Conceptual Framework for Unified Payment Integration in Multi-Bank Financial Ecosystems

OYEJIDE TIMOTHY ODOFIN[1], OLUWADEMILADE ADEREMI AGBOOLA[2], EJIELO OGBUEFI[3], JEFFREY CHIDERA OGEAWUCHI[4], OLUWASANMI SEGUN ADANIGBO[5], TOLUWASE PETER GBENLE[6]

[1]*Comsoft Ltd, Abuja, Nigeria*
[2]*Thrive Agric, Abuja, Nigeria*
[3]*Mac-Umec Associate limited And NYSC @Enugu, Nigeria*
[4]*Brickwall Global Investment Company, Lagos State, Nigeria*
[5]*Bancore Group HQ, Copenhagen, Denmark*
[6]*Soft-com Limited, Nigeria*

Abstract- ***In the evolving landscape of global finance, the need for seamless and interoperable payment systems across multiple banks has become increasingly evident. This paper proposes a conceptual framework for unified payment integration aimed at overcoming the fragmentation inherent in current multi-bank ecosystems. The framework introduces a layered architecture comprising data, integration, and application layers, each designed to ensure robust transaction processing, compliance, and data privacy. Central to this architecture are key modules such as transaction orchestration, compliance gateways, identity and access management, and an API hub, which together provide a flexible, scalable, and secure payment ecosystem. The framework is grounded in global standards like ISO 20022 and open banking protocols, ensuring compatibility across institutions and jurisdictions. Additionally, it addresses core challenges including regulatory compliance, data protection, and scalability while offering insights into potential implementation barriers, such as regulatory diversity and adoption inertia. The paper concludes by outlining avenues for future research, including empirical validation through pilot studies and the integration of emerging technologies like blockchain and artificial intelligence. This conceptual framework provides a foundation for the future development of unified, cross-institutional payment systems that are efficient, secure, and adaptable to evolving financial technologies.***

Indexed Terms- ***Unified Payment Integration, Multi-Bank Ecosystem, Transaction Orchestration, Regulatory Compliance, API Hub, Open Banking Protocols***

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In the modern financial landscape, multi-bank environments have become increasingly common, especially among corporations and digitally active consumers [1, 2]. These entities often manage accounts across several financial institutions for reasons including cash flow optimization, regional regulatory compliance, and financial risk diversification [3, 4]. However, the absence of a unified payment system creates significant operational friction [5]. End-users and institutions are often required to navigate disjointed online portals, distinct authentication mechanisms, and varying transaction formats, making seamless financial management a complex task [6]. This fragmentation inhibits real-time decision-making and introduces inefficiencies that are no longer acceptable in a digital-first economy [7, 8].

The proliferation of digital banking and financial technology platforms has improved individual banking services but has further amplified systemic fragmentation across banks. Each institution tends to implement proprietary systems and standards, leading to a lack of harmonization in how payments are processed or data is exchanged [9]. While isolated innovations have emerged—such as mobile wallets or national real-time payment rails—they rarely extend cohesively across a broader multi-bank environment.

This has widened the gap between innovation and actual financial interoperability at scale [10-12].

Therefore, the call for a unified payment integration framework is both timely and critical. It aligns with the growing demand for ecosystem-level efficiency, heightened customer experience, and regulatory harmonization. In a world moving rapidly toward open finance and embedded banking, the lack of interoperability threatens to undermine progress. A well-structured conceptual framework can offer a common ground for collaboration between traditional banks, fintech entities, and oversight bodies, fostering scalable, secure, and inclusive financial ecosystems. [13, 14]

1.2 Problem Statement

Despite rapid advancements in financial technologies, a core problem persists: most multi-bank financial ecosystems remain siloed, lacking the interoperability required to support unified payment processes. Financial institutions continue to maintain separate infrastructures, often driven by legacy technologies, varied compliance obligations, and differing strategic priorities [15, 16]. As a result, financial transactions across multiple banks are typically routed through inefficient, redundant processes, which delay settlements, elevate transaction costs, and limit visibility for stakeholders. For enterprises and end-users managing diverse banking relationships, these inefficiencies introduce operational burdens and data fragmentation [17, 18].

Redundant infrastructure also poses cybersecurity and maintenance challenges. Each bank often maintains its own redundant services for identity verification, transaction tracking, fraud detection, and reconciliation. This duplication of effort not only increases systemic costs but also fragments accountability. When cross-bank disputes arise, resolution processes are complex and inconsistent due to the lack of a standardized approach. Additionally, overlapping data flows and multiple integration endpoints create unnecessary complexity for third-party service providers who seek to build cross-bank financial solutions [19, 20].

Furthermore, without a unified payment infrastructure, regulators face hurdles in achieving effective oversight. Disparate reporting formats, incompatible data schemas, and the absence of centralized monitoring mechanisms obstruct comprehensive risk assessment and policy enforcement. Collectively, these factors emphasize the urgent need for an integrated conceptual model that promotes interoperability, reduces system redundancies, and enhances the operational efficiency of multi-bank financial ecosystems [21].

