-bank (C2B) environment.

The vendor application must support the generation and processing of MT 798 envelope message, enveloping Letter of Credit and Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit transactions.

Test Scenarios Planning and Execution for FIN Support

The test messages must cover the bank-to-corporate and the corporate-to-bank scenarios.

For facilitating the test execution of business workflow scenarios, test scenarios are provided in section 4.1 in this document. This is applicable for new label applicant only and they must execute all the scenarios

- The vendor application should generate a minimum of one test message each of MT 798 envelope message for all the in-scope scenarios specified therein.
- The Standards MT Message Implementation Guide defines the “Rules” and “Guidelines” for implementing the MT 798 envelope message under “Usage Details” of the respective message structure.
- The test messages must adhere to the “Rules” mandatorily. Adherence to “Guidelines” is a recommended practice.
- There are no network validated rules for the MT 798 (Proprietary Message) and the enveloped message within the MT 798.
- The vendor applications must adhere to the network validated rules as specified in the latest Swift User Handbook for the enveloped message (e.g., MT 700 - Issue of a Documentary Credit), unless otherwise stated in Section 5 – Trade Standards of Swift for Corporates – Standards MT Message Implementation Guidelines [5]
- Swift Compatible Application Label applications must respect the “Rules” and will be verified during technical validation.

2.2.1.1 Confirmation of Test Execution & Evidence Documents

The vendor must send the following test evidences by email to the Validation Service provider:

- Screenshots, Log Files, Reports from application evidencing generation Swift messages.
- A copy of the MT test messages generated by the business application.

File Naming Convention

- The test messages must be packaged using the RJE format.
- One file must contain one scenario of the MT 798 envelope message.
- The files must bear the name as **xxxx**SR**yy**_MT798_**nnn**.RJE, where “**xxxx**” representing 4 characters code [to be given by the vendor], “**yy**” representing the Year of Standards Release and “**nnn**” meaning the test message sequence number for the vendor. For eg. For a file containing test message for scenario number “001” sent by vendor “ABCD” for Standards Release 2024, the file name would be **“ABCDSR22_MT798_001.RJE”.**

Public

- The vendor must also send a summary spread sheet explaining the scenario sequence number and a brief description of the scenario.

2.2.1.2 Verification of the Test Results

The Validation Service provider will verify the following while performing the technical validation analyse the test result to build the scorecard and recommendation.

FIN Message Validation

Standards Implementation Guide in respect of:

- Coverage of scenarios.
- Message Format Validation Rule of the base message.
- Presence of the Mandatory fields in the envelope message.
- Presence of the Sub Message Types in the C2B flow.
- Presence of Sub Message Types in the B2C flow.
- Rules specified in “Usage Details”.
- Linkage of Index Message with one mandatory envelope message (Details Message, where applicable).
- Message Index and Total Number of Message in Field 27A.
- Cross Reference to Customer Reference Number (Field 21A) or Advising Bank Reference Number (Field 21P) depending on the message set function.
- Document Reference Number (where applicable).
- Field 45A / 45B (Description of Goods and/or Services), 46A / 46B (Documents required), or 47A / 47B (Additional Conditions) are distributed across MT 701 and does not get repeated.
- Dates defined as 6!n must be in the form of YYMMDD.
- Dates defined as 8!n must be in the form of YYYYMMDD.
- MT 798 envelope message must not exceed 10000 Characters.
- Size of Field 77E (Proprietary Message) must not exceed 9,800 characters.

2.2.1.3 Verification of Test the Results

The Validation Service provider will validate the vendor output against the expected results and analyse the test result to build the scorecard recommendation.

2.2.2 Qualification Criteria Verified

Sl. No	SWIFT Compatible Application Label Qualification Criteria		Pass / Fail Status
	Section Ref Number	Label Requirement	
7.	3.5	Standards – FIN Support	
8.	3.8	Business Workflow	

Public

3 Summary of Technical Validation

Validation Activity		Label NEW	Label RENEWAL
Message Validation [Business Workflow]	Outgoing	MT 798 [Message Flows – C2B]. All the sub-message types are listed in section 3.8 workflow.	NA
	Incoming	MT 798 [Message Flows – B2C]. All the sub-message types are listed in section 3.8 workflow	NA
Standards	Standards Release	MT and ISO 20022 Standards Release (SR) 2024	
	Rule Book Ref	Standards MT - Message Implementation Guide - Volume 1 and the FileAct Implementation Guide for SCORE	
	Optional Messages	Verified only on specific request by the vendor	
Connectivity	Alliance Access 7.7 or higher	AFT or MQHA or SOAPHA	
	Message Format	FIN – RJE / XML, FileAct real-time mode and store-and forward mode	
	Local Authentication (LAU)	LAU is mandatory for 2024 compliance application	NA

Public

4 Test Scenario

4.1 Test Scenarios for FIN Messages

The following scenario will be tested for FIN support.

