



Market Consultation openFinance API Framework Implementation Guidelines Push Account Information Service

COMMENTS SHEET V1.00

Distribution: Publicly available

Comment (N° / ID)	Comment/question (when applicable with justification/rationale or reference section/page n°)	Suggested Resolution (alternative)	Agreed Resolution (Berlin Group)
G	Under "Section 6 Push Account Information", GLEIF suggests that the "creditorLEI" and "debtorLEI" for business clients are added in the push account entries request, in addition to the already existing "creditorName" and "debtorName".	additional layer of security and also enables numerous downstream business processes (see <u>Global adoption of the LEI (Legal Entity Identifier) in ISO 20022</u> <u>Payment Messages – 2021</u> which provides examples of how the LEI can be used in sanctions screening, reducing fraud for Corporate Treasurers, account to account owner validation and also improvements across the industry for Know your Customer (KYC) processes). Moreover, since the LEI is machine-readable, its use	IGs V1.3.x do not support yet structured creditor and debtor in fields. Domestically this is already supported, cp. the domestic AIS PIS documentation. V2 of openFinance will support creditor/debtor id fields with anyBIC and LEI as permitted attributes for identification.





Market Consultation openFinance API Framework Implementation Guidelines Push Account Information Service

COMMENTS SHEET V1.00

Distribution: Publicly available

Document	Document:					
Push Account Information Service, Implementation Guidelines, V 0_9						
Comment (N° / ID)	Comment/question (when applicable with justification/rationale or reference section/page n°)	Suggested Resolution (alternative)	Agreed Resolution (Berlin Group)			
G/T	Under "7.10 Transactions", GLEIF suggests that the LEI is adopted to uniquely identify creditor, debtor, ultimate creditor, and ultimate debtor, respectively.	In the current public consultation, GLEIF understands that the text field (with a maximum of 70 characters) is allowed to identify all these parties, which would cause manual intervention for data reconciliation and hinder straight through processing.	see above			
		Recently, SWIFT published its <u>Guiding principles for screening ISO 20022</u> <u>payments</u> . The report highlights that unstructured data is a barrier to building effective transaction screening and monitoring tools that mitigate sanctions and AML risks. As the payments industry prepares to adopt ISO 20022, banks are revisiting their screening environments. The report advises that BIC and LEI codes of Entities published on sanctions lists are listed as the relevant information should be screened against. The targeted screening approach allows financial institutions to avoid false positives linked to mismatches between information types (e.g. debtor name hitting against vessel names, street name information hitting against embargo data). SWIFT's Guidelines have been <u>endorsed by the Wolfsberg Group</u> , who develop frameworks and guidance for the management of financial crime risks, particularly with respect to Know Your Customer, Anti-Money Laundering and Counter Terrorist Financing policies.				