1.3 Research Objectives and Scope

This study aims to design a conceptual framework for unified payment integration that addresses the core challenges faced in multi-bank financial ecosystems. The proposed framework will serve as a blueprint to facilitate interoperability between institutions, improve infrastructure efficiency, and support regulatory alignment. By defining architectural components, key integration mechanisms, and stakeholder roles, the framework will establish a strategic foundation for payment unification. It seeks to reduce friction in cross-bank interactions and promote a seamless user experience across institutional boundaries.

The target audience for this framework includes banks seeking to modernize and interconnect their payment infrastructures, fintech companies developing multi-bank platforms, and regulators aiming to ensure systemic stability and compliance in a rapidly digitizing financial world. The framework is intended to be technology-agnostic, allowing it to accommodate different system architectures and regional contexts while adhering to global best practices and standards. Emphasis is placed on scalability, security, and compliance-readiness to ensure long-term viability.

Although the conceptual framework is not an implementation model, it is grounded in a rigorous synthesis of existing technologies, industry practices, and policy considerations. It sets the stage for future empirical research, prototyping, and pilot testing. By articulating a shared vision and standardization roadmap, this work contributes to the growing body of knowledge on financial integration and supports

ongoing efforts to create more inclusive and efficient financial ecosystems.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Evolution of Multi-Bank Payment Systems

The development of multi-bank payment systems has evolved alongside the broader digitization of financial services. Historically, financial institutions operated in silos, utilizing proprietary core banking systems designed primarily for intra-bank transactions [22-24]. These legacy systems were adequate in an era dominated by paper-based instruments and closed-loop networks. However, as global commerce expanded and customer needs grew more complex, financial institutions began to face increasing pressure to enable efficient interbank transactions [25-27]. This led to the rise of interbank clearinghouses, real-time gross settlement systems, and SWIFT-based messaging protocols. Although these solutions offered incremental interoperability, they remained limited in speed, transparency, and adaptability [28].

With the emergence of digital banking in the early 2000s, banks began introducing online and mobile platforms to support user-friendly, always-on access. However, even as digital channels matured, true integration across banks lagged behind [29-31]. Clients managing accounts with multiple institutions still encounter siloed interfaces and inconsistent transaction handling. This disjointed experience highlights the limitations of current systems in supporting multi-bank interaction seamlessly [32-34].

The financial ecosystem has recently witnessed a shift toward collaborative infrastructure models. Initiatives such as domestic real-time payment schemes (e.g., Faster Payments in the UK, UPI in India) aim to streamline interbank transfers [35-37]. However, these are often limited to national boundaries and do not inherently resolve the issue of unified interfaces or integrated service delivery across multiple banks. As customers increasingly demand centralized control over dispersed financial relationships, the evolution of multi-bank systems must progress beyond basic transaction settlement toward cohesive digital integration [38].

2.2 Integration Technologies in Financial Services

Modern financial integration relies heavily on scalable and standardized technologies, chief among them being APIs. These application programming interfaces facilitate real-time data exchange and process automation between financial institutions and third-party providers [39-41]. Through standardized API frameworks, banks can securely expose payment initiation, account information, and identity verification services to authorized platforms [42]. This has enabled the rise of account aggregators, digital wallets, and financial management apps that operate across institutional boundaries, forming the backbone of open finance ecosystems [43-45].

Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA) has also played a significant role by enabling banks to modularize their services into discrete, reusable components. This allows financial institutions to integrate payment capabilities, compliance tools, and customer management systems with external platforms in a flexible and scalable manner [46-48]. Unlike monolithic legacy systems, SOA promotes interoperability and service reusability, key attributes for building multi-bank integration layers. Its role in enabling abstraction and service orchestration makes it especially relevant for frameworks seeking to unify cross-bank processes [49-51].

Furthermore, open banking initiatives have institutionalized integration practices through legal and regulatory mandates [52, 53]. By requiring banks to provide secure access to customer data and services, open banking frameworks have stimulated innovation while ensuring data protection and consumer control. The PSD2 regulation in Europe and similar policies globally have accelerated the adoption of standardized interfaces, providing fertile ground for building unified payment ecosystems [54-56]. Despite these advances, challenges remain in harmonizing implementation across institutions and geographies, making the case for a conceptual framework that unifies integration strategies even stronger [57, 58].

2.3 Gaps in Existing Frameworks

Despite the technological advances and regulatory mandates driving integration, current frameworks still

fall short in addressing several critical areas. Latency remains a key challenge, particularly in cross-border or multi-party transaction workflows. Delays arise from asynchronous settlement processes, incompatible processing windows across institutions, and complex routing requirements. These issues can undermine the real-time capabilities that modern consumers and businesses expect from digital payment systems. As latency affects both user experience and risk exposure, it represents a major barrier to seamless payment integration [59-61].

Security is another area where fragmentation persists. Although industry standards such as OAuth2 and mutual TLS exist, their implementation across financial institutions is often inconsistent. Varying authentication protocols, encryption models, and fraud detection mechanisms create vulnerabilities, particularly when multiple banks are involved in a single transaction chain. Furthermore, integrating with third-party platforms expands the attack surface, necessitating a unified approach to identity management, access control, and data protection across the ecosystem [62-64].

