

N	Page	Subsection	Original Text	Comment	Status	Feedback to CG
1	30	1.5.2.1. Instant Payment transaction settlement process	Reserved Instant Payment transaction may subsequently transition change its status into one of the four final statuses,	A reserved Instant Payment transaction may subsequently transition change its status into one of the four final statuses,	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
2	30	1.5.2.1. Instant Payment transaction settlement process	If the Beneficiary Participant confirms the Instant Payment but any kind of error occurs, the transaction instruction moves to status Failed;	If the Beneficiary Participant rejects or confirms the Instant Payment but any kind of error occurs, the transaction instruction moves to status Failed;	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
3	35	1.5.3.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer	An Inbound Liquidity Transfer moves liquidity from an RTGS account to TIPS account	An Inbound Liquidity Transfer moves liquidity from an RTGS account to a TIPS account	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
4	35	1.5.3.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer	If the received message passes all the business check successfully	If the received message passes all the business checks successfully	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
5	36	1.5.3.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	If the Liquidity Transfer request passes all the business check successfully	If the Liquidity Transfer request passes all the business checks successfully	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
6	42	1.7.1. Service configuration	[Table 15 - Investigation Offset] This parameter must be configured for each currency.	Why must it be configured for each currency?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
7	165	3.2.1. Message signing	ESMI	ESMIG	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
8	168	3.3.2.1.1 FIToFIPaymentStatusReportV03 (pacs.002.001.03)	The message as received by the Beneficiary Participant PSP is forwarded to the Originator	The message as received by the Beneficiary Participant PSP is forwarded to the Originator Participant	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
9	186	3.3.2.2.4 ReturnBusinessDayInformation (camt.019.001.06)		Details will follow?	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
10	186	3.3.2.2.5 Receipt (camt.025.001.04)	The Receipt message as received by the RTGS System, is then sent to the Originator of the Outbound Liquidity Transfer	By the RTGS System?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
11	190	3.3.2.2.8 BankToCustomerAccountReport (camt.052.001.03)		Details will follow?	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
12	190	3.3.2.2.9 BankToCustomerStatement (camt.053.001.03)		Details will follow?	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
13	190	3.3.2.2.10 BankToCustomerDebitCreditNotification (camt.054.001.06)	The Bank To Customer Debit Credit Notification message is used in TIPS in order to report the settlement of a liquidity transfers credited on an own TIPS account.	The Bank To Customer Debit Credit Notification message is used in TIPS in order to report the settlement of a liquidity transfer credited on an own TIPS account.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
14	190	3.3.2.2.10 BankToCustomerDebitCreditNotification (camt.054.001.06)		Is a debit not possible or not reported?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
15	193	3.3.2.3.1 AccountRequestAcknowledgement (acmt.010.001.02)	Field Name = Process Identification Description = Identification of the message.	Field Name = Process Identification Description = Identification of the process.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
16	193	3.3.2.3.1 AccountRequestAcknowledgement (acmt.010.001.02)	Field Name = Status	What is the meaning of "COMP"?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
17	194	3.3.2.3.2 AccountRequestRejection (acmt.011.001.02)	Field Name = Process Identification Description = Identification of the message.	Field Name = Process Identification Description = Identification of the process.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
18	194	3.3.2.3.2 AccountRequestRejection (acmt.011.001.02)	Field Name = Organisation Identification	Why fill with BIC of TIPS Account owner if it is already in the previous field?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
19	198	4.1. Business Rules	Check ID = 000002	The same couple may exist for multiple messages related to different use cases	To be clarified by the requestor	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
20	198	4.1. Business Rules	Check ID = 010001	In fact there are two checks	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
21	198	4.1. Business Rules	Check ID = 010002	Why is the beneficiary side offset specified per currency?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
22	198	4.1. Business Rules	Check ID = 010003	Why is the beneficiary side offset specified per currency?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
23	198	4.1. Business Rules	Check ID = 000008 that (i) the Instructed Amount is lower than or equal to its limit headroom is lower and	that (i) the Instructed Amount is lower than or equal to its limit headroom and (ii)	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
24	206	4.2. List of ISO Error codes		Why not list all error codes?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
25	211	4.5. List of acronyms		missing acronyms: NCB, NRO	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
26	211	4.5. List of acronyms	TRGS	RTGS	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
27	211	4.5. List of acronyms	TIPS = TARGET Instant Payments Settlement Service	TIPS = TARGET Instant Payment Settlement	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
28	213	4.7. Glossary	[Instructing Party] An entity acting on behalf of either a Participant or a Reachable Party and communicate with TIPS directly	An entity acting on behalf of either a Participant or a Reachable Party and communicating with TIPS directly	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
29	213	4.7. Glossary	Liquidity transfer	Liquidity Transfer	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
30	213	4.7. Glossary	[Participant] An entity which has a BIC and own at least a TIPS	An entity which has a BIC and owns at least a TIPS Account	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
31	213	4.7. Glossary	[Reachable Party] An entity which does not have TIPS accounts and have to rely on a Participant to allow them to use an account	An entity which does not have TIPS accounts and has to rely on a Participant to allow it to use an account	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
32	14	1.2.4.2. Integrity		The 4-Eyes principle does not support Integrity. It helps preventing a Participant to take the wrong action; but the wrong action could still be valid for TIPS and would not jeopardise its integrity.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
33	15	1.3.1. Parties	are generically known as TIPS Actors	are generically known as TIPS Actors	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
34	18	1.3.1.4. Party identification	due to the fact the settlement process must be able to infer the accounts to be debited and credit	due to the fact that the settlement process must be able to infer the accounts to be debited and credited	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
35	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	[model] Party BIC : Date	Party BIC : String	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
36	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	[table 4] When Direction is "Outbound", it specifies the DN TIPS uses the send messages to the Instructing Party.	When Direction is "Outbound", it specifies the DN TIPS uses to send messages to the Instructing Party.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
37	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS		The term "Instructing Party" sounds confusing when it relates to a Beneficiary Party (who is not expected to "instruct" but to "react").	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

38	38	1.5.4. Reference data management	Update of a CMB limit (and consequently adjustment the related headroom)	Update of a CMB limit (and consequently adjustment of the related headroom)	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
39	40	1.5.4.3. Limit management	that a change in the limit leads the headroom to become negative	that a change in the limit leads the headroom to becoming negative	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
40	41	1.5.5.1. Queries	also to Participants or Instructing Parties acting on behalf of Participants or Reachable Parties	also to Participants or Instructing Parties acting on behalf of Participants or Reachable Parties	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
41	42	1.5.6. Data extraction		Details will follow?	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
42	42	1.6.1. TARGET2 and other RTGS Systems		Details will follow?	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
43	42	1.6.2. Eurosystem Single Market Infrastructure Gateway		Details will follow?	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
44	42	1.6.3. Common Reference Data Management		Details will follow?	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
45	42	1.6.4. Archiving		Details will follow?	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
46	42	1.6.5. Billing		Details will follow?	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
47	42	1.7.1. Service configuration	[Originator Side Offset] This value parameter can only have values smaller or equal to zero.	This value parameter can only have values smaller than or equal to zero.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
48	42	1.7.1. Service configuration	[Originator Side Offset] that is already past the timeout window (SCTInst Timestamp Timeout + Originator Side Offset).	If the Originator Side Offset is negative, adding it to the SCTInst Timestamp Timeout will make this window shorter. If the goal is to prevent the transaction from being rejected because of differences in the clocks of parties, causing the transaction to arrive before the time set by the Originator, it is a good idea to shift the window back in time; but setting back the timeout timestamp will not help much. If the goal is to account for the time elapsing in the network, it would be better to allow for more time rather than less.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
49	42	1.7.1. Service configuration	[Beneficiary Side Offset] if it is submitted to TIPS with a timestamp (the SCTInst timestamp, field AT-50 in DS-02) that is already past the timeout window	if it is submitted to TIPS with a timestamp (the SCTInst timestamp, field AT-50 in DS-02) that is already past the timeout window (the "is" has been wrongly removed)	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
50	42	1.7.1. Service configuration	[Sweeping Timeout]	The transactions waiting for Confirmation could be written to a separate list with the time when have to be timed out. This list should be relatively short, as they are deleted as soon as the reply arrives. The daemon then only has to check if there are any transactions having a timeout timestamp in the past.	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
51	45	2.1. General Communication process		Details will follow?	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
52	46	2.2. Instant Payment transaction	[Table 16, Step 3 and 4]	Is it possible for a TIPS Participant to have more than one TIPS Account in the same currency and if so, how is it decided which one is going to be used for a transaction?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
53	46	2.2. Instant Payment transaction	[Table 16, Step 9] the system decreases its headroom of the same amount. [Table 16, Step 15n] the possibly involved Debiting CMB is increased of the same amount.	... by the same amount.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
54	46	2.2. Instant Payment transaction	[Table 16, Step 15p] If a Debiting CMB is involved, TIPS decreases its headroom by the same amount.	The headroom has already been decreased in step 9. So this implies it will be decreased twice.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
55	46	2.2. Instant Payment transaction	[Table 16, Step 15p] The reserved amount of the Originator Account is decreased by the amount of the corresponding settled transaction	At the same time the actual amount has to be decreased.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
56	46	2.2. Instant Payment transaction	[Table 16, Step 17p] and send it to the Beneficiary DN	and sends it to the Beneficiary DN	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
57	57	2.2.2. Examples	The constellation follows what described	The constellation follows what ? described	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
58	59	2.2.2.1. Successful scenario with confirmed order – only accounts involved	it identifies the Beneficiary Account (Account2)	why Account2 and not Account3 ?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
59	59	2.2.2.1. Successful scenario with confirmed order – only accounts involved	the new availability for Account1 decreases from 1000 EUR to 900 EUR	the original amount (1000) is nowhere in the data constellation	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
60	59	2.2.2.1. Successful scenario with confirmed order – only accounts involved	The system, after performing the expected checks successfully, find the reserved transaction	TIPS, after performing the expected checks successfully, finds the reserved transaction	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
61	64	2.2.2.3. Successful scenario with confirmed order – Creditor CMB and debtor Account	No errors or timeouts occur. No floor or ceiling notification is expected. (page 72)	But: In this example, CMB2 exceeds the defined limit for the CMB. (page 74)	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
62	61	2.2.2.2. Successful scenario with confirmed order – Creditor account and debtor CMB	and a TIPS Account owned by a TIPS Participants B but used by a related Reachable Party	and a TIPS Account owned by a TIPS Participant B but used by a related Reachable Party	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
63	61	2.2.2.2. Successful scenario with confirmed order – Creditor account and debtor CMB	it identifies the Beneficiary Account (Account3) from the Beneficiary BIC	why Account3 and not Account2 ?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
64	61	2.2.2.2. Successful scenario with confirmed order – Creditor account and debtor CMB	The system, after performing the expected checks successfully, find the reserved transaction	TIPS, after performing the expected checks successfully, finds the reserved transaction	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
65	61	2.2.2.2. Successful scenario with confirmed order – Creditor account and debtor CMB	In this example, CMB1 ha no additional movements	In this example, CMB1 has no additional movements	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
66	64	2.2.2.3. Successful scenario with confirmed order – Creditor CMB and debtor Account	This positive scenario describes a successful payment transaction between a TIPS Account owned and held by a TIPS Participants A	This positive scenario describes a successful payment transaction between a TIPS Account owned and held by a TIPS Participant A	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
67	64	2.2.2.3. Successful scenario with confirmed order – Creditor CMB and debtor Account	The system, after performing the expected checks successfully, find the reserved transaction	TIPS, after performing the expected checks successfully, finds the reserved transaction	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
68	67	2.2.2.4. Successful scenario with rejected order	and a TIPS Account owned by a TIPS Participants B.	and a TIPS Account owned by a TIPS Participant B.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

