Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context ID	Time	Comment	Group	Feedback 4CB
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_PaymeniReturnV08_pacs.004.001.08	1 TransactionInformation/OriginalGroupInformation 1	2018-10-19 09:35:13	Original Transaction Identification is excluded in pacs 004 but is mandatory in pacs.008 where it is used to uniquely identify the payment (technical End To End Id / UETR). Therefore, the element should also be present in PACS.004.		Decision was taken in the Message Working Group to prune Transaction! form pacs.004 as the message provides sufficient elements to identify reconsible the original instruction (OriginalMessageld, OriginalEndTeCn01d and OriginalInstruction)!, If you arfeet to the logical setup and consistency between the pacs messages we would like to refer to the upcompli introduction of the UETR (usage in RTGS will be mandatory).
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	_GENERIC	Credit Transfer TransactionInformation/PaymentIdentification/EndToEndIdentification 1	2018-10-17 13:46:35	What is the current status of CRs in terms of End-to-End Identification? The CR will propose renaming EndToEndIdentification to CustomerEndToEndIdentification. A CR is issued to make EndToEndIdentification optional in parcs.009	PUBLIC_GROUP	The only accepted CR accepted is to add UETR as an optional element and to make the transaction Id optional with a rule mandating the presence of a fleast one of these 2 Ids (both can be present). So no CR accepted to rename E2E Id into Customer E2E Id as per March 26 HVPS+ meeting.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	_GENERIC	/CreditTransferTransactionInformation/PaymentIdentification/InstructionIdentification 1	2018-10-17 13:45:16	In order to achieve harmonization with the still existing MT world, fields should be limited in size. Thus, the complete transfer of information can be guaranteed in the customer-customer relationship. In addition, the unique referencing for research, reconciliation, return processes is important. Specifically, this field should be limited to 16 digits	PUBLIC_GROUP	Coexistence is not supported in RTGS, i.e. against general messaging principles.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	GENERIC	CreditTransferTransactionInformation/PaymentIdentification/TransactionIdentification 1	2018-10-17 13:47:30	What is the current status of CRs in terms of UETR? PTGS-Use: New UETR Identification - Change Request will be submitted to ask for an additional optional (bank-to-bank) identification to transport the UETR. This identification field will exceptionally be 36 characters long in order to avoid truncation of the dashes. This new UETR identification field should be added in every message containing today a Transaction D.	PUBLIC_GROUP	To be implemented in November 2019.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFIFinancialInstitutionCreditTransferV07_pacs.009.001.07 _GENERIC		2018-10-17 13:48:51	The need for differentiation between Target and EBA is important for easy STP processing. Where should this identification be placed in pacs009?	-	Please clarify comment further.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFIFinancialInstitutionCreditTransferV07_pacs.009.001.07 _GENERIC		2018-10-17 13:49:39	Our proposal is a general limitation of the possible agents in pacs to the possible agents in the MT103	PUBLIC_GROUP	Coexistence is not supported in RTGS, i.e. against general messaging principles.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFIFinancialInstitutionCreditTransferV07_pacs.009.001.07 _GENERIC		2018-10-17 13:50:24	There are currently no fields / options for forwarding in MT format	PUBLIC_GROUP	Coexistence is not supported in RTGS, i.e. against general messaging principles.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFIFinancialInstitutionCreditTransferV07_pacs.009.001.07 _GENERIC	/CreditTransferTransactionInformation/UltimateDebtor 1	2018-10-17 13:50:15	There are currently no fields / options for forwarding in MT format	PUBLIC_GROUP	Coexistence is not supported in RTGS, i.e. against general messaging principles.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFIFinancialInstitutionCreditTransferV07_pacs.009.001.07 _GENERIC		2018-10-17 13:44:13	The need for differentiation between Target and EBA is important for easy STP processing. Where should this identification be placed in pacs009?	_	Please clarify comment further.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFIFinancialInstitutionCreditTransferV07_pacs.009.001.07 _GENERIC	/GroupHeader/SettlementInformation 1	2018-10-17 13:43:50	The need for differentiation between Target and EBA is important for easy STP processing. Where should this identification be placed in pacs009?	