Regulatory compliance and cross-border complexity further compound the integration challenge. Each jurisdiction imposes its own rules regarding data sovereignty, anti-money laundering, and consumer rights. As a result, institutions face difficulty harmonizing processes without duplicating compliance infrastructure for each context. Moreover, interoperability standards such as ISO 20022, while promising, have yet to achieve uniform adoption. These inconsistencies highlight the urgent need for a high-level conceptual framework that can accommodate regulatory variation while maintaining integration, security, and performance in multi-bank ecosystems [57, 58].

III. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

3.1 Conceptual Framework Design Principles

The design of the conceptual framework for unified payment integration draws heavily from systems thinking principles, which focus on understanding how components interact within a broader ecosystem. Systems thinking encourages viewing multi-bank payment systems not just as isolated entities but as interconnected components within a dynamic environment [65, 66]. By employing a holistic perspective, the framework recognizes that effective integration requires not only technical solutions but also the alignment of business, regulatory, and operational structures across stakeholders. This approach ensures that the proposed framework accounts for both immediate transactional needs and long-term sustainability in a multi-institutional context [59, 60].

Interoperability standards, such as ISO 20022, play a pivotal role in the framework's design. This global standard for electronic data exchange in financial services allows institutions to achieve seamless integration through a common messaging format. ISO 20022 facilitates standardized communication between banks, ensuring compatibility across diverse systems and jurisdictions [46, 67, 68]. By incorporating such standards into the framework, the design provides a foundation for cross-institutional integration that minimizes barriers to entry for different participants. Moreover, the modular design of the framework allows institutions to implement and scale individual components without disrupting the entire system. This flexibility is crucial for addressing the varying technical capabilities and operational priorities of different banks and third-party service providers [69-71].

The overall design is future-proofed by aligning with emerging financial technologies and regulatory trends. For instance, support for open banking protocols is integrated, anticipating the evolution of the financial services landscape toward more decentralized and customer-centric models. Ultimately, this modular and standardized approach ensures that the framework can accommodate the complexities of multi-bank environments while remaining adaptable to future technological developments.

3.2 Data Sources and Modeling Techniques

The development of the conceptual framework is informed by a comprehensive synthesis of both industry best practices and academic literature. Industry sources, including reports from financial

technology providers, payment system operators, and regulatory bodies, offer valuable insights into the challenges faced by multi-bank ecosystems [72, 73]. Additionally, data from real-world case studies—such as the implementation of national real-time payment systems or cross-border payment integrations—serve as foundational examples for the framework's design. These case studies illustrate practical issues related to latency, security, and compliance that the framework aims to address.

Modeling techniques such as Unified Modeling Language (UML) and Business Process Model and Notation (BPMN) are employed to represent the structure and flow of the conceptual framework visually. UML diagrams help define the key components of the framework, such as the interaction between banks, third-party service providers, and regulatory entities [74-76]. BPMN is used to map the processes involved in payment transactions across different institutions, ensuring that the interactions are clear, standardized, and efficient [77]. These modeling techniques allow for a detailed, structured representation of the framework that can be easily understood by stakeholders and modified as needed during the implementation phase [78-80].

Furthermore, academic sources on systems integration, financial regulations, and digital banking inform the theoretical underpinnings of the framework. The combination of real-world examples and formal modeling techniques provides a robust, empirically grounded foundation for the conceptual framework, ensuring that it is both theoretically sound and practically applicable [81-83].

3.3 Validation Criteria

The conceptual framework for unified payment integration will be validated through a set of rigorous criteria that emphasize interoperability, scalability, and compliance readiness. Interoperability is the first critical factor for validation, ensuring that the proposed framework can facilitate seamless data exchange and transaction processing across different banks and systems. This includes adherence to industry standards, such as ISO 20022 and open banking protocols, which are necessary to ensure that various participants—banks, fintechs, and third-party providers—can communicate efficiently and securely.

Scalability is the next key criterion, as the framework must be able to support the growing demands of multi-bank environments. It should be able to accommodate an increasing number of participants, transactions, and data flows without compromising system performance. This requires modularity and flexibility in the design to allow banks to scale individual components of the system based on their needs. Additionally, the framework should be adaptable to various geographic regions and regulatory environments, further demonstrating its scalability across diverse contexts.

Finally, compliance readiness is crucial for the long-term success of the framework. The ability to meet regulatory requirements such as data protection laws, anti-money laundering (AML) standards, and payment system regulations is a non-negotiable feature of any financial integration model. As such, the framework's design must incorporate mechanisms for ensuring that it adheres to both local and international compliance standards. Compliance validation will also involve examining the framework's capacity to integrate with existing regulatory reporting structures and ensure transparency in transaction flows. These validation criteria ensure that the conceptual framework is not only operationally effective but also legally and ethically sound.

IV. PROPOSED CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

4.1 Architecture Overview

The proposed conceptual framework for unified payment integration follows a layered architecture, which is designed to facilitate seamless communication and data exchange across different banking institutions, third-party providers (TPPs), and regulatory bodies. The architecture consists of three primary layers: the data layer, the integration layer, and the application layer.