69	67	2.2.2.4. Successful scenario with rejected order	and trigger an unreservation of funds	and trigger an unreservation of funds	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
70	70	2.2.2.5. Error scenarios	[2 times] and a TIPS Account owned by a TIPS Participants	and a TIPS Account owned by a TIPS Participant	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
71	70	2.2.2.5. Error scenarios	The transaction fails since the account to be debiteddebtor account is blocked	The transaction fails since the account to be debited is blocked	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
72	70	2.2.2.5. Error scenarios	it recognise that blocking status on Account1	it recognises the blocking status on Account1	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
73	77	2.2.2.6. Delayed Beneficiary-side answer scenario	In case a pending payment is found for which the SCTInst Timestamp Timeout is elapsed,	In case a pending payment is found for which the SCTInst Timestamp Timeout has elapsed,	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
74	80	2.3. Recall		Step 6p is not in Figure 45.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
75	80	2.3. Recall		Step 6e is twice in Figure 45.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
76	80	2.3. Recall	[13p] the system decreases/increase its Headroom	the system decreases/increases its headroom	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
77	80	2.3. Recall	[Figure 45]	Step 18p in figure but not in table.	To be clarified by the requestor	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
78	103	2.5.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer	its balance goes up the configured threshold.	its balance exceeds the configured threshold.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
79	108	2.5.1.1.1 Successful scenario - Inbound Liquidity Transfer order is settled in TIPS		the transferred amount is 1.000 in Figure 65 and 100 in Figure 66	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
80	108	2.5.1.1.1 Successful scenario - Inbound Liquidity Transfer order is settled in TIPS		status code is SSET in Figure 67 and SETT in Figure 68	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
81	110	2.5.1.1.2 Unsuccessful scenario: Inbound LT order is rejected because LT duplicate check failed	and has the same Transferred Amount (100 EUR) as another	in Figure 70 this amount is 1000	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
82	112	2.5.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	describes the processing of a Liquidity Transfer order sent by a Participant or instructing party	describes the processing of a Liquidity Transfer order sent by a Participant or Instructing Party	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
83	112	2.5.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer		In Figure 72 step 7e happens after step 9 which implies the accounts debited and credited while the RTGS is closed	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
84	119	2.5.2.1.1 Successful scenario - Outbound LT order settled in TIPS and RTGS System	[Figure 77 & 78]	The text "(RTGS Confirmation)": is it actually included in the message or is it just an explanation of the code? (Should it be represented like in Figure 80: "Description: RTGS Confirmation"?)	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
85	125	2.5.2.2. RTGS Alert scenario – No reply from RTGS	After that TIPS informs the corresponding RTGS System about the liquidity transfer and waiting for an answer.	After that TIPS informs the corresponding RTGS System about the liquidity transfer and will be waiting for an answer.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
86	125	2.5.2.2. RTGS Alert scenario – No reply from RTGS	All the single step from 1 to 10	All the single steps from 1 to 9	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
87	125	2.5.2.2. RTGS Alert scenario – No reply from RTGS	The remaining steps are described in Table xx	The remaining steps are described in Table 88	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
88	125	2.5.2.2. RTGS Alert scenario – No reply from RTGS	[Figure 88]	Steps 11 and 12 are not included in Figure 87.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
89	125	2.5.2.2. RTGS Alert scenario – No reply from RTGS	RTGS Alarm/Alert system parameter	The system parameter is nowhere described. The system parameter is sometimes called RTGS Alarm or sometimes RTGS Alert. I doubt if we want this parameter to be specified in minutes (rather than seconds).	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
90	128	2.6.1. Floor notification on account	between two TIPS Account	between two TIPS Accounts	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
91	128	2.6.1. Floor notification on account	The system recognises that the account goes under the threshold	The system recognises that the account falls below the threshold	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
92	128	2.6.1. Floor notification on account	In this case, the owner of the account receives to separate messages	In this case, the owner of the account receives two separate messages	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
93	129	2.6.2. Ceiling notification on CMB	This positive scenario describes a successful payment transaction between two TIPS Actors that generates a ceiling notification on the credited CMB or account. (...) The scenario is similar when the available amount of an Account exceeds the defined threshold.	To me it is unclear what is "similar" about the situation in the second sentence. I think it is the "same".	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
94	128	2.6.1. Floor notification on account	[Figure 91]	Would it be better to include a warning message in the Return Account? This way the Return Account could be used for more purposes without causing confusion.	To be clarified by the requestor	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
95	146	2.8. Report		Details will follow?	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
96	146	2.9. Reference data management	[Table 25 - Step 3e] TIPS unsuccessfully executes one of the check of step 3.	TIPS unsuccessfully executes one of the checks of step 3.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
97	146	2.9. Reference data management	[Table 25/26 - Step 4] If the received message requests to remove a restriction: - the system sets the blocking status to "Blocked for both debit and credit"	If a restriction is to be removed, the status should not be changed to "Blocked".	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
98	146	2.9. Reference data management	[Table 27 - Step 4]	This step is not about blocking accounts or CMBs but about changing limits for CMBs.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
99	154	2.9.1.1.1 Successful scenario – Block of a participant	In this positive scenario a Central Bank successfully blocks for debit a TIPS Participants.	In this positive scenario a Central Bank successfully blocks for debit a TIPS Participant.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
100	160	2.9.1.1.6 Unsuccessful scenario – Restriction type not allowed	The system, performing the expected checks, cannot identify the requested block and raise the error.	Expected issue: "message contains a wrong reference to the type of blocking operation"	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
101	160	2.9.1.1.6 Unsuccessful scenario – Restriction type not allowed	The system, performing the expected checks, cannot identify the requested block and raise the error.	The system, performing the expected checks, cannot identify the requested block and raises the error.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
102	161	2.9.1.1.7 Successful scenario – Decrease of a CMB Limit	In this positive scenario a TIPS Participant successfully decrease the CMB Limit of a CMB under its datascope	In this positive scenario a TIPS Participant successfully decreases the CMB Limit of a CMB under its datascope	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