Note: Testing for message validation and standards support is applicable for both new and renewal label applicant vendors.

	Corporate-to-bank message flow
	Bank-to-corporate message flow

Sl No.	Scenario	Message Direction	Sub-Message Type	Envelope Message Content	Label
Import Letter of Credit Transactions					
1	Irrevocable Letter of Credit	C2B	770	LC Application Index	New Label
			700	LC Application Details	New Label
2	Notification of Issuance of Documentary Credit	B2C	771	LC Notification of Issuance Index	New Label
			700	LC Notification of Issuance Details	New Label/ Renewal
3	Irrevocable Letter of Credit	C2B	770	LC Application Index	New Label
			700	LC Application Details	New Label
			701	LC Application Extension	New Label
			701	LC Application Extension	New Label
4	Notification of Issuance of Documentary Credit	B2C	771	LC Notification of Issuance Index	New Label
			700	LC Notification of Issuance Details	New Label/ Renewal
			701	LC Application Extension	New Label
			701	LC Application Extension	New Label
5	Request of Amendment of Documentary Credit	C2B	772	LC Amendment Request Index	New Label
			707	LC Amendment Request Details	New Label/ Renewal
			708	LC Amendment Request extension	New Label

Public

6	Notification of Amendment of Documentary Credit	B2C	773	LC Notification of Amendment Index	New Label
			707	LC Notification of Amendment Details	New Label/ Renewal
			708	LC Amendment Request extension	New Label
7	Notification of Acceptance/Refusal of Amendment	B2C	736	LC Amendment Acceptance Notice Index	New Label
8	Advice of Discrepancy	B2C	748	LC Discrepancy Advice Index	New Label
			750	LC Discrepancy Advice Details	New Label
9	Response to Advice of Discrepancy	C2B	749	LC Discrepancy Response Index	New Label
10	Notification of Advice of Payment/Acceptance/Negotiation	B2C	753	LC Compliance Advice Index	New Label
11	Notification of Advice of Discharge	B2C	731	LC Discharge Advice Index	New Label
			732	LC Discharge Advice Details	New Label
12	Notification of Advice of Refusal	B2C	733	LC Refusal Advice Index	New Label
			734	LC Refusal Advice Details	New Label
13	Notification of Advice of Reimbursement or Payment	B2C	755	LC Payment Advice Index	New Label
14	Settlement of Import Documentary Credit	B2C	757	LC Import Settlement Index	New Label
Sl No.	**Scenario**	**Message Direction**	**Sub-Message Type**	**Envelope Message Content**	
15	Advice of Documentary Credit	B2C	774	LC Advice Index	New Label
			700	LC Advice Details	New Label
			701	LC Advice Extension	New Label
16	Advice of Amendment of Documentary Credit	B2C	776	LC Amendment Index	New Label
			707	LC Amendment Details	New Label
			708	LC Amendment Advice Extension	New Label
17	Advice of Third Bank Documentary Credit	B2C	780	LC Third Bank Advise Index	New Label
			710	LC Third Bank Advise Details	New Label/ Renewal
			711	LC Third Bank Advice Extension	New Label
18	Advice of Transfer of a Documentary Credit	B2C	782	LC Transfer Advice Index	New Label
			720	LC transfer Advice Details	New Label

Public

19	Advice of Transfer of a Documentary Credit	B2C	782	LC Transfer Advice Index	New Label
			720	LC transfer Advice Details	New Label/ Renewal
			721	LC transfer Advice Extension	New Label
20	Advice of Acceptance/Refusal of Amendment	C2B	735	LC Amendment Acceptance Advice Index	New Label
21	Response to Documentary Credit presentation	B2C	737	LC Presentation Response Index	New Label
22	Discrepant Presentation Response	C2B	738	LC Discrepant Presentation Response Index	New Label
23	Notification of authorization to Pay, Accept or Negotiate	B2C	751	LC Authorization Index	New Label
24	Notification of Advice of Payment/Acceptance/Negotiation	B2C	753	LC Compliance Advice Index	New Label
25	Notification of Advice of Discharge	B2C	731	LC Discharge Advice Index	New Label
			732	LC Discharge Advice Details	New Label
26	Notification of Advice of Refusal	B2C	733	LC Refusal Advice Index	New Label
			734	LC Refusal Advice Details	New Label
27	Notification of Advice of Reimbursement or Payment	B2C	755	LC Payment Advice Index	New Label
28	Request for Transfer of a Documentary Credit	C2B	722	LC Transfer Request Index	New Label
29	Transfer Notification	B2C	723	Transfer Notification index	New Label/ Renewal
			720		
			721		
30	Settlement of Export Documentary Credit	B2C	758	LC Export Settlement Index	New Label
Guarantees/Standby Letters of Credit					
31	Application for Issuance of Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit	C2B	784	Guarantee / Standby / Undertaking Application Index	New Label/ Renewal
			760	Guarantee / Standby / Undertaking Application Details	

Public

			761	Guarantee / Standby / Undertaking Application Extension	
32	Notification of Draft or Issuance of Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit	B2C	762	Guarantee / Standby / Undertaking Notification Index	New Label
			760	Guarantee / Standby / Undertaking Notification Details	
			761	Guarantee / Standby / Undertaking Notification Extension	
33	Request for amendment of Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit	C2B	763	Guarantee / Standby Amendment Request Index	New Label/ Renewal
			767	Guarantee / Standby Amendment Request Details	
			775	Guarantee / Standby Amendment Request Extension	
34	Notification of amendment of Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit	B2C	764	Guarantee / Standby Amendment Notification Index	New Label/ Renewal
			767	Guarantee / Standby Amendment Notification Details	
			775	Guarantee / Standby Amendment Request Extension	
35	Advice of acceptance/refusal of Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit Amendment	B2C	739	Guarantee / Standby Amendment Acceptance/Refusal Advice Index	New Label
			787	Guarantee / Standby Amendment Acceptance/Refusal Advice Details	
36	Query to extend or pay Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit	B2C	777	Query to extend or pay Guarantee / Standby Index	New Label
			765	Query to extend or pay Guarantee / Standby Details	
37	Response to extend or pay Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit	C2B	778	Response to extend or pay Guarantee / Standby Index	New Label
38	Notification of demand for payment of Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit	B2C	779	Notification of demand for payment of Guarantee / Standby Index	New Label/ Renewal
			765	Notification of demand for payment of Guarantee / Standby Details	
39	Settlement of Guarantee / Standby Letter of	B2C	781	Settlement of Guarantee / Standby claim for	New Label

Public

	Credit claim for payment and/or charges			payment and/or charges Index	
40	Request for Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit Reduction / Release	C2B	783	Request for Guarantee / Standby Reduction / Release Index	New Label
41	Advice of Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit Reduction or Release	B2C	766	Advice of Guarantee / Standby Release / Reduction Index	New Label
			769	Advice of Guarantee / Standby Release / Reduction Details	
42	Advice of issued Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit	B2C	745	Guarantee / Standby Advice Index	New Label
			760	Guarantee / Standby Advice Details	
			761	Guarantee / Standby Notification Extension	
43	Advice of amended Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit	B2C	743	Guarantee / Standby Amendment Advice Index	New Label/ Renewal
			767	Guarantee / Standby Amendment Advice Details	
			775	Guarantee / Standby Amendment Request Extension	
44	Response to Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit Amendment	C2B	728	Response to Guarantee / Standby Amendment Index	New Label
			787	Response to Guarantee / Standby Amendment Details	
45	Notification of Non-Extension of Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit –	B2C	727	Notification of Non-extension of Guarantee / Standby Index	New Label
			785	Notification of Non-extension of Guarantee / Standby Details	
46	Demand for payment under Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit	C2B	712	Demand for payment of Credit Index	New Label
			765	Demand for payment under Guarantee / Standby Details	
47	Demand Refusal under Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit	B2C	729	Demand Refusal under Guarantee / Standby Index	New Label
			786	Demand Refusal under Guarantee / Standby Details	
48	Acknowledgment of demand for payment under Guarantee / Standby Letter of Credit	B2C	714	Acknowledgment of demand for payment under Guarantee / Standby Index	New Label

Public

Common Group/Ancillary					
49	Draft Undertaking Response	C2B	719	Draft Undertaking Response Index	New label
50	Request for Cancellation	C2B	797	Request for Cancellation Index	New label
51	Notification of Cancellation/Refusal	B2C	741	Notification of Cancellation / Refusal Index	New label
52	Notification of Settlement of Charges	B2C	793	Charges Settlement Notice Index	New label
			790	Charges Settlement Notice Details	New Label
53	Request for Settlement of Charges	B2C	794	Charges Settlement Request Index	New label
			791	Charges Settlement Request Details	New label
54	Ancillary Message	C2B	726	Ancillary Message Index	New label
			759	Ancillary Message Details	
55	Ancillary Message	B2C	725	Ancillary Message Index	
			759	Ancillary Message Details	New label

5 FAQ

1. Can we exchange MT 798 on Swift ITB if we only have PIC codes? I.e. can we act as a corporate sender/receiver?

   MT 798 can be exchanged by using your PIC on ITB. There is no validation on ITB for FIN Messages to verify whether the sender / receiver are a Corporate or not.

2. In MT 798, sub-type 700, tag 20 appears twice, 1. Transaction Reference No (Before tag 77E) and 2. Documentary Credit No (Under tag 77E). When parsing an incoming MT 798 this identical tag no. for different purposes, will it not create problems?

   The incoming MT 798 must be parsed by taking the enveloped message as a separate message. This will not create a problem in parsing two tags having the same tag value.

3. The “Standards MT Message Implementation Guidelines” states: “Each MT 798 message must not exceed 10,000 characters, further the size of field 77E (Proprietary Message) must not exceed 9,800 characters.” This means that tags 20 and 12 may include maximal 200 characters. However, according to their specification together they may not comprise more than 27 characters. When ensuring that:
   - Tag 77E does not exceed 9,800 characters
   - Tags 20 and 12 may not exceed its pre-defined size

4. It is not possible to exceed 10,000 characters for the whole MT 798. Could you please describe the scenario in which the validation of 10,000 characters is required?
   The format of field 77E is 73x (Text) followed by (n*78). This means that the number of lines that can be included in field 77E is unlimited. However, the maximum size of 798 messages is 10,000 characters only. Therefore, there is a restriction of 9800 characters for field 77E. Please note that while calculating the total length of field 77E, you need to add 2 characters for every CrLf used as line separator inside the field.
   Remaining 200 characters comprises of the Block 1,2,3,5 and in Block 4 fields 20 and 21. Total length of the message is calculated as follows:
   - 4 or 5 characters for the field tags
   - 2 characters for every CrLf used in the message

Public

- Length of every field used in the message.

Possible scenario for exceeding 10000 characters in MT 798:

- In MT 798<700> LC Application Details Message, you can use field 77E to send the details of MT 700 and the length of MT 700 is in itself 10000 characters.
- In MT 798<700> LC Application Details Message, fields 45A, 46A and 47A can accommodate 100 * 65x each, collectively up to 19500 characters.

In either of these scenarios, you are likely to exceed 9800 characters in 77E and also 10000 characters for the MT 798 messages.

5. The MT 798 SCORE Implementation Guide specifies certain additional Usage Rules and Guidelines, Is it Mandatory?

   Guidelines as specified in the MT 798 SCORE implementation Guide are for recommended practice only and hence implementation is not mandatory. However, for the Swift Compatible Application accreditation purposes, all the Usage Rules must be adhered to.

6. When sending an MT 798 to a bank what should be the receiver details in the Block 2 of the message?

   When sending an MT 798 to a corporate-to-bank message flow the Block 2 should contain receiver's BIC. However, for the Technical Validation Block 2 should contain your own PIC.

7. For the validation process is membership with SCORE or MACUG mandatory?

   For Technical validation of Swift Compatible Application Label, membership with SCORE or MACUG is not mandatory.

Public

Legal Notices

Copyright

Swift © 2024. All rights reserved.

You may copy this publication within your organisation. Any such copy must include these legal notices.

Disclaimer

Swift supplies this publication for information purposes only. The information in this publication may change from time to time. You must always refer to the latest available version.

Translations

The English version of Swift documentation is the only official version.

Trademarks

Swift is the trade name of S.W.I.F.T. SC. The following are registered trademarks of Swift: Swift, the Swift logo, Sibos, SWIFT Net and Accord. Other product, service, or company names in this publication are trade names, trademarks, or registered trademarks of their respective owners.

***** End of document *****