The data layer serves as the foundation of the framework, where all raw transaction data, financial records, and customer information are stored securely. This layer ensures data integrity, availability, and

confidentiality by implementing robust encryption and access control measures. The data layer is responsible for maintaining standardized formats that support various payment systems and compliance requirements. For instance, data formats like ISO 20022 ensure that transactions can be processed uniformly across institutions, regardless of their underlying technologies.

The integration layer acts as the intermediary that orchestrates interactions between different systems. This layer facilitates seamless communication across disparate banking systems, fintech applications, and external entities. It is responsible for routing transactions, ensuring that payments are initiated and validated correctly across multiple banks. This layer utilizes APIs and service-oriented architecture (SOA) to enable interoperability, thereby allowing different entities to communicate securely and efficiently. Furthermore, it serves as the central hub for monitoring the health of the payment ecosystem, tracking transaction statuses, and managing dispute resolutions.

The application layer is the topmost layer where user-facing services and application functionalities are implemented. This layer encompasses the interfaces through which end-users, banks, TPPs, and regulators interact with the system. It provides payment initiation, reporting, transaction monitoring, and compliance validation features. This layer can include mobile and web applications for consumer transactions, dashboards for institutional monitoring, and interfaces for regulatory oversight.

4.2 Core Components and Functionalities

The core components of the framework are designed to ensure efficient and secure payment integration across multi-bank ecosystems. These components include transaction orchestration, compliance gateway, identity and access management, and an API hub. The transaction orchestration module is responsible for managing the lifecycle of a payment, from initiation to settlement. It handles the routing of payment requests across different banks, ensuring that each transaction follows the appropriate processing rules, such as those defined by the International Bank Account Number (IBAN) or the Real-Time Gross Settlement (RTGS) system. This component ensures that payments are processed according to established banking protocols while maintaining system integrity [84, 85].

The compliance gateway is a critical component that ensures all transactions adhere to regulatory standards such as Anti-Money Laundering (AML), Know Your Customer (KYC), and data protection laws. The gateway automatically scans transactions for suspicious activities and verifies that they comply with jurisdiction-specific regulations. This module also serves to authenticate the identities of involved parties, ensuring that all participants are authorized to engage in financial transactions within the framework [86-88].

Identity and access management (IAM) plays a vital role in securing user and system interactions. It manages the authentication and authorization processes, ensuring that only authorized users or systems can access sensitive transaction data or perform specific actions within the platform. Through features like multi-factor authentication (MFA) and role-based access control (RBAC), IAM ensures that access to payment systems is secure and that transactions are initiated by verified entities [89].

The API hub is the component responsible for connecting various systems within the ecosystem. It exposes standardized APIs that allow for easy integration with external services, such as digital wallets, accounting systems, and regulatory reporting tools. The API hub is built on open standards, ensuring that new services can be quickly added to the system without disrupting existing workflows. This modularity allows for a flexible ecosystem where new financial innovations can be incorporated without requiring significant changes to the underlying infrastructure [90-92].

4.3 Stakeholder Integration Strategy

A key aspect of the proposed framework is how it facilitates interaction between different stakeholders: banks, third-party providers (TPPs), and regulatory bodies. Effective integration across these groups is essential for ensuring the smooth operation of multi-bank payment systems.

Banks are central to the payment ecosystem, as they serve as the gateways for processing and clearing financial transactions. Within the framework, banks interact with each other through standardized APIs and data protocols, ensuring that payments are executed accurately and efficiently [93, 94]. By adhering to interoperability standards such as ISO 20022, the framework allows for seamless communication between banks, even if they use different backend systems. The integration layer ensures that all transaction routing is handled properly, while the compliance gateway ensures that banks meet regulatory requirements throughout the transaction lifecycle [95-97].

Third-party providers (TPPs), such as fintech companies, digital wallets, and payment processors, add additional layers of innovation to the ecosystem. They interface with the payment platform via the API hub, enabling end-users to initiate payments, track transactions, or access financial services from different institutions [98, 99]. The framework allows TPPs to securely interact with multiple banks, offering a unified interface for consumers and businesses to manage their financial activities. TPPs must comply with the same regulatory standards as banks, and the framework includes mechanisms for ensuring that they are authorized to process payments and access sensitive data [11, 100, 101].

Regulatory bodies play an oversight role within the framework, ensuring that transactions meet compliance standards and that data privacy is upheld. Through the integration of a regulatory node, the framework ensures that data flows from the payment platform are regularly audited for compliance with national and international financial regulations. Regulatory bodies can access real-time transaction data, perform audits, and issue regulatory reports without compromising the privacy or security of the underlying financial information. This fosters greater transparency and trust in the financial ecosystem while allowing for the necessary checks and balances to ensure systemic integrity [102, 103].

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This paper presents a conceptual framework for unified payment integration in multi-bank financial ecosystems, addressing several key inefficiencies in current payment systems. The framework proposes a layered architecture that promotes interoperability, scalability, and regulatory compliance across a diverse set of financial institutions, third-party providers, and regulatory bodies. By integrating modular components such as transaction orchestration, compliance gateways, identity and access management, and a standardized API hub, the framework ensures that multi-bank payment systems can operate cohesively and securely. The incorporation of global standards like ISO 20022 and open banking protocols enables seamless data exchange and processing across different platforms, ultimately reducing latency, eliminating redundancy, and minimizing the risk of fraud.

