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Summary

1. Gap analysis description
2. Classification of identified gaps
Part 1

Gap Analysis Description
Gap Analysis Description

- To check the level of compliance of TIPS messages Xml Schema Definitions and the EPC SCT Inst documentation, a gap analysis between TIPS and EPC Xml Schema Definition resources has been performed.
- All of the SCT Inst schema related messages have been compared (i.e. pacs and camt schema definitions).
- Relevant findings requiring actions, have been grouped into three categories and included in the shared document produced out of the analysis.
- For each of the categories, a way forward should be agreed by the group.
Classification of Identified Gaps
Classification of Identified Gaps

- Relevant findings requiring actions, have been grouped into three categories:
  1. Gap on SCT Inst schema
  2. Gap on TIPS schema
  3. EPC clarification needed

- The following table groups the gaps by message type
Category 1: Gap on SCT Inst schema

This category groups all the findings which do not comply with:

- Interbank SCT Inst Guideline
  - Elements which are not included as required in the interbank guidelines are in the schema.

- XML/XSD W3C recommendations
  - A complex type should always include at least one simple type

Proposed way forward

- EPC provides XSD as samples which are not to be used in production environments.
- Discrepancies to be provided to EPC for information.
- EPC to decide if corrections are to be implemented.
Category 2: Gap on TIPS schema

• This category groups all of the findings which do not comply with Interbank SCT Inst Guideline
  ▪ Elements which are not included as required in the interbank guidelines are in the schema.
  ▪ Elements which are described in the interbank guidelines are not in the schema.

Proposed way forward

• Despite none of the findings falling under this category affects TIPS processing, it is necessary to correct the schemas for compliance with the SCT Inst specifications.
• A Change Request should be drafted by 4CB in order to close all the gaps.
Category 3 – EPC clarification needed

Category 3: EPC clarification needed

• This category groups all of the findings which have not been detailed enough or are ambiguous in the Interbank Guideline document
  ▪ Components defined in different ways across different messages.
  ▪ Message elements not enough detailed to customize the messages with no interpretation of the requirements.

Proposed way forward

• Despite none of the findings falling under this category affects TIPS processing, it is recommended to have clarifications on how the message elements are expected by Market Participants.
• A request for clarification should be sent to the EPC.