PUBLIC_GROUP	Please clarify comment further.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV07_pacs.008.001.07	CreditTransferTransactionInformation/PaymentIdentification/EndToEndIdentification 1	2018-10-17 11:52:52	What is the current status of CRs in terms of End-to-End Identification? The CR will propose renaming EndTeEndIdentification to CustometraToTEndIdentification. A CR is issued to make EndTeEndIdentification optional in pace. 300 with the rule: IF COVER payment THEN EndTeEndIdentification can use stat with value of pace.300 EndTeEndIdentification. IF CORE payment THEN EndTeEndIdentification can not be used. If CR is not accepted, in the case of CORE the payment value is EndTeEndIdentification will be "NOTPROVIDED".	PUBLIC_GROUP	For Customer E2E Id,CR not accepted to rename E2E Id in Customer E2E Id as per March 25 HVPS+ meeting. For CR to make E2E Id optional, CR not accepted and E2E Id will remain mandatory with NOTPROVIDED in case of Core Payment.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV07_pacs.008.001.07	/CreditTransferTransactionInformation/PaymentIdentification/InstructionIdentification 1	2018-10-17 08:34:00	In order to achieve harmonization with the still existing MT world, fields should be limited in size. Thus, the complete transfer of information can be guaranteed in the customer-customer relationship. In addition, the unique referencing for research, reconciliation, return processes is important. Specifically, this field should be limited to 16 digits	PUBLIC_GROUP	Coexistence is not supported in RTGS, i.e. against general messaging principles.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV07_pacs.008.001.07	CreditTransferTransactionInformation/PaymentIdentification/TransactionIdentification 1	2018-10-17 12:09:15	What is the current status of CR in terms of UETR? New UETR (Reinfications, Catange Request will be submitted to ask for an additional optional (bank-to-bank) identification to transport the UETR. This identification field will exceptionally be 36 characters long in order to avoid truncation of the dashers. This new UETR identification field should be added in every message containing today a Transaction ID. UETR when available will be made mandatory in EMIP guideline.	PUBLIC_GROUP	To be implemented in November 2019.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV07_pacs.008.001.07	/CreditTransferTransactionInformation/RelatedRemittanceInformation 1	2018-10-17 13:18:51	Should be meaningfully limited in the context of harmonization with the still existing MT world and due to a possible the data overflow (according to SEPA?).	PUBLIC_GROUP	Coexistence is not supported in RTGS, i.e. against general messaging principles.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV07_pacs.008.001.07	/CreditTransferTransactionInformation/RemittanceInformation 1	2018-10-17 13:19:42	Should be meaningfully limited in the context of harmonization with the still existing MT world and due to the data overflow (according to SEPA?).	PUBLIC_GROUP	Coexistence is not supported in RTGS, i.e. against general messaging principles.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV07_pacs.008.001.07	/CreditTransferTransactionInformation/UltimateCreditor 1	2018-10-17 13:14:13	There are currently no fields / options for forwarding in MT format	PUBLIC_GROUP	Coexistence is not supported in RTGS, i.e. against general messaging principles.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV07_pacs.008.001.07	/CreditTransferTransactionInformation/UltimateDebtor 1	2018-10-17 13:07:11	There are currently no fields / options for forwarding in MT format	PUBLIC_GROUP	Coexistence is not supported in RTGS, i.e. against general messaging principles.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV07_pacs.008.001.07	/GroupHeader/PaymentTypeInformation/ClearingChannel 1	2018-10-17 12:13:31	The need for differentiation between Target and EBA is important for easy STP processing.	PUBLIC_GROUP	Please clarify comment further.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV07_pacs.008.001.07	/GroupHeader/SettlementInformation/SettlementMethod 1	2018-10-16 09:21:09	The need for differentiation between Target and EBA is important for easy STP processing. Where should this identification be placed in pars008?	PUBLIC_GROUP	Please clarify comment further.
RTGS_pacs_guidelines	RTGS_FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV07_pacs.008.001.07	IGroupHeader/SettlementInformation/SettlementMethod 2	2018-10-16 09:37:05	Actually, there is the PaymentTypeInformation /Clearing Channel field. This was unfortunately removed.	PUBLIC_GROUP	Please further detail the comment. Do you see business cases which may justify the use of PaymentTypeInformation /Clearing Channel?