

ECB-UNRESTRICTED

ECB DG-MIP

T2/T2S Consolidation

T2/T2S Consolidation Project Team

Directory Services

5th Task Force Meeting on Future RTGS Services 24 April 2017

General Principles

- Each service will provide its own directory
 - Each service might have different reachable parties
 - Each service needs a different scope of information
 - The directories will be maintained centrally
- With change of delivery (Y-copy to V-shape) the addressing of participants will change

Directory Services

Addressing messages changes



XML – V Shape = Bank A addresses FRS/ FRS addresses Bank B



Structure of the TARGET2-Directory

Field name	Note			
BIC	Participant's BIC			
Addressee	BIC identifying the party receiving the messages			
Account Holder	BIC identifying the settlement bank			
Institution Name	Participant's company name			
City Heading	Participant's establishment			
National Sorting Code	Participant's national sorting code			
Main BIC Flag	Y: yes N: no Yes means that this BIC could be used to address the payments if the sender has no other information where to send to			
Type of Change	A: added M: modified D: deleted U: unchanged			
Valid from	Date from which the entry is valid			
Valid till	Date up to which the entry is valid			
Participation type	 01 - "Direct" 02 - "Indirect" 03 - multi addressee - Credit institutions 04 - multi addressee - Branch of Direct participant 05 - addressable BIC - Correspondent (including CB customer), 06 - addressable BIC - Branch of Direct participant 07 - addressable BIC - Branch of Indirect participant 08 - addressable BIC - Branch of correspondent 			
Reserve	Space			

Open questions

- Are there strong requirements to keep the national sorting code in the directory
- Are the fields "Institution Name" and "City Heading" needed?
- Would it be easier for technical integration on your side to keep empty fields or to drop them?

Booking of funds for addressable parties – option 1

- Should the account number to be used for received payments be part of the wildcard rules?
 - Pro:
 - Possibility to define credited account per addressable party/wildcard rule (business segregation)
 - Contra:
 - Clustering of wild cards (would they still make sense?)

Wildcard Rules					
Branch Flag		Account			
BIC	BIC Addressee	Participation Type	Туре		
ZYEFDEF0*		Addressable BIC - branch	Inclusion 🔽		
ZYED*		Multi addressee - Credit institutions			

Booking of funds for addressable parties - option 2

- Should the direct participant define a default account for payments not defining the receiving account
 - Pro:
 - Easy to set up
 - Contra:
 - business segregation more difficult to handle (no technical separation per defined wildcard)

Participant			
Responsible Central Bank	EU	Participant Name	
Legal Entity BIC			
Participant BIC			
BIC Addressee		Address	
Account Holder BIC		ZIP Code	
Main BIC Flag		City	
Participation Type	\checkmark	Institutional Sector Code	\checkmark
Internet based Participant		National Sorting Code	
Published in T2 Directory		MFI-Code	
		Packed File Delivery	
Service for Receiving TARGET2 Directory		T2S value-added service package	
DN for Receiving TARGET2 Directory:			
	o = SWIFT		
- BIC8	0 =	Default account	
- Organisation Unit	ou =		
New row for ou	ou =		
	ou =		
- Common Name	cn =		
New row for cn	cn =		
	cn =		
RTGS Participation	Direct 🗸		

Directory Services

Generation of the RTGS-Directory