103	161	2.9.1.1.7 Successful scenario – Decrease of a CMB Limit	it amends the CMB Headroom decreasing it of the difference from the old limit value and the new limit value. In this example, the Headroom of the CMB is 600€ and must be adjusted of 200€ (old limit 1000€ - new limit 800€) reaching the final value of 400€.	it amends the CMB headroom decreasing it by the difference between the old limit value and the new limit value. In this example, the headroom of the CMB is 600€ and must be adjusted by 200€ (old limit 1000€ - new limit 800€) reaching the final value of 400€.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
104	163	2.10. Raw data extraction		Details will follow?	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
105	165	3.2.3. Supported Character Set	Following the SEPA Instant Credit Transfer specifications, the allowed character set is restricted to support the Latin characters which are commonly used in international communication.	TIPS must support UTF-8. Current text refers to Identification fields	Rejected	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
106	168	3.3.2.1.1 FIToFIPaymentStatusReportV03 (pacs.002.001.03)	TIPS usage 'Only schema validation is performed'	For Message Identification in pacs002 should TIPS not validate uniqueness? (to prevent repeating pacs002 send)	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
107	168	3.3.2.1.1 FIToFIPaymentStatusReportV03 (pacs.002.001.03)	Agent that instructs the next party in the chain to carry out the instruction.	Please explain content/what to be expected for the several business cases in (final) pacs002 as received by beni bank: F.i. in case of errors in outgoing pacs002 will it be identifying TIPS? And what is value when its sent by TIPS to the Beneficiary Participant as a confirmation for processing of the pacs.002 received from the Beneficiary Participant PSP itself. Is it that beneficiary participant itself or TIPS?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
108	168	3.3.2.1.1 FIToFIPaymentStatusReportV03 (pacs.002.001.03)	n.a.	What will be error code when TIPS rejects pacs002 as send by beneficiary bank. If that depends on situation can it be added per field?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
109	168	3.3.2.1.1 FIToFIPaymentStatusReportV03 (pacs.002.001.03)	"Either Group Status or Transaction Status must be used."	So as a beni bank we can choose either to use group status or transaction status for our status? We assume it must be 'RJCT' in case of negative and 'ACCP' (= accepted) when its accepted?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
110	171	3.3.2.1.2 PaymentReturn (pacs.004.001.02)	"Point to point reference, as assigned by the original instructing party, to unambiguously identify the original message."	We assume this must refer to original pacs008 and not camt.56	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
111	171	3.3.2.1.2 PaymentReturn (pacs.004.001.02)	"Specifies the original message name identifier to which the message refers."	Must equal 'pacs.008.001.02'.?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
112	171	3.3.2.1.2 PaymentReturn (pacs.004.001.02)	"Unique identification, as assigned by an instructing party for an instructed party, to unambiguously identify the returned transaction."	Uniqueness not verified by TIPS?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
113	171	3.3.2.1.2 PaymentReturn (pacs.004.001.02)	"The specific reference of the bank initiating the Recall"	To be clear we suggest it must contain the Cancellation Identification of the original recall. 'reference can be confused with TxId fo original pacs008.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
114	175	3.3.2.1.3 FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV02 (pacs.008.001.02)	"Number Of Transactions"	"Must contain the value "1". ??	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
115	175	3.3.2.1.3 FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV02 (pacs.008.001.02)	"Instructed Agent"	What will be value for TIPS?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
116	175	3.3.2.1.3 FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV02 (pacs.008.001.02)	Settlement Amount, The amount of SCT Inst in euro	TIPS checks allowed limit ?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
117	175	3.3.2.1.3 FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV02 (pacs.008.001.02)	Settlement Amount, The amount of SCT Inst in euro	So Currency Code must be "EUR"? Does TIPS check this	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
118	175	3.3.2.1.3 FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV02 (pacs.008.001.02)	Settlement Amount, The amount of SCT Inst in euro	Does TIPS checks the Total Interbank Settlement Amount in the Group Header is having same value?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
119	175	3.3.2.1.3 FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV02 (pacs.008.001.02)	Acceptance Timestamp	Please specify bit more with some examples to prevent confusion. F.i "Must contain - either UTC, for example 2018-11-21T09:30:59.123Z, - or local time (such as CET/CEST) with UTC offset, for example 2017-11-21T10:30:59.123+01:00	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
120	175	3.3.2.1.3 FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV02 (pacs.008.001.02)	Beneficiary BIC. "The Beneficiary BIC must be linked with at least one Distinguish Name for outbound message routing"	Means creditor Agent must be a participant reachable by TIPS?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
121	175	3.3.2.1.3 FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV02 (pacs.008.001.02)	Beneficiary BIC	What is reason code when TIPS rejects?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
122	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	n.a.	Content received by participants to inform about TIPS reach? Via special report with what frequency?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
123	179	3.3.2.1.4 FIToFIPaymentStatusRequest (pacs.028.001.01)	n.a.	What is reason code when TIPS can't find the original?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
124	179	3.3.2.1.4 FIToFIPaymentStatusRequest (pacs.028.001.01)	Payment Transaction Status query FIToFIPmtStsReq/OrgnlGrplnf/OrgnlMsgld	In case beni bank sends pacs028 does it need to be 'pacs008' or 'pacs002' (because beni bank wants to retrieve status of their outgoing pacs002).	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
125	179	3.3.2.1.4 FIToFIPaymentStatusRequest (pacs.028.001.01)	FIToFIPmtStsReq/GrpHdr/InstgAgt/Finlnstnld/BICFI "This field is used in combination with the requestor Distinguish Name to check user access rights."	Please clarify. Can it be rejected if beni bank sends pacs028?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
126	190	3.3.2.2.8 BankToCustomerAccountReport (camt.052.001.03)	N.a.	As a participant what reconciliation reports do we receive ? Are that the empty camt.52 & camt.53 specs?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

127	41	1.5.5.1. Queries	As requested in the TIPS Contact Group we have looked into the three scenarios's for the Transaction Status Query Implementation	Our preferred option is option 1. Option 2 is a deviation from the URD and not acceptable. Option 3 will take a lot of manual work in case of multiple queries. Maybe an option 1a can be a scenario: Option 1a Resend the original PACS002 once more by the BPSP, TIPS to answer with a PACS002 with their registration of the status. This is current practice with several Clearing Houses.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
128	9	1.1. Introduction to the TIPS Service	The participants are also provided with two additional functionalities to either recall settled Instant Payments transactions or initiate investigations on Instant Payments submitted to TIPS whose status confirmation has not been received yet	TIPS also supports outbound liquidity transfer messages	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
129	9	1.1. Introduction to the TIPS Service	(...) or any other payment related messages based – when possible – on ISO 20022 standards and in accordance with the SEPA Instant Credit Transfer (SCTInst) scheme.	As stated in the following section 1.2.1, at the current stage there is no business case requiring flat data files to be used instead of ISO 20022 standard messages. Could you clarify which types of messages do you refer to?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
130	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	They can manage CMBs (see section 1.3.2.1.2) linked to their own accounts as well as Instructing Party (see below) roles for Actors acting on behalf of themselves or of Reachable Parties (see below) defined as users of their accounts or CMBs. In addition, they define the access rights configuration of said Instructing Parties. They can also act as Instructing Parties and by definition they already have the prerogatives of an Instructing Party for what concerns their own accounts.	In the previous section it has been stated that Central Banks "are responsible for setting up and maintaining reference data in the Common Reference Data Management repository for all the TIPS Actors belonging to their national community." Could you clarify which CMB reference data will be managed by Central Bank or by the Participant (ex. set up of CMB, update of CMB limit)?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
131	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	The Operator is also responsible for setting up and maintaining Central Banks reference data in the Common Reference Data Management repository and, if required, they may operate on behalf of any TIPS Actor	It should be clarified in which cases the TIPS Operator could act on behalf of a Participant. In T2 and T2S the T2/T2S Operator may act on behalf of a Central Bank, while the responsible Central Bank may act on behalf of a Participant.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
132	33	1.5.2.2. Recall settlement process	After running the proper checks, a negative response is simply forwarded by TIPS to the Recall Assigner.	Change "After running the proper check" with "If the proper checks failed".	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
133	33	1.5.2.2. Recall settlement process	There is no time limits set for the receiver of the Recall to respond.	It should be clarified if the retention period is valid also for this transaction. We understood that after the retention period all transaction data are deleted from TIPS.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
134	30	1.5.2.1. Instant Payment transaction settlement process	Figure 4	Settlement confirmed is misleading; use "Beneficiary confirms" instead	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
135	128	2.6.1. Floor notification on account	Figure 90 - Floor notification settlement	This figure has to be corrected with debits on the left and credit on the right	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
136	211	4.5. List of acronyms	TRGS: tbd	"TRGS" has to be defined	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
137	108	2.5.1.1.1 Successful scenario - Inbound Liquidity Transfer order is settled in TIPS	Figure 65	Mismatch with Figure 66 (where Transferred Amount is 100 EUR). If Amount is 1000 then a ceiling notification shall be sent in the successful scenario (1800).	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
138	12	1.2.3. Access rights	TIPS users will be assigned one or more roles in the CRDM depending on their requirements	Will it be possible to assign to a user also single privileges?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
139	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	They are responsible for the initial setup and day-to-day operations of TIPS and act as single point of contact for Central Banks and directly connected TIPS Actors.	Please clarify the concept of single point of contact for directly connected TIPS Actors. Will it be only for connectivity problems?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
140	17	1.3.1.3. Hierarchical party model	The reference data scope of a Central Bank includes its reference data, plus the reference data of all its parties;	Could you clarify if the reference data of the central bank are included only in the data scope of TIPS operator or also in the data scope of Central Bank?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
141	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	Are the attributes of table 3	Although the attributes of table 3 are stored in the Local Reference Data Management repository, are they however inserted in the CRDM GUI?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
142	21	1.3.2.1. TIPS accounts	Each Participant may own one or many TIPS Accounts	How is an account correctly identified in a instant payment transaction if a participant can own different accounts?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
143	22	1.3.2.1.3 Reference data for accounts and CMBs in TIPS	In this case, the related Reachable Party may make use of the full payment capacity of the TIPS Account linked to the CMB. TIPS Participants create CMBs for their TIPS Accounts.	When defining a CMB we think that, also for safety reasons, the limit has to be set to null and the related reachable party should not use the capacity of TIPS account	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
144	36	1.5.3.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	Outbound Liquidity Transfer orders can be triggered only in TIPS and are received by the relevant RTGS System	Please consider if the CR 794 will be approved the sentence has to be modified in order to consider also the possibility to have Outbound Liquidity Transfer triggered by T2	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
145	38	1.5.4. Reference data management	For example, if an Account is deleted at CRDM level but has a balance over zero when the change is propagated to TIPS, this change is rejected.	In this case is an alert foreseen for the CB?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
146	41	1.5.5.1. Queries	TIPS shall take into account all access rights while processing queries and only return results if the interested data are part of the TIPS Actor data scope, as defined in the table Query permissions.	We prefer that the system should return a message error in the case the access rights are missing	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
147	146	2.9. Reference data management	Table 25, Table 26 If the received message requests to remove a restriction: - the system sets the blocking status to "Blocked for both debit and credit" on the specified TIPS Participant data.	We think that the status should be "Unblocked for both debit and credit"	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
148	146	2.9. Reference data management	Table 27	Please check the step 4	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