Through this framework, the payment ecosystem becomes more agile and capable of accommodating new financial innovations while maintaining high levels of security and compliance. Moreover, the flexible design ensures that the system can scale with the growing demands of modern financial markets, making it a robust solution for addressing the fragmentation in current multi-bank payment systems.

Despite its promising potential, the implementation of the proposed framework is not without challenges. One of the primary obstacles is the diversity of regulatory environments across different jurisdictions. Financial institutions are often bound by local regulations governing data sovereignty, consumer protection, and anti-money laundering (AML) requirements. While the framework includes a compliance gateway designed to adapt to varying legal landscapes, the sheer complexity of aligning these regulations across borders may hinder the seamless integration of global systems. It may require ongoing coordination between regulatory bodies, financial institutions, and technology providers to ensure consistent standards and procedures.

Another significant consideration is data privacy. While the framework integrates mechanisms for secure data transfer and storage, ensuring that sensitive financial data is protected across multiple banks and service providers remains a critical concern. Compliance with stringent data protection laws, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in

the EU or similar regulations in other jurisdictions, will require careful planning and technological solutions to maintain user privacy while enabling cross-institutional transactions. Additionally, adoption inertia could delay the widespread implementation of the framework. Financial institutions and third-party providers may be resistant to change due to the high costs of transitioning from legacy systems to modern, integrated solutions. The time and investment required for retraining staff, adapting existing infrastructure, and ensuring ongoing system compatibility could deter stakeholders from fully embracing the framework.

Future research can build on the conceptual framework presented here by focusing on empirical testing and simulation studies to assess its real-world applicability. One promising avenue for future work is piloting the framework in sandbox environments where controlled trials can be conducted to assess its performance under different conditions, such as varying transaction volumes, regulatory constraints, and participant behaviors. These pilot studies can provide valuable insights into potential bottlenecks, security risks, and compliance issues that were not fully anticipated during the design phase.

Moreover, simulation studies can be used to model the interactions between different stakeholders in the payment ecosystem, testing how the framework performs under various network conditions, transaction types, and user behaviors. These simulations could also help identify areas where the framework could be further optimized, especially in terms of latency, security, and cost-effectiveness. Finally, further research is needed to explore how the framework could be adapted to accommodate emerging technologies such as blockchain and artificial intelligence, which have the potential to revolutionize payment processing and compliance mechanisms. By investigating these technological advancements and their integration into multi-bank payment systems, researchers can develop more adaptive and resilient financial infrastructures.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Alt, R. Beck, and M. T. Smits, "FinTech and the transformation of the financial industry," vol. 28, ed: Springer, 2018, pp. 235-243.

[2] E. Hofmann, U. M. Strewe, and N. Bosia, *Supply chain finance and blockchain technology: the case of reverse securitisation*. Springer, 2017.

[3] C.-Y. Tsang, "From industry sandbox to supervisory control box: rethinking the role of regulators in the era of Fintech," *U. Ill. JL Tech. & Pol'y,* p. 355, 2019.

[4] C. Bryant and E. Camerinelli, "Supply chain finance," *EBA (Euro Banking Association),* 2013.

[5] A. Botta, M.-C. Nadeau, P. Bruno, G. Tayar, and R. Chaudhuri, "Global Banking Practice," 2020.

[6] E. Nygren, R. K. Sitaraman, and J. Sun, "The akamai network: a platform for high-performance internet applications," *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review,* vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 2-19, 2010.

[7] E. Sisinni, A. Saifullah, S. Han, U. Jennehag, and M. Gidlund, "Industrial internet of things: Challenges, opportunities, and directions," *IEEE transactions on industrial informatics,* vol. 14, no. 11, pp. 4724-4734, 2018.

[8] S. Nagaraju and L. Parthiban, "Trusted framework for online banking in public cloud using multi-factor authentication and privacy protection gateway," *Journal of Cloud Computing,* vol. 4, no. 1, p. 22, 2015.

[9] X. Vives, "Digital disruption in banking," *Annual Review of Financial Economics,* vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 243-272, 2019.

[10] A. W. Boot, "Understanding the Future of Banking Scale and Scope," *The future of large, internationally active banks,* vol. 55, p. 431, 2016.

[11] M.-S. Jameaba, "Digitization revolution, FinTech disruption, and financial stability: Using the case of Indonesian banking ecosystem to highlight wide-ranging digitization opportunities and major challenges," *FinTech Disruption, and*

Financial stability: Using the Case of Indonesian Banking Ecosystem to highlight wide-ranging digitization opportunities and major challenges (July 16 2, 2020), 2020.

[12] L. Wewege, J. Lee, and M. C. Thomsett, "Disruptions and digital banking trends," *Journal of Applied Finance and Banking,* vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 15-56, 2020.

[13] S. T. Omarova, "Technology v technocracy: Fintech as a regulatory challenge," *Journal of Financial Regulation,* vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 75-124, 2020.

[14] A. Głogowski, "Financial innovations and systemic risk–a financial stability policy perspective," in *Innovation in Financial Services*: Routledge, 2020, pp. 60-76.

[15] B. A. Mayienga *et al.*, "A Conceptual Model for Global Risk Management, Compliance, and Financial Governance in Multinational Corporations."

[16] C. I. Lawal, S. C. Friday, D. C. Ayodeji, and A. Sobowale, "Strategic Framework for Transparent, Data-Driven Financial Decision-Making in Achieving Sustainable National Development Goals."

[17] S. C. Friday, M. N. Ameyaw, and T. O. Jejeniwa, "Conceptualizing the Impact of Automation on Financial Auditing Efficiency in Emerging Economies."

[18] O. Famoti *et al.*, "Data-Driven Risk Management in US Financial Institutions: A Business Analytics Perspective on Process Optimization."

[19] O. Famoti *et al.*, "Agile Software Engineering Framework for Real-Time Personalization in Financial Applications."

[20] E. O. Alonge and E. D. Balogun, "Innovative Strategies in Fixed Income Trading: Transforming Global Financial Markets."

[21] O. O. OKERE and E. KOKOGHO, "Determinants of Customer Satisfaction with Mobile Banking Applications: Evidence from University Students."

[22] R. Caneve, "Applications of Blockchain Technology in International Logistics-a Case Study," 2018.

[23] O. Nationalbank, "The financial system of the future: 44th Economics Conference 2017 of the OeNB in cooperation with SUERF," 2017: Vienna: SUERF-The European Money and Finance Forum.

[24] F. Giannella, "An innovative framework in the banking sector: a business case analysis," Politecnico di Torino, 2019.

[25] M. Berman *et al.*, "Report of the third global experimentation for future internet (GEFI 2018) workshop," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.02929,* 2019.

[26] Y. Zhang and M. Chen, *Cloud based 5G wireless networks*. Springer, 2016.

[27] N. Helander and H. Li, "IMPACT OF BIG DATA ANALYTICS AND FINANCIAL TECHNOLOGY IN FINNISH BANKING SECTOR," 2020.

[28] D. Granlund, P. Holmlund, and C. Åhlund, "Opportunistic mobility support for resource constrained sensor devices in smart cities," *Sensors,* vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 5112-5135, 2015.

[29] B. King, *Breaking banks: The innovators, rogues, and strategists rebooting banking*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.

[30] D. Mohan, *The financial services guide to Fintech: Driving banking innovation through effective partnerships*. Kogan Page Publishers, 2020.

[31] B. Nalunkuma, "Electronic banking and bank performance," 2016.

[32] T. W. Gathongo, "Older adults and technology adoption: investigating the use of online banking among the seniors in Nairobi county," UoN, 2019.

[33] H. T. T. Tran and J. Corner, "The impact of communication channels on mobile banking adoption," *International Journal of Bank Marketing,* vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 78-109, 2016.

[34] D. Kapantaidakis, "The new era in banking-Digital transformation," 2017.

[35] A. Greenfield, *Everyware: The dawning age of ubiquitous computing*. New Riders, 2010.

[36] D. G. Chowdhry, R. Verma, and M. Mathur, *The evolution of business in the cyber age:*

Digital transformation, threats, and security. CRC Press, 2020.

[37] P. Lai and W. Scheela, "Convergence of technology in the E-commerce world and venture capital landscape in South East Asia," in *Global Entrepreneurship and New Venture Creation in the Sharing Economy*: IGI Global, 2018, pp. 149-168.

[38] R. W. Gregory, E. Kaganer, O. Henfridsson, and T. J. Ruch, "IT consumerization and the transformation of IT governance," *MIS quarterly,* vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 1225-9, 2018.

[39] S. K. R. Thumburu, "Interfacing Legacy Systems with Modern EDI Solutions: Strategies and Techniques," 2020.

[40] M. Santoro, L. Vaccari, D. Mavridis, R. Smith, M. Posada, and D. Gattwinkel, "Web application programming interfaces (apis): General purpose standards, terms and European commission initiatives," *Eur. Commission, Louxembourg, Louxembourg, UK, Tech. Rep. JRC118082,* 2019.

[41] L. Weir, *Enterprise API Management: Design and deliver valuable business APIs*. Packt Publishing Ltd, 2019.

[42] M. Boyd, L. Vaccari, M. Posada, and D. Gattwinkel, "An Application Programming Interface (API) framework for digital government," *European Commission, Joint Research Centre,* 2020.

[43] M. García-Valls, A. Dubey, and V. Botti, "Introducing the new paradigm of social dispersed computing: Applications, technologies and challenges," *Journal of Systems Architecture,* vol. 91, pp. 83-102, 2018.

[44] M. Benmoussa, "API "Application Programming Interface" Banking: A promising future for financial institutions (International experience)," *La Revue Des Sciences Commerciales,* vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 31-43, 2019.

[45] N. Fikri, M. Rida, N. Abghour, K. Moussaid, and A. El Omri, "An adaptive and real-time based architecture for financial data integration," *Journal of Big Data,* vol. 6, pp. 1-25, 2019.

[46] M. Zachariadis, "How "Open" Is the Future of Banking? Data Sharing and Open Data Frameworks in Financial Services," *The Technological Revolution in Financial Services. How Banks, FinTechs, and Customers Win Together,* pp. 129-157, 2020.

[47] E. Avgouleas and A. Kiayias, "The architecture of decentralised finance platforms: a new open finance paradigm," *Edinburgh School of Law Research Paper,* no. 2020/16, 2020.

[48] P. Raj and A. C. Raman, *The Internet of Things: Enabling technologies, platforms, and use cases*. Auerbach Publications, 2017.

[49] H. Oh, N. Ivezic, and S. T. Nieman, "Standards-based semantic integration of manufacturing information: Past, present, and future," *Journal of manufacturing systems,* vol. 52, pp. 184-197, 2019.

[50] D. Gozman, J. Hedman, and K. Sylvest, "Open banking: Emergent roles, risks & opportunities," in *26th European Conference on Information Systems, ECIS 2018*, 2018: Association for Information Systems. AIS Electronic Library (AISeL).

[51] A. Gruber, "Deduction of a technical modernization process for the software architecture of Core Banking Systems," Wien, 2019.

[52] L. Ștefan, "Blockchain technologies and microservices for open learning communities. a software architecture perspective," in *Conference proceedings of» eLearning and Software for Education «(eLSE)*, 2020, vol. 16, no. 03: Carol I National Defence University Publishing House, pp. 126-133.

[53] A. L. Kooijmans, R. Balaji, Y. Patnaik, and S. Sinha, *A transformation approach to smarter core banking*. IBM Redbooks, 2012.

[54] O. Barros Vera, "Business engineering and service design. Vol. I," 2016.

[55] M. Makamba, "Integrating Legacy Applications Into Service Oriented Architecture Middleware," University of Fort Hare, 2012.

[56] O. Henfridsson and B. Bygstad, "The generative mechanisms of digital infrastructure evolution," *MIS quarterly,* pp. 907-931, 2013.

[57] A. D. Giordano, *Data integration blueprint and modeling: techniques for a scalable and sustainable architecture*. Pearson Education, 2010.

[58] R. G. Wolff, "Analysis of ROI in industry SOA implementation," Monterey, CA; Naval Postgraduate School, 2011.

[59] A. K. Whitcraft, I. Becker-Reshef, C. O. Justice, L. Gifford, A. Kavvada, and I. Jarvis, "No pixel left behind: Toward integrating Earth Observations for agriculture into the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals framework," *Remote Sensing of Environment,* vol. 235, p. 111470, 2019.

[60] D. J. Fagnant and K. Kockelman, "Preparing a nation for autonomous vehicles: opportunities, barriers and policy recommendations," *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice,* vol. 77, pp. 167-181, 2015.

[61] J. E. Siegel, D. C. Erb, and S. E. Sarma, "A survey of the connected vehicle landscape—Architectures, enabling technologies, applications, and development areas," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems,* vol. 19, no. 8, pp. 2391-2406, 2017.

[62] T. Vijayakumar, "Practical API architecture and development with Azure and AWS," *Apress, Berkeley, CA,* 2018.

[63] R. Filippov, "Security model for the open messaging interface (o-mi) protocol," 2016.

[64] S. Cheruvu, A. Kumar, N. Smith, and D. M. Wheeler, *Demystifying internet of things security: successful iot device/edge and platform security deployment*. Springer Nature, 2020.

[65] J. SVENSSON, "Context-Specific Interoperability for Banks: A Co-opetition Analysis," ed, 2014.

[66] K. McKenna, J. Northey, and B. Nichols, "Financial data interchange standards," *Handbook of Financial Data and Risk Information II,* vol. 2, p. 138, 2014.

[67] D. Bruggink, P. Karsten, and C. de Meijer, "The European cards environment and ISO 20022," *Journal of Payments Strategy & Systems,* vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 80-99, 2012.

[68] T. Egner, "ISO 20022 Newsletter," 2011.

[69] L. Fratini Passi, "The value of standardisation in public administration services: The Italian corporate banking experience," *Journal of Payments Strategy & Systems,* vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 42-59, 2010.

[70] K. Houstoun, A. Milne, and P. Parboteeah, "Preliminary report on standards in global financial markets," *Available at SSRN 2531210,* 2015.

[71] T. Bhatt, M. Gooch, B. Dent, and G. Sylvia, "Implementing interoperability in the seafood industry: learning from experiences in other sectors," *Journal of food science,* vol. 82, no. S1, pp. A22-A44, 2017.

[72] S. Asanga Abhayawansa, "A review of guidelines and frameworks on external reporting of intellectual capital," *Journal of Intellectual Capital,* vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 100-141, 2014.

[73] F. Boons, W. Spekkink, and Y. Mouzakitis, "The dynamics of industrial symbiosis: a proposal for a conceptual framework based upon a comprehensive literature review," *Journal of cleaner production,* vol. 19, no. 9-10, pp. 905-911, 2011.

[74] D. Badura, "Modelling business processes in logistics with the use of diagrams BPMN and UML," in *Forum Scientiae Oeconomia*, 2014, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 35-50.

[75] Z. Allah Bukhsh, "BPMN Plus: a modelling language for unstructured business processes," University of Twente, 2015.

[76] C. V. Geambasu, "BPMN vs. UML activity diagram for business process modeling," *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems (JAMIS),* vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 637-651, 2012.

[77] D. Bork, D. Karagiannis, and B. Pittl, "Systematic analysis and evaluation of visual conceptual modeling language notations," in *2018 12th International Conference on*

Research Challenges in Information Science (RCIS), 2018: IEEE, pp. 1-11.

[78] G. Aagesen and J. Krogstie, "BPMN 2.0 for modeling business processes," in *Handbook on business process management 1: introduction, methods, and information systems*: Springer, 2014, pp. 219-250.

[79] R. Bendraou, J.-M. Jézéquel, M.-P. Gervais, and X. Blanc, "A comparison of six uml-based languages for software process modeling," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering,* vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 662-675, 2010.

[80] Y. Wautelet and S. Poelmans, "An integrated enterprise modeling framework using the RUP/UML business use-case model and BPMN," in *The Practice of Enterprise Modeling: 10th IFIP WG 8.1. Working Conference, PoEM 2017, Leuven, Belgium, November 22-24, 2017, Proceedings 10*, 2017: Springer, pp. 299-315.

[81] G. Polančič and B. Orban, "A BPMN-based language for modeling corporate communications," *Computer Standards & Interfaces,* vol. 65, pp. 45-60, 2019.

[82] B. S. Onggo and O. Karpat, "Agent-based conceptual model representation using BPMN," in *Proceedings of the 2011 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*, 2011: IEEE, pp. 671-682.

[83] M. Rospocher, C. Ghidini, and L. Serafini, "An ontology for the business process modelling notation," in *Formal ontology in information systems*, 2014: IOS press, pp. 133-146.

[84] B. Bossone, G. Srinivas, and H. Banka, "Granting access to real-time gross settlement systems in the FinTech era," *Journal of Payments Strategy & Systems,* vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 363-379, 2020.

[85] D. T. K. Wardhono, "Establishing an integrated payment system (real-time gross settlement) in ASEAN: A proposal for a cross-border payment mechanism to support the AEC 2015," 2015.

[86] M. Subramanian, "Payments in the Middle East and Africa: An overview and review of implications for corporates operating in the region," *Journal of Payments Strategy & Systems,* vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 188-205, 2014.

[87] F. Latifi, "Bringing IBAN to Kosovo/[presentation given May 17, 2011]," 2011.

[88] T. Khiaonarong, "Creating an Association of Southeast Asian Nations payment system: Policy and regulatory issues," ADBI Working Paper, 2013.

[89] D. Anand and V. Khemchandani, "Identity and access management systems," *Security and Privacy of Electronic Healthcare Records: Concepts, Paradigms and Solutions,* p. 61, 2019.

[90] I. Azhar, "The interaction between artificial intelligence and identity & access management: An empirical study," *Ishaq Azhar Mohammed," THE INTERACTION BETWEEN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND IDENTITY & ACCESS MANAGEMENT: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY", International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT), ISSN,* pp. 2320-2882, 2015.

[91] I. A. Mohammed, "Systematic review of identity access management in information security," *International Journal of Innovations in Engineering Research and Technology,* vol. 4, no. 7, pp. 1-7, 2017.

[92] A. M. Al-Khouri, "Optimizing identity and access management (IAM) frameworks," *International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications,* vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 461-477, 2011.

[93] S. Lumpkin and S. Schich, "Banks, digital banking initiatives and the financial safety net: theory and analytical framework," *Journal of Economic Science Research,* vol. 3, no. 1, 2020.

[94] J. Hedman and S. Henningsson, "The new normal: Market cooperation in the mobile payments ecosystem," *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications,* vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 305-318, 2015.

[95] T. Dapp, L. Slomka, D. B. AG, and R. Hoffmann, "Fintech reloaded–Traditional banks as digital ecosystems," *Publication of the German original,* pp. 261-274, 2015.

[96] L. F. Passi, "An open banking ecosystem to survive the revised Payment Services Directive: Connecting international banks and FinTechs with the CBI Globe platform," *Journal of Payments Strategy & Systems,* vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 335-345, 2018.

[97] A. E. Omarini, "Fintech and the future of the payment landscape: the mobile wallet ecosystem. A challenge for retail banks?," *International Journal of Financial Research,* vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 97-116, 2018.

[98] C. Pazarbasioglu, A. G. Mora, M. Uttamchandani, H. Natarajan, E. Feyen, and M. Saal, "Digital financial services," *World Bank,* vol. 54, no. 1, 2020.

[99] L. Brodsky and L. Oakes, "Data sharing and open banking," *McKinsey & Company,* vol. 1097, p. 1105, 2017.

[100] U. Milkau and J. Bott, "Digitalisation in payments: From interoperability to centralised models?," *Journal of Payments Strategy & Systems,* vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 321-340, 2015.

[101] N. Remolina, "Open banking: Regulatory challenges for a new form of financial intermediation in a data-driven world," 2019.

[102] H. J. Allen, "Regulatory sandboxes," *Geo. Wash. L. Rev.,* vol. 87, p. 579, 2019.

[103] D. W. Arner, J. Barberis, and R. P. Buckey, "FinTech, RegTech, and the reconceptualization of financial regulation," *Nw. J. Int'l L. & Bus.,* vol. 37, p. 371, 2016.