

CHANGE REQUEST

FOR THE UPDATE OF A NORMATIVE CGI-MP DELIVERABLE-**ACMT.007.001.01**

*-Note: the purpose of this document is to give guidelines to parties who want to introduce a request to change an existing **normative CGI-MP deliverable**. Such change requests are subject to the approval of the CGI-MP Working Group in charge of the related deliverable and subsequent the CGI-MP Plenary. Please consult the CGI-MP Deliverables Approval and Maintenance Process for additional details. Change requests are to be sent to CGI-MP Support CGI.Support@swift.com. All change requests conforming to this template received by March 1st will be considered for development in the following yearly CGI-MP maintenance cycle which completes with publication of new deliverables on July 1st the same year.*

A. Origin of the request:

A.1 Submitter: Name of the submitter, organization, group, initiative or community that submits the change request.

Lorraine Orr, Identrust, CGI-MP WG4

Linda Haddad, Bank of America, CGI-MP WG4

A.2 Contact person: person(s) who can be contacted to get additional information on the request (name, e-mail, telephone)

Glen Solimine, J.P.Morgan; glen.p.solimine@jpmchase.com; phone 212.552.2615

Linda Haddad, Bank of America, CGI-MP WG4 linda.hddad@baml.com ph 925-675-3061

B. Related CGI-MP deliverables:

This is a list of CGI-MP normative deliverables which is impacted by the change request.

This CR incorporates changes to the structure of the eBAM harmonization acmt.007.01.01

C. Description of the change request:

The change request form must be exhaustive for all particular change requested to each normative CGI-MP deliverable (for example, adding, deleting, modifying, renaming, changing the cardinality, moving an element/component, or changing the type of an element, changing a code list. adding new functionality which requires several changes).

Change requests may not lead to creation of new messages. In such cases, a new work item proposal needs to be submitted to the CGI-MP Plenary.

Category	Element Name	ISO Index Number Current	ISO Index Number Proposed	Details	acmt.007.001.01 Account Open Req Ref ID	Business Purpose
Account	<Sts>	2.3	No Change	Field is Optional in Account Open, but Not Used in Account Excluded Maintenance message. Should there be consistency between the two messages? The status seems somewhat more relevant to the Account Excluded Maintenance message.	2.3 Optional Change to Not Used	Consistency: Account status is irrelevant in a an open account request and status cannot be changed in an excluded mandate message
Account	<Id>	4.10	4.1.0	Element ID indexed incorrect according to ISO 20022 specifications s/b 4.1.0 in Message 7 instead of 4.10.	4.10 s/b 4.1.0	Correct Index to reflect true hierarchy
Account	<SchmeNm>	4.11	4.1.1	Element ID indexed incorrect according to ISO 20022 specifications s/b 4.1.1 in Message 7 instead of 4.11.	4.11 s/b 4.1.1	Correct Index to reflect true hierarchy
Account	<Issr>	4.12	4.1.2	Element ID indexed incorrect according to ISO 20022 specifications s/b 4.1.2 in Message 7 instead of 4.12.	4.12 s/b 4.1.2	Correct Index to reflect true hierarchy
Account Servicer	<BrnchId>	3.1.25	No Change to ISO Index Number	Request a change from Optional to Bilaterally Determined.	3.1.25 Optional to Bilaterally Determined? Okay	In the case where a bank has more than one branch for processing, this code is used for bank routing. Therefore, some banks wished to make this mandatory. Consensus is

						to make it Bilaterally Determined.
Account Servicer	<Id>	3.1.26	No Change to ISO Index Number	Request a change from Optional to Bilaterally Determined.	3.1.26 Optional to Bilaterally Determined? Okay	In the case where a bank has more than one branch for processing, this code is used for bank routing. Therefore, some banks wished to make this mandatory. Consensus is to make it Bilaterally Determined.
Mandate Holder	<Nm>	7.6	No Change to ISO Index Number	Field is Optional in Account Open, but ISO Mandatory in Account Mandate Maintenance message. Should there be consistency between the two messages?	7.6 Optional to Mandatory if Mandate Tag is included Yes	Error: If mandatory in Mandate Maint request then it has to be populated by the account open message. Therefore mandatory in Acct open request when Mandate Tag is present.
Mandate Holder	<BirthDt>	7.19	No Change to ISO Index Number	Field marked as Not Used in Account Open but marked as ISO Mandatory in Account Mandate Maintenance. Also, Tag DtAndPlcOfBirth marked as XOR, so if it is included, it is logical that the associated fields should be available for data.	7.19 Not Used but associated fields XOR to match message 017? Change to Mandatory if Tag DtAndPlcOfBirth is present	Error: if DtAndPlcOfBirth is present then BirthDt is required.
Mandate Holder	<PrvcOfBirth>	7.2	No Change to ISO Index Number	Field marked as Not Used in Account Open but marked as Optional in Account Mandate Maintenance. Also, Tag DtAndPlcOfBirth marked as XOR, so if it is included, it is logical that the associated fields should be available for data.	7.20 Not Used but associated fields XOR to match message 017? Change to Optional if Tag DtAndPlcOfBirth is present	Error: If DtAndPlcOfBirth tag is present then PrvcOfBirth can be used so Optional
Mandate Holder	<CityOfBirth>	7.21	No Change to ISO Index Number	Field marked as Not Used in Account Open but marked as ISO Mandatory in Account Mandate Maintenance. Also, Tag DtAndPlcOfBirth marked as XOR, so if it is included, it is logical that the associated fields should be available for data.	7.21 Not Used but associated fields XOR to match message 017? Change to Mandatory if Tag DtAndPlcOfBirth is present	Error: If DtAndPlcOfBirth tag is present then CityOfBirth must be included.
Mandate Holder	<CtryOfBirth>	7.22	No Change to ISO Index Number	Field marked as Not Used in Account Open but marked as ISO Mandatory in Account Mandate Maintenance. Also, Tag DtAndPlcOfBirth marked as XOR, so if it is included, it is logical that the associated fields should be available for data.	7.22 Not Used but associated fields XOR to match message 017? Change to Mandatory if Tag DtAndPlcOfBirth is present	Error: If DtAndPlcOfBirth tag is present then CtryOfBirth must be included.
Mandate Holder	<MinAmtPerTx>	7.41	No Change to ISO Index Number	Field is missing the disposition attribute. Assuming it is required based on other noted information.	7.41 No designation but should be Mandatory	Error: Oversight in previous release.

D. Purpose of the change:

This section must explain why the CGI-MP normative deliverable needs to be changed. The reason for the update may be a business reason, a technical reason, a regulatory reason or the extension of the user community (newly identified business requirements).

Twelve changes to acmt.007.001.01 are meant to fix errors, harmonize across banks, and ensure consistency across all eBAM Message types.

See purpose of each change in table above.

E. Urgency of the request:

If there is a need to have the new version of the related normative CGI-MP deliverables published earlier, the reason for the urgency should be described here. Acceptance of such an unscheduled maintenance is subject to approval of the CGI-MP Plenary.

Normal priority

F. Business examples: If possible examples illustrating the change request.