149	156	2.9.1.1.2 Successful scenario – Unblock of a participant	Figure 115 - Block of a TIPS Participant successful scenario PartyStatusAdvice	Figure 115 - Unblock of a TIPS Participant successful scenario PartyStatusAdvice	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
150	157	2.9.1.1.3 Unsuccessful scenario – Party not existing	Figure 117 - Block of a TIPS Participant successful scenario PartyStatusAdvice	Figure 117 - Block of a TIPS Participant unsuccessful scenario PartyStatusAdvice	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
151	159	2.9.1.1.5 Successful scenario – unblock of an Account	Figure 121 - Block of an Account successful scenario	Figure 121 - Unblock of an Account successful scenario	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
152	36	1.5.3.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	"The process foresees that an authorised entity triggers an Outbound Liquidity Transfer order towards the corresponding RTGS System"	Could the Outbound Liquidity Transfer receiver be a RTGS account's owner different from the TIPS participant? If yes, please specify in the UDFS.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
153	80	2.3. Recall	"The request is forwarded by the Assigner to TIPS and passed directly by TIPS to the Assignee"	Within what time-frame is it possible to forward a Recall request to TIPS?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
154	97	2.4. Investigation	"The transaction status investigation process can be initiated by Participants or Instructing Parties acting on behalf of Participants or Reachable Parties on the originator side using the transaction status inquiry message, allowing the TIPS Actors to retrieve the last generated payment transaction status advice".	Is it possible to trigger an Investigation request in whatever moment if the conditions indicated in the paragraph (the Payment transaction doesn't cross its retention period and is in a final state) are satisfied?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
155	80	2.3. Recall	"A Recall request is forwarded by the Assigner which is an Originator Participant or instructing party of a previously settled Instant Payment transaction to request that said transaction is cancelled and a refunded amount – equal or possibly lower than the original one - is credited back to the original account."	Are the recall motivations compliant with EPC SCTInst scheme?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
156	35	1.5.3. Liquidity Management	"TIPS provides liquidity management functionalities to allow the transfer of liquidity between TIPS Accounts and RTGS Accounts, in both directions"	Is it possible for a TIPS participant (or Instructing Party acting on behalf of Participants or Reachable Parties) to transfer funds between a TIPS account and a technical account held in TARGET2 by an Ancillary System for ASI6 real-time purposes?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
157	35	1.5.3. Liquidity Management	"TIPS provides liquidity management functionalities to allow the transfer of liquidity between TIPS Accounts and RTGS Accounts, in both directions"	Please, specify the types of "RTGS account" you are considering in the text.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
158	46	2.2. Instant Payment transaction	The Instant Payment transaction process covers the scenarios in which an Originator Participant or Instructing Party instructs the system in order to immediately transfer funds to the account of a Beneficiary Participant.	In Section 2 every possible TIPS actor (originator participant, beneficiary and instructing parties potentially acting in their behalf) is correctly considered, while in section 1 this specification has not made in many subsections. For example Table 9 of Section 1.7.1 or Section 1.5.2.1 refer only to Originator Participant and Beneficiary. It should be specified that we refer also to the instructing parties acting in their behalf in all Section 1.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
159	28	1.5. TIPS Features		Which are the routing table (meaning the list of participants and reachable parties for reachability purposes) specifications? Will you provide them in a separate document?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
160	21	1.3.2. Accounts structure and organisation		Is it possible for a TIPS Participant (not being a Reachable Party) to use an account opened by another entity in TIPS (for instance a central bank)?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
161	139	2.7.2. Queries on Payment transactions.	TIPS checks if the TIPS actor instructing the query is the Beneficiary of the interested Payment transaction.	Step 3 - Could the query be executed only the beneficiary or also by the originator?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
162	28	1.5. TIPS Features	TIPS triggers the production of full reports when the relevant RTGS System notifies TIPS about the end of the current business day. In addition, delta reports can be scheduled to be produced and sent at regular intervals corresponding to the moments when snapshots are taken (every number of hours, e.g. every 3 hours, every 6 hours, etc.) by each TIPS Actor. When subscribing for a report in Delta mode, the end of the business day of the relevant RTGS System triggers in any case a last report generation for the business day which contains all the data remaining between the trigger itself and the last Delta report produced for the interested Actor.	We were wondering if there is any other communication in TIPS, apart from the EOD reports, which signals the end of day. Also, we would like to know if there is a functionality which allows the user to consult when the EOD/SOD of TIPS has taken place.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
163	139	2.7.2. Queries on Payment transactions.	The Payment transaction status query allows the authorised actor to get the detailed information for one Instant Ppayment transaction (which not expired its retention period) specified by the Payment transaction reference and the Originator BIC Returned data are : - Originator BIC of the Instant Payment transaction; - Beneficiary BIC of the Instant Payment transaction; - Instant Payment transaction reference; - Instant Payment transaction status; - Amount of the plnstant Payment transaction; - Settlement timestamp, for a settled Instant Payment transactions.	The UDFS makes reference to settlement timestamps, we were wondering if the date on the timestamp is the calendar date or the value date, we understand that it's the calendar date but we think it should be clarified in the documentation. Also does this reasoning apply to both queries and reports?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
164	16	1.3.1.1. Setup of parties for TIPS	Table 2	In my opinion Table 2 should also contain "Party (Operator) ".	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

165	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	Table 4 When Direction is "Outbound", it specifies the DN TIPS uses the send messages to the Instructing Party	Shouldn't it be Instructed Party instead of Instructing Party?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
166	38	1.5.4. Reference data management	Blocking/unblocking status and CMB limit data maintenance operations are also available in the CRDM.	Sentence needs to be elaborated. If I'm not mistaken in the meeting of the 7th November, you mentioned that changes you do in TIPS you must then do them in CRDM otherwise they will get lost in the next propagation from CRDM to TIPS.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
167	40	1.5.4.2. Blocking accounts and CMBs	On the contrary, TIPS verifies, before performing the block/unblock operations, if an object with a higher blocking priority is already blocked. In this case, the requested operation is rejected.	For clarity, sentence may need to be re-written to "On the contrary, in case of blocking accounts and CMBs, TIPS verifies, before performing the block/unblock operations, if an object with a higher blocking priority is already blocked. In this case, the requested operation is rejected."	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
168	80	2.3. Recall		It would be useful to have FltoFIPaymentStatusReport sent to the Recall Assigner to notify the Assigner the successful settlement of the Recall as a result of the positive recall answer.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
169	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	Participants represent entities that are eligible for participation in TARGET2 (but do not necessarily own a TARGET2 PM account)	Besides the eligibility for participation in TARGET2 there will be our understanding be another eligibility criteria for TIPS participation, namely adherence to SCTInst scheme. To avoid ambiguity we recommend that Participants are defined as "entities that hold one or more TIPS accounts".	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
170	36	1.5.3.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	Outbound Liquidity Transfer orders can be triggered only in TIPS ...	After the TARGET2 change request is finalised there might be a need for the sentence to be redrafted. Alternatively, the following wording could be added: "However, if a corresponding RTGS system supports pull functionality, Outbound Liquidity Transfer orders could also be triggered in RTGS system". Please consider the comment also in section 2.5.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
171	103	2.5. Inbound/Outbound Liquidity Transfers	Liquidity Transfer from a TIPS Account to an RTGS Account starts with the request sent by the TIPS Participant owner of the TIPS Account or by an Instructing Party on behalf of the TIPS Participant.	To our understanding "only" individual payments can be sent through instructing parties. Can also liquidity transfers (from TIPS to RTGS) be initiated through instructing parties?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
172	103	2.5. Inbound/Outbound Liquidity Transfers	The Liquidity Transfer shall be initiated in TIPS in Application-to-Application mode	Should TARGET2 support pull functionality (depending on the TARGET2 change request – please see comment above) we recommend for the following wording to be added at the end of paragraph: "Outbound liquidity transfers could also be initiated in RTGS system, provided that it supports pull functionality. In this case the respective functionalities are described in the specifications of respective RTGS system.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
173	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS		Provide the full list of Actors in TIPS (RTGS is missing and Instructing Party is explained but not listed)	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
174	16	1.3.1.1. Setup of parties for TIPS	Setup of Parties for TIPS	Is the list complete? (e.g. Instructing Party not listed)	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
175	17	1.3.1.3. Hierarchical party model	Similarly, legal relationships exist between each party belonging to the second level (i.e. a Central Bank) and all its community (i.e. Participants and Reachable Parties).	Please confirm there is a legal relationship between CB (second level) and RP as the latter's actions in TIPS are under the responsibility of their Participant.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
176	22	1.3.2.1.3 Reference data for accounts and CMBs in TIPS	Table 6 - CMB reference data -CMB Number: It specifies the unique number of the Account.	Is it the number the identification of the CMB or the TIPS account? Are CMB considered as accounts?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
177	24	1.4. Dynamic data model	If an Instant Payment transaction exceeds the current CMB Headroom for the Originator Participant, then it is rejected.	Originator Participant OR Reachable Party?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
178	33	1.5.2.2. Recall settlement process		Section entirely modified without track changes. Please make sure that modified sections are easily identified.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
179	35	1.5.3.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer	Figure 6 - Inbound Liquidity Transfer status	Figure does not match with explanation; it does not show the failure to the validation checks	To be clarified by the requestor	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
180	38	1.5.4. Reference data management	Table 14 – Reference data management functions available in TIPS	This table seems inconsistent with Table 1 (– TIPS U2A Functions) in terms of responsible actors listed for the operations / functions	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
181	46	2.2. Instant Payment transaction	the FltoFIPaymentStatusReport message sent (i) by the Beneficiary Participant to TIPS to either accept or reject the Instant Payment transaction, or (ii) by TIPS to inform the actors about the result of the settlement (i.e. settled, rejected, timed out);	Please confirm if TIPS sends the message to the Originator Participant and to the Beneficiary Participant	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
182	198	4.1. Business Rules		"TIPS Cash Account" = "TIPS Account", if so please align the wording	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
183	103	2.5.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer		Include in the description the check on the statut of the TIPS Account (cf. 1.5.3.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer)	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
184	103	2.5.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer	An Inbound Liquidity Transfer order is Received and Validated by TIPS if it passes all validation checks successfully and the related TIPS account is not blocked	An Inbound Liquidity Transfer order is Received and Validated by TIPS if it passes all validation checks successfully and the related TIPS account is not blocked [for crediting or blocked for credit and debit]	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
185	103	2.5.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer	Schema validation, check of mandatory fields and authentication checks have already been successfully executed (step 1)	Who executes these checks?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

186	112	2.5.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer		List of checks under Step 2 does not include the blocking status of the account to be debited. Is that correct?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
187	146	2.9. Reference data management	Update of a CMB Limit: the Receipt message in order to report the successful or unsuccessful execution of the requested block/unblock operation.	The message should report to the sender the status of the Limit modification request (not a blocking status)	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
188	146	2.9. Reference data management	Table 25 – Block/unblock Participant steps - Step 4: If the received message requests to remove a restriction: - the system sets the blocking status to "Blocked for both debit and credit" on the specified TIPS Participant data.	The system sets the status to UNBLOCKED	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
189	146	2.9. Reference data management	Table 26 – Block/unblock Account/CMB steps	same as previous comment	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
190	146	2.9. Reference data management	Table 27 – Update of a CMB Limit steps	Step 4 describes a (un)block process instead of a limit modification	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
191	38	1.5.3.3. Reserve calculation	To make sure that the balances used for the calculation in TIPS and TARGET2 are coherent, TIPS prepares snapshots of the balances during the RTGS end of day procedure, ensuring that no liquidity transfers are pending confirmation from the related RTGS System. These snapshots are the basis for the General Ledger files produced by TIPS and forwarded to the linked RTGS Systems.	How shall CB receive the information for the reserve calculation? i.e. Shall the GL be sent by T2, shall the file provide 2 separate balances or 1 sum?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
192	12	1.2.3. Access rights	§2 : ..., which also offers the possibility to group different Privileges into sets known as Roles	Who will have the privilege to define roles ? Will we have access to roles pre-defined by the TIPS operator ?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
193	12	1.2.3. Access rights	§2 : ..., and these roles will define their access rights configuration.	Does it mean that a privilege cannot be directly assigned to a user ?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
194	12	1.2.3. Access rights	§4 : The first condition depends on the DN's access rights profile, which is defined by the role(s) assigned to it in the CRDM. For example, a DN may be enabled to send Instant Payment transactions but not liquidity transfers	If the role assigned to a DN are stored in the CRDM, does it mean that CRDM has to be accessible 24/24, 7/7 ? Will we be able to perform intraday modifications (e.g. to revoke roles attached to a user/instructing party for instance) ?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
195	12	1.2.3. Access rights	§6 : Instructing Parties are DNs that are authorised to send instructions on behalf of a specific BIC	Does it mean that Wildcards will not be allowed ?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
196	14	1.2.4.2. Integrity	§2 : In U2A mode, TIPS offers users in addition the possibility to further ensure the data integrity via usage of a dual authorisation concept, the 4-Eyes principle	4 eyes principle : is it with or without NRO ?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
197	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	§2 : ...act as single point of contact for Central Banks and directly connected TIPS Actors	Only for connecting issue in this latter case	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
198	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	§5 : Reachable Parties are also identified by a BIC11, but they cannot hold TIPS Accounts...	We suggest to use "Don't" instead of "cannot, it seems to be more appropriate	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
199	18	1.3.1.4. Party identification	§2 : with the only constraint that this BIC must be unique within the set of parties having established a business relationship with the same party . This results in the possibility, for the same legal entity, on the one hand to establish multiple business relationships with different parties using the same 11-digit BIC	- A second constraint could be that the BIC is still valid in the BIC Directory - A few lines below, it is specified that CRDM does not allow different parties to share the same BIC11 (because of the settlement process that needs to determine the TIPS accounts from the BIC11). To facilitate the understanding, only the last final rule should be mentioned	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
200	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	Party reference data graph	The Party BIC attribute should not be a "Date" but a "String"	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
201	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	Table 4, distinguished name item : ..., it specifies the DN TIPS uses the send messages to the Instructing Party	We suggest : it specifies the DN TIPS uses to send messages to the Instructing Party	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
202	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	Table 4, User BIC item : When Direction is "Inbound", it specifies the BIC the Instructing Party uses as Originator in the messages it sends to TIPS. When Direction is "Outbound", it specifies the beneficiary in the messages TIPS sends to the Instructing Party	We suggest to replace the sentence as follows : When Direction is "Inbound", it specifies the BIC the Instructing Party uses as Originator in the messages sent to TIPS. When Direction is "Outbound", it specifies the BIC TIPS uses in the messages sent to the Instructing Party as Beneficiary.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
203	21	1.3.2.1. TIPS accounts	§2 : Each Participant may own one or many TIPS Accounts	We suggest to add the mention "10 accounts maximum"	Rejected	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
204	17	1.3.1.3. Hierarchical party model	Table 7 Authorised Account User reference data	What is the difference with a reachable party ? Is it linked to the instructing party concept ?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
205	30	1.5.2.1. Instant Payment transaction settlement process	§6 : ...the headroom and the limit utilisation of the related CMBs is are also modified	Note : Except for unlimited CMBs	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
206	36	1.5.3.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	§1 : Outbound Liquidity Transfer orders can be triggered only in TIPS	OLT should also be triggered from TARGET2	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
207	36	1.5.3.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	§6 : If the RTGS does not respond properly and the status is not set to Settled or Rejected within a configurable timeframe	How is the configurable timeframe defined ?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
208	38	1.5.4. Reference data management	§6 : When a 4-Eyes instruction is submitted, it is provisionally validated and put on hold until a second user, different from the initial submitter	Complete "different from the initial submitter" with "and with the adequate privileges"	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
209	40	1.5.4.2. Blocking accounts and CMBs	§1	- A2A mode : These functions shall be also available in U2A (cf. Table 1 – TIPS U2A Functions)	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
210	40	1.5.4.3. Limit management	§2 : When a CMB limit is modified, the headroom of the CMB is updated accordingly	Note : Except for unlimited CMBs	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
211	44	1.7.3. Archiving management	§2 : to retrieve archived Instant payment Payment transaction	Liquidity Transfers shall also be archived	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
212	80	2.3. Recall	Figure 45 - Recall flow	Step 6p is not included in the figure	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

213	80	2.3. Recall	Table 18 - Recall steps	Step 9p : §2 : "From now on, this amount" should be replaced by "from now on, this date" §3 : "From now on, this amount" should be replaced by "from now on, this reference"	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
214	80	2.3. Recall	Table 18 - Recall steps	Step 12p : TIPS should also check that CMBs are not blocked	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
215	112	2.5.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	Table 21 - Outbound Liquidity Transfer Order steps	Step 2 RTGS Creditor Account inclusion Check : From our understanding of the business rule, this check is also perform in the previous step (validation of the mandatory fields)	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
216	112	2.5.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	Table 21 - Outbound Liquidity Transfer Order steps	Step 12e "The status of the Outbound Liquidity Transfer Order is set to "Failed": TIPS should also perform an automatic reverse of funds from the original Account to be credited and the original Account to be debited	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
217	128	2.6.1. Floor notification on account	Sentence under Figure 91 "since the CMB and the Account have their own and separate floor amount"..	We suggest the following amended sentence, in order to adapt it in regard of ceiling notification : "Since both the CMB and the Account have their own and separate floor amount, when settling on a CMB it can happen that both CMB and Account go below their threshold. In this case, the owner of the account receives two separate messages, one notifying about the current headroom of the CMB and the other notifying the current account balance"	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
218	146	2.9. Reference data management	Table 25 – Block/unblock Participant steps : Item 4 - the system sets the blocking status to "Blocked for both debit and credit" on the specified TIPS Participant data.	The status should be set to "Unblocked", not "blocked"	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
219	146	2.9. Reference data management	Table 26 – Block/unblock Account/CMB steps, item 4 : - the system sets the blocking status to "Blocked for both debit and credit" on the specified Account or CMB data.	The status should be set to "Unblocked", not "blocked"	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
220	146	2.9. Reference data management	Table 27 – Update of a CMB Limit steps, item 4	The requested operation is to update the CMB limit, not to apply or remove a restriction	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
221	171	3.3.2.1.2 PaymentReturn (pacs.004.001.02)	§2	We suggest to replace PSP by "participant"	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
222	9	1.1. Introduction to the TIPS Service	§4 : The Eurosystem European Single Market Infrastructure Gateway (ESMIG) which allows TIPS Actors to gain access to all Eurosystem services, including TIPS	We would suggest to replace "TIPS Actors" by "users" in order to avoid duplication : "which allows users to gain access to all Eurosystem services, including TIPS	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
223	22	1.3.2.1.1 Transit accounts	Transit Accounts are accounts that Central Banks own for providing liquidity to TIPS Participants	- It seems that this definition refers to "CB account" as defined in T2S, we don't really understand this definition since TIPS doesn't provide intraday liquidity. From our understanding, the transit account reflects liquidity transfer between TIPS DCA and Target2 PM account - Could you please clarify in which circumstances the transit account could have a negative balance ? From our understanding, the net off balance with T2 transit account should be zero and can't be negative since there is no intraday liquidity in TIPS	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
224	22	1.3.2.1.1 Transit accounts	The TIPS Operator creates Transit Accounts for the Central Banks	Does it refer to the case of currencies settlement in TIPS ? (meaning that if TIPS provides currencies payments in the future, the transit account in this currency will be opened by the TIPS operator and held by the concerned CB)	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
225		1.1. Introduction to the TIPS Service	General comment	Where can the information on the list of participants be found?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
226	9	1.1. Introduction to the TIPS Service	page 9: "The participants are also provided with two additional functionalities to either recall settled Instant Payments transactions or initiate investigations on Instant Payments submitted to TIPS whose status confirmation has not been received yet."	The wording gives the impression as if these functionalities would not be part of the EPC requirements. Please change sentence to "The participants are also provided with functionalities to either recall settled Instant Payments transactions or initiate investigations on Instant Payments submitted to TIPS whose status confirmation has not been received yet as described in the EPC SCT inst scheme."	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
227	9	1.1. Introduction to the TIPS Service	TIPS is, in any case, designed to be currency-agnostic in order to provide settlement in non-euro Central Bank Money, if requested, by connecting to any European RTGS System.	Please clarify what exactly is meant with "any European RTGS System". Do you refer to EEA or not? Moreover, in case this is not restricted to the EEA why is it limited to European?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

228	9	1.1. Introduction to the TIPS Service	The participants (i.e. Payment Service Providers or PSPs) have a settlement interface	<p>Please note that the term PSP does also include so-called e-money institutions (see PSD2 Directive Article 1 where the categories of payment service providers are defined: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32015L2366&from=EN).</p> <p>However, e-money institutions are not allowed to become TARGET2 participants according to the TARGET2 Guideline (see GL Article 4 (3) https://www.ecb.europa.eu/ecb/legal/pdf/celelex_02012o0027-20160415_en_txt.pdf).</p> <p>Owing to the fact that the legal framework for TIPS is not yet finalised, we strongly recommend to add a general reference that the description in the UDFS is purely technically and the terminology is updated accordingly (see also our comment on section 1.2 during the first round of comments).</p>	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
229	10	1.1. Introduction to the TIPS Service	TIPS makes use of the following Eurosystem services:	When will the UDFS for the mentioned services be provided? (see presentation held during the first TIPS CG meeting where it is stated "Each (settlement and shared) service will have its own set of Scope Defining Documents (e.g. UDFS, UHB).")	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
230	12	1.2.2. Authentication and authorisation process	Additional information on the setup of access rights and on the underlying concepts can be found in the CRDM documentation.	see comment above: <i>When will the UDFS for the mentioned services be provided?</i>	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
231	12	1.2.3. Access rights	General comment	The CRDM details are needed in order to check the information. Without the CRDM it is not possible to finally approve this section.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
232	12	1.2.3. Access rights	Instructing Parties are DNs that are authorised to send instructions on behalf of a specific BIC. This configuration is defined by means of a DN-BIC routing table set up within the CRDM.	<p>It seems that the current version of the T2/T2S URD on CRDM does not include the requirement to have such routing table for TIPS.</p> <p>Moreover, we would like to come back to our comment during the first consultation ("As mentioned above, some clarity on what is part of the CRDM would be highly appreciated. In this regard, it would also be great to get some information to which extent the Shared Services (CRDM) URD will need to be updated as eg CMB seems not to be part of CRDM URD so far.")</p> <p>Unfortunately, the first feedback in the previous round was "to be drafted". Therefore, we kindly ask you to let us know how your descriptions with regard to CRDM, which are not reflected in the current version, will become part of the "consolidation documentation"</p>	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
233	12	1.2.3. Access rights	The entire access rights configuration process is carried out within the CRDM: the CRDM documentation provides additional details on these aspects.	see comment above: <i>When will the UDFS for the mentioned services be provided?</i>	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
234	14	1.2.4.4. Monitoring	TIPS operational monitoring provides tools to the TIPS Operator for the detection in real-time of functional or operational problems. Technical monitoring allows for the detection of hardware and software problems via real-time monitoring of the technical components involved in the processing, including the network connections. In addition, the monitoring provides the TIPS Operator with an overview of the message flows.	CBs should have the possibility to monitor the payments and liquidity transfers from their community.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
235	15	1.2.5. Graphical user interface	Table 1	In the table liquidity transfers are missing. They should be visible in the TIPS GUI.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
236	15	1.2.5. Graphical user interface	TIPS Actor	May we kindly ask you to add a comprehensive description of the term "TIPS Actor" in the glossary. In this context also the discussion on the legal framework needs to be considered.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
237	16	1.3.1.1. Setup of parties for TIPS	Central Banks are responsible for setting up and maintaining party reference data for the banks of their national community.	We propose to delete the word "national" as (reachable) parties participating via a National Central Bank could also be in a different country.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
238	16	1.3.1.1. Setup of parties for TIPS	Table 2 on page 16 and picture at the beginning of section 1.3.1.5	Table 2 lists reference data objects and the actor responsible for setting them up. In the third line also "Reachable Party" is included. Based on the picture provided in section 1.3.1.5 it is not clear why the data object "instructing party" is not included.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
239	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	Central Banks are responsible for setting up and maintaining reference data in the Common Reference Data Management repository for all the TIPS Actors belonging to their national community.	We propose to delete the word "national" as (reachable) parties participating via a National Central Bank could also be in a different country.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
240	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	Central Banks provide liquidity to Participants through Liquidity Transfers from the relevant RTGS system...	The wording might be misleading as the responsibility for liquidity management and especially for the initiation of liquidity transfers lies with the participants.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

241	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	...they can act on behalf of one of their Actors in case of need.	This needs to be further specified, as Central Banks can only act for their participants regarding liquidity transfers and reference data but NOT with regard to sending payment instructions.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
242	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	The Operator is the legal and organisational entity that operates TIPS. They are responsible for the initial setup and day-to-day operations of TIPS and act as single point of contact for Central Banks and directly connected TIPS Actors. They are responsible for monitoring the system and carrying out corrective actions in case of incidents or in the event of service unavailability. Actors can act as Instructing Parties on behalf of other Participants or Reachable Parties	In order to avoid any potential misunderstanding, we kindly ask you to update this part in line with the TIPS URD where it is clearly stated that "Central Banks provide support to their national community with the responsibility for reference data setup and liquidity management..." The TIPS Operator is the single point of contact for the Central Banks. A direct connected participant can contact the TIPS Operator regarding technical problems and connectivity issues. The contractual partner of a participant is the National Central Bank. For all information regarding static data, Billing, Liquidity Transfers the National Central Bank is responsible. With regard to the section part mentioned, please refer to our comment on 1.3.1.5	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
243	17	1.3.1.3. Hierarchical party model	The TIPS Operator is the only party on the top level of the hierarchy and it is in a legal relationship with each party of the second level, i.e. each Central Bank in TIPS.	From a formal point of view the legal relationship is between the 4CB as operator and the Eurosystem.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
244	17	1.3.1.3. Hierarchical party model	Similarly, legal relationships exist between each party belonging to the second level (i.e. a Central Bank) and all its community (i.e. Participants and Reachable Parties).	From my point of view the legal relationship of a reachable party is with the participant owning the account, NOT with the central bank.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
245	18	1.3.1.4. Party identification	Each Participant and Reachable Party is identified by the BIC of its Central Bank plus its own BIC	Maybe a reachable party should rather be identified with the BIC of the participant/account owner and its own BIC.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
246	18	1.3.1.4. Party identification	This results in the possibility, for the same legal entity, on the one hand to establish multiple business relationships with different parties using the same 11-digit BIC[...] Therefore, in order to allow a given financial institution to be defined as two different TIPS parties (by the same Central Bank or by two different Central Banks), the same financial institution must be defined in the CRDM repository as two parties identified by two different 11-digit BIC.	The two sentences seem to be in contradiction. It is not clear to us if a party can use the same BIC11 to participate via two different central banks. The first sentence allows this, the second says it is not possible.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
247	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	Table 3 - Party Type	Please clarify if "Instructing Party" is also a party type of it's own and needs to be added to the table.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
248	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	Table 3 - Party Type	Question regarding Reachable Parties: The information, via which participant the party is reachable, is not stored in TIPS static data but in CRDM?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
249	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	Each Central Bank party may be linked to one and only one Transit Account (see section 1.3.2.1.10), as account owner of the Transit Account for a given currency.	As there is only one transit account for Euro there can only be one account owner, not each central bank can act as account owner.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
250	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	Table 4 - Direction	We assume that an instructing party can also act as Inbound AND outbound. It should be clarified that both directions could be chosen together.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
251	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	the same entity may play the Instructing Party role for many Participants and Reachable Parties, possibly for many Originator BICs within the same Participant or Reachable Party. Conversely, one Originator BIC may be linked to many Distinguished Names, which means one Participant or Reachable Party may authorise many entities to play the Instructing Party role, for one or many of their BICs. For outbound routing purpose, any given Beneficiary BIC may be linked to one and only one Distinguished Name, which means each Participant and Reachable Party must authorise one and only one entity to play the Instructing Party on the Beneficiary side.	In addition to the comment No. 14, it should be clarified how the terminology used in the UDFS does map with the legal concept envisaged according to the TIPS URD and in line with the TARGET2 Guideline. This is especially true regarding the possible activities described for "reachable parties" mentioned within this section. According to our understanding which is based on the current participation structure the responsible CB will have a legal relationship with the participant only. This means that all reference updates should be done via the participant and from a CB perspective a reachable party cannot authorise an Instructing party (ie we understand that the form needs to be sent by the participant and no one else). According to our understanding this is done according to agreements out of our "CB scope". Consequently, the description in this part (including the picture at the beginning) should be updated accordingly.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
252	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	Blocking status for the Party. Exhaustive list of possible values: - blocked for credit; - blocked for debit; - blocked for credit and debit; - unblocked.	It is not clear how the terminology used here does fit with the shared service URD where the following is described: "This business process describes the blocking of Cash Accounts and Parties.". Taking into account also the draft TIPS UHB, it is not clear to me why we have such functionality in CRDM and in TIPS.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
253	21	1.3.2. Accounts structure and organisation	General comment	Transit accounts and Credit Memorandum Balance are no sub genre of TIPS accounts and should be on the same level: 1.3.2.1 TIPS accounts 1.3.2.2 Transit Accounts 1.3.2.3 Credit Memorandum Balance	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

254	21	1.3.2. Accounts structure and organisation	TIPS Actors input and maintain in the Common Reference Data Management repository the following categories of accounts, depending on their role: <input type="checkbox"/> TIPS Accounts <input type="checkbox"/> Transit Account	The term "TIPS Actors" should be replaced by "The Operator and Central Banks".	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
255	21	1.3.2. Accounts structure and organisation	Accounts are opened in TIPS for the provision of liquidity and the settlement of instant payments. This section provides a detailed description of all the reference data CRDM stores and TIPS uses for all its accounts. Furthermore, TIPS Participants may define Credit Memorandum Balances (CMBs) on their TIPS Accounts, in order to define payment capacity limits for their Reachable Parties.	It seems that the current version of the T2/T2S URD on CRDM does not include the requirement to have CMBs for TIPS Accounts. Please clarify as the first quote for this section refers to CRDM.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
256	21	1.3.2.1. TIPS accounts	Each Participant may own one or many TIPS Accounts and they may use them for their settlement activities or to give the possibility to settle to Reachable Parties or other Participants as well as authorising several BICs to operate on the account.	We assume that based on this information the TIPS account are "linked" to the participant which is in principle fine for us. Unfortunately, it is not entirely clear for us how this with the entity description provided in the Shared Service URD of the consolidation. In section 9 of the Shared Service URD it seems that the Cash Account is linked to the Party and not directly to the Party Type. Please clarify.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
257	22	1.3.2.1.2 Credit Memorandum Balance	When defining a CMB, it is possible to specify a limit, which may be initially set to null. In this case, the related Reachable Party may make use of the full payment capacity of the TIPS Account linked to the CMB.	What would a participant do, if he actually would like to have a limit of "Zero"? Would a setting of a limit to "Null" always result in having no limit at all?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
258	22	1.3.2.1.3 Reference data for accounts and CMBs in TIPS	Table 5 - Account Number	Please clarify if there will be a structured and harmonised format for the account numbers.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
259	22	1.3.2.1.3 Reference data for accounts and CMBs in TIPS	Furthermore, each TIPS Account may be linked to one or many CMBs and to one or many Authorised Account Users.	Please clarify what is meant by the term "Authorised Account Users" as this is never defined anywhere before.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
260	22	1.3.2.1.3 Reference data for accounts and CMBs in TIPS	Table 6 - CMB Number	It should read "CMB" instead of "Account" in the second column.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
261	22	1.3.2.1.3 Reference data for accounts and CMBs in TIPS	Table 6 - Floor and Ceiling Notification	We assume that these thresholds refer to the limit utilisation or CMB headroom and NOT to the account balance. Please confirm.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
262	22	1.3.2.1.3 Reference data for accounts and CMBs in TIPS	The following table shows the exhaustive list of Account reference data attributes that TIPS stores in its Local Reference Data Management repository. Table 5 - Account Reference data Attribute Description Account Number It specifies the unique number of the Account. Account Type Type of account. The exhaustive list of account types is as follows: <input type="checkbox"/> TIPS Account <input type="checkbox"/> Transit Account Currency It specifies the currency of the Account. Opening Date Opening date of the Account. Closing Date Closing date of the Account. Floor Notification Amount It specifies the lower threshold for notifying the Account owner. Ceiling Notification Amount It specifies the upper threshold for notifying the Account owner. Credit Notification Flag Boolean attribute specifying whether the Account owner must receive a credit notification after the settlement of any inbound Liquidity Transfer from the relevant RTGS system....	How does the description provided here fit with the Shared service URD (see SHRD.UR.BDD.090 where eg the opening date is considered a mandatory attribute)?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
263	22	1.3.2.1.3 Reference data for accounts and CMBs in TIPS	Table 7 – Authorised Account User reference data	Just for clarification: Is this "user BIC" also the one used in the "DN-BIC routing table"? (See previous section: "This configuration is defined by means of a DN-BIC routing table set up within the CRDM.")	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
264	22	1.3.2.1.3 Reference data for accounts and CMBs in TIPS	Table 7	As I understood, the authorised Account User is a reachable party BIC. Is that correct? In that case the term "operating the account" would be misleading. Please clarify if our understanding is not correct.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
265	24	1.4. Dynamic data model	Table 8	A Settlement Timestamp would be helpful. Where can this information be found?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
266	24	1.4. Dynamic data model	Table 9	A Timestamp for incoming message and settlement time would be helpful. Where can this information be found?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

267	24	1.4. Dynamic data model	<p>Cash Posting A Cash Posting is created for each Payment Transaction transaction or Liquidity Transfer that results in a reserved or settled amount on a TIPS Account.</p> <p>Cash Balance A Cash Balance is created for each TIPS Account and modified each time a Payment Transaction or Liquidity Transfer results in a reserved or settled amount.</p>	What about the Transit Account (as the term TIPS account excludes the transit account) in this section?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
268	28	1.5.1. General concepts	TIPS provides the same RTGS System with data on the business day that just elapsed and	Just for clarification: We understand that the term "data" used here refers to the section 9.3 "General Ledger" of the TIPS URD. Correct?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
269	28	1.5.1. General concepts	Payment transaction status query	<p>In the last round of comments we commented that "distinction between payment transaction (see table 2) and liquidity transfer (see table 3). Please confirm that the mentioned status query allows to query payment transactions as well as liquidity transfers. It seems that your answer ("Payment Transaction Status query applies to Payment Transactions only. Queries on Liquidity Transfers are not included in the TIPS URD. Information should be retrieved using the related TARGET2 functionality.") is not exhaustive for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Based on the TIPS URD CBs are in charge of liquidity monitoring and in case an LT was initiated in TIPS but rejected due to lack of cash this information is not available in TARGET2 as T2 will never be aware of such failed LT. Therefore, a functionality for querying such LTs in TIPS is needed. 2) According to our understanding the term "payment transaction" was not exclusively used for IPs in the URD (ie no consistent application of the described term). For example in the TIPS URD section 10.3 regarding the archiving we refer to payment transaction and status message data only. From our point also LTs need to be archived and therefore it</p>	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
270	30	1.5.2.1. Instant Payment transaction settlement process	In the following description, and in the rest of this document, the terms "Originator Participant" and "Beneficiary Participant" can also be taken to indicate instructing parties Parties acting on behalf of the actual TIPS participants, i.e. TIPS Participants or Reachable Parties.	The last part of the sentence seems not consistent. Please check.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
271	30	1.5.2.1. Instant Payment transaction settlement process	Subsequently, TIPS will forward a status advice to both the originator Originator and beneficiary Beneficiary participantParticipants	Having in mind the definition for "originator participant" used earlier on this page, please clarify who will be the receiver of the status advice in case an Instructing party is sending. The instructing party and not the account holder. Correct?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
272	30	1.5.2.1. Instant Payment transaction settlement process	figure 4	In case the validation of a received message is not successful, we assume the status will move directly from "received" to "failed". Correct?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
273	33	1.5.2.2. Recall settlement process	As mentioned above TIPS acts as a channel between the Assigner and the Assignee without storing any messages data or internal statuses related to Recalls and negative Recall Answers	If you send a transaction query for the original payment, can you see that a recall was send for the original payment? That should be the case for investigations.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
274	33	1.5.2.2. Recall settlement process	In case a positive Recall Answer is given by the Recall Assignee, additional processing has to be performed by TIPS. The system determines from the Originator Participant or Reachable party BIC and Beneficiary Participant or Reachable party BIC within the recall answer message the accounts or CMBs that TIPS has to use for settlement of the recall.	<p>Why is it "account or CMBs" and not "account and CMBs" (in case CMB is used)? Because for the settlement mentioned in the next sentence we assume that the process is in principle the same as the one described in the previous section.</p>	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
275	35	1.5.3.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer	An Inbound Liquidity Transfer order is Received and Validated by TIPS if it passes all validation checks successfully and the related TIPS account is not blocked; otherwise its status turns into a Failed status. Subsequently, it changes to Settled status once the Settlement Core component settles the full amount of the order.	With regard to the "blocking" we think that the current description is too generic having in mind the various possibilities for blocking. Please note that this is also true for the further descriptions in section 2.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
276	36	1.5.3.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	Transient	Just for clarification: Based on the description provided in the URD and in the text, this status refers to a settled LT in TIPS. However, in case the RTGS system is not available, a kind of reversal is necessary and will be done. In case of a positive confirmation the status will be changed to settled although the LT was already booked on the account. Correct?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
277	36	1.5.3.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	figure 7	In case the validation of a received message is not successful, we assume the status will move directly from "received" to "failed". Correct?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

278	38	1.5.4. Reference data management	TIPS may reject certain changes at the time of propagation. For example, if an Account is deleted at CRDM level but has a balance over zero when the change is propagated to TIPS, this change is rejected.	Does this mean that there will be no check when doing the reference data changes in CRDM, but only when the data propagation takes place?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
279	39	1.5.4.1. Blocking Participants	TIPS allows Central Banks to block immediately a TIPS Participant falling under their datascope for credit operations, debit operations or both in A2A mode	This functionality is also available in U2A (see table 14) - please correct.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
280	40	1.5.4.2. Blocking accounts and CMBs	TIPS allows Central Banks to block immediately an Account or a CMB linked to TIPS Participant falling under their datascope for credit operations, debit operations or both in A2A mode.	This functionality is also available in U2A (see table 14) - please correct.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
281	42	1.7.1. Service configuration	Table 15 first line "retention period"	This parameter defines also the maximum period of time to recall an instant payment	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
282	42	1.7.1. Service configuration	page 44: Table 15 - System Parameters	In current SCT infrastructures the duplicate check is done in a timeframe of one day. To prevent deviations of specifications between different infrastructures we recommend to implement a (similar) duplicate check time frame of one day.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
283	42	1.7.1. Service configuration	table 15, retention period	Is it possible to get some further details when the calculation of the five calendar days starts? At midnight or at the point the instruction was accepted /settled? Please clarify.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
284	43	1.7.2. Business and operations monitoring	CB monitoring	The section for CB monitoring is still missing (see also our comment during the first round on which the answer was "to be drafted").	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
285	46	2.2. Instant Payment transaction	figures for examples	In figure 12 and some following examples the balance of a participants account should always shown on the right hand side of an account. All debits are normally on the left hand side. This is not correctly shown in some examples.	To be clarified by the requestor	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
286	46	2.2. Instant Payment transaction	page 52: Table 16 - Instant Payment transaction steps >>> steps 3 and 4 (column: "Description")	In step 3 and 4 the fields "Originator BIC" and Beneficiary BIC" are mentioned. These fields do not exist in the EPC SCT inst rulebook and implementation guidelines. We strongly recommend to use the field designation as provided by EPC (in this case "debtor agent" and "creditor agent").	Rejected	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
287	55	2.2.1. Timeout scenario: missing/delayed Beneficiary-side answer	page 61: Table 17 Step 5	This is the scenario where the Beneficiary answer is delayed and settlement fails due to timeout. Additional to the existing information to the beneficiary, there should be an information of the Originator via pacs002 (FItoFIPaymetStatusReport).	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
288	80	2.3. Recall	page 95 (second paragraph): "A Recall request is forwarded by the Assigner which is an Originator Participant or instructing party..."	Capital letters (--> Instructing Party)	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
289	80	2.3. Recall	page 95 (third paragraph): "The involved actors are [...] The Recall Assignee: the Beneficiary Participant or Recipient Party"	"Instructing Party" instead of "Recipient Party"	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
290	97	2.4. Investigation	page 111: "The transaction status investigation process can be initiated by Participants or Instructing Parties acting on behalf of Participants or Reachable Parties..."	Typo --> "...on behalf of Participants or Reachable Parties"	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
291	97	2.4. Investigation	page 113: Table 19 - investigation steps	Please check accordance of step 5 and 6 with process flows of the EPC SCT inst rulebook (chapter 4.4 especially CT-03.06).	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
292	103	2.5. Inbound/Outbound Liquidity Transfers	For Liquidity Transfers from RTGS Accounts to TIPS Accounts, transfers must be initiated in the RTGS System by the RTGS holder of the debited RTGS Account; the Liquidity Transfer is then forwarded by the RTGS System to TIPS through the A2A interface.	Just for clarification: Does this mean that TARGET2 uses the "normal" TIPS A2A interface which is also used by the user? If this is the case, do we have to consider anything special with regard to the access rights concept.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
293	103	2.5.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer	TIPS Account owner which is duly informed if the account is credited and if its balance goes up the configured threshold.	The account owner will also be informed (via BankToCustomerDebitCreditNotification) even if the balance does not exceed the ceiling (which is a different notification). Please correct.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
294	108	2.5.1.1 Successful scenario - Inbound Liquidity Transfer order is settled in TIPS	The current business date is 30/12/2017	Can we use another example date as the 30 December is a Saturday and therefore no TARGET2 business day.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
295	112	2.5.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	First bullet point of section 3: The TIPS Participant or Instructing Party as instructor of the Liquidity Transfer;	A CB can act on behalf of a participant and can be involved in the process of an outbound liquidity transfer.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
296	125	2.5.2.2. RTGS Alert scenario – No reply from RTGS	page 140: Figure 88 - Outbound Liquidity Transfer - Missing RTGS answer steps	"Figure 88" is a table und should be named this way (e.g. "Table 22")	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
297	131	2.7. Queries	page 146: Table 22 - Query permission > line: Instructing Party on behalf of a participant	Columns "Account Balance and Status Query" and "CMB Limit and Status Query" --> Please change "... is set as authorized user" to "is owner".	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
298	131	2.7. Queries	Payment transaction status query	See our comment No. 70	To be clarified by the requestor	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

299	131	2.7. Queries	Table 22	Are LTs covered in this table by the term "payment data"? The last line on page 147 seems not to be in line with the envisaged legal concept. The issue needs to be checked but according to our understanding, from a TARGET2 system point of view an instructing party always acts on behalf of the participant and not on behalf of a reachable party. Based on the information received so far, the relationship will be based on the account holder only. If this is not correct, it should be explicitly clarified. Pls check	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
300	139	2.7.2. Queries on Payment transactions.	first section first bullet point: The Participant or Instructing Party sending the query;	A CB can send a query on payment transactions for an account holder or CMB in their data scope. Please add CBs to the list.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
301	146	2.9. Reference data management	Table 25	Regarding the blocking please see to our comments above.	To be clarified by the requestor	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
302	146	2.9. Reference data management	page 171: Table 25 - Block/unblock Participant steps >> step 5 column "Description"	Please change to: "If the received message requests to remove a restriction: - the system sets the blocking status to "unblocked" on the specified TIPS Participant data."	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
303	146	2.9. Reference data management	page 172: Table 26 - Block/unblock Account/CMB steps >> step 4 column "Description"	Please change to: "If the received message requests to remove a restriction: - the system sets the blocking status to "unblocked" on the specified Account or CMB data."	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
304	146	2.9. Reference data management	page 174: Table 27 - Update of a CMB Limit steps >> step 4 column "Description"	Please change to: "If the received message requests to remove a restriction: - the system sets the blocking status to "unblocked" on the specified Account or CMB Data"	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
305	146	2.9. Reference data management	page 174: Table 27 - Update of a CMB Limit steps >> step 4 column "Description"	Table 27 does explain steps for change of CMB (not blocking/unblocking of accounts). Please change content of step 4 accordingly.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
306	164	3.1. Introduction	Third paragraph	Please change wording to: "Cash management messages are used to provide complete coverage for SEPA SCT Inst investigation and recall processes as specified by the EPC SCT Inst Scheme and to ..."	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
307	185	3.3.2.2.3 ModifyLimit (camt.011.001.06)	field Name:"New limit value"	Does the message "Modify Limit" always set a new limit? Is a modification with a delta amount possible?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
308	189	3.3.2 Messages Description	General comment	Unfortunately, the EPC SCT inst Implementation Guidelines was not published until 14 November 2017. So there was no chance for a detailed check of the message descriptions. We will send our remarks to this part of the UDFS asap.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
309	30	1.5.2.1. Instant Payment transaction settlement process	Just after figure 4 : "an acceptance timestamp already older than the acceptable timeout"	Could you define what an "acceptable timeout" is ?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
310	22	1.3.2.1.2 Credit Memorandum Balance	When defining a CMB, it is possible to specify a limit, which may be initially set to null. In this case, the related Reachable Party may make use of the full payment capacity of the TIPS Account linked to the CMB.	I understand that if the limit is set to 0 then there is no limit. I think it could be misunderstanding: someone would like to stop the activity of a reachable party could set the limit to 0 and obtains the opposite result. Could you propose another mechanism to give the full access to the liquidity for a reachable party ? For example : "Empty" or "Null" value	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
311	61	2.2.2.2. Successful scenario with confirmed order – Creditor account and debtor CMB	Just after figure 17 : "In this example, CMB1 has no additional movements – the reduction of the headroom is confirmed."	Typo : "In this example, CMB1 has no additional movements – the reduction of the headroom is confirmed."	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
312	40	1.5.4.2. Blocking accounts and CMBs	TIPS allows TIPS Participants.... To block CMB in .. A2A mode.	As the previous page (Table 14) shows this blocking will be available in U2A mode too and just wanted to seek confirmation this is indeed the case and then any reason why it is not mentioned in 1.5.4.2?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
313	103	2.5. Inbound/Outbound Liquidity Transfers	Liquidity transfers through U2A (GUI)	Will 4 Eyes control principle be available for liquidity transfers, similarly to CMB blocking? It would be good.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
314	125	2.5.2.2. RTGS Alert scenario – No reply from RTGS	This entire section	Please clarify why is this scenario required a standard timeout cannot work. Will this not create complexity and potential for risks due to manual intervention?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
315	139	2.7.2. Queries on Payment transactions.	The query allows the actor to get information for one Instant Payment specified by the Payments transaction reference and the Originator BIC	Is the search not possible based on other parameters e.g. date, amount and/or BIC? Does the actor always know the transaction ID?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
316	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	Concept of instructing party	Is there a need to setup a separate instructing party or is this only a party by concept? If a participant has outsourced its entire payments processing to a third party processor. (no contact whatsoever from the legal participant to TIPS) shall it be sufficient for the legal participant to register the third party provider's DN to be used as participant DN. Allow the service provider to setup the connection and have its NSP authorised, handle recall requests etc.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
317	36	1.5.3.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	"an authorised entity triggers an Outbound LT"	Please elaborate on the 'authorised entities'. E.g. Participant, instructing party and CB acting on behalf.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
318	38	1.5.4. Reference data management	CRDM availability of 22 hours a day	please add the number of days per week CRDM is available	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

319	12	1.2.3. Access rights	The role of Instructing Party constitutes a specific case. Instructing Parties are DNs that are authorised to send instructions on behalf of a specific BIC.	Page 13. Is an Instructing Party also authorised to receive or only to send?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
320	46	2.2. Instant Payment transaction	FItoFICustomerCreditTransfer message sent by the Originator Participant	Page 48 Is it also possible that this FItoFICustomerCreditTransfer message is sent by the Instructing Party?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
321	46	2.2. Instant Payment transaction	Figure 8 right top	Page 50. please add: Instructing Party to: Beneficiary participant/ recipient party	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
322	103	2.5.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer	BankToCustomerDebitCreditNotification: the message sent by TIPS to report the settlement of a liquidity transfers to the TIPS Account owner	Page 117: please add to Account owner or mandated Instructing Party	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
323	112	2.5.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	TIPS Account owner which is duly informed	Page 126 A TIPS Account holder could have mandated an Instructing Party to manage its balance limits, in this situation the message should be send to the IP. Proposal: add "or instructing party" to TIPS Account owner	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
324	112	2.5.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	ReturnAccount: the message sent by TIPS to notify the owner of the debited	Page 126 Please add to owner of the debited account or instructing party	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
325	112	2.5.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	Table 21 step 16p / involved actors	Page 131 Please add to TIPS Account owner as receiver or instructing party	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
326	161	2.9.1.1.7 Successful scenario – Decrease of a CMB Limit	After the amendment, TIPS sends a confirmation message to the TIPS Participant	Page 183 please add to TIPS Participant or instructing party	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
327	164	3.1. Introduction	Following ISO20022 business domains	Page 185 Will TIPS use the ISO version in use by EPC? The current ISO version in use by EPC is ISO20022 Version 2009.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
328	168	3.3.2.1.1 FIToFIPaymentStatusReportV03 (pacs.002.001.03)	is sent by TIPS to the Originator Participant to report	Page 189 Could this message also be send by an instructing party?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
329	179	3.3.2.1.4 FIToFIPaymentStatusRequest (pacs.028.001.01)	The Originator Bank	Page 201 Please add to "Originator Bank" or instructing party	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
330	15	1.3. TIPS Actors and account structure	Additional paragraph required	Please include/add par 1.3.3. Terms & Conditions, incl. more extensive description in matrix re. Roles & responsibilities of TIPS and TIPS actors involved.:This is essential to prevent any malfunctioning of exchange of TIPS messages.	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
331	42	1.6.4. Archiving	this paragraph is empty	please include who will be responsible	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
332	45	2.1. General Communication process	Please add a paragraph. Whole paragraph empty	please include a paragraph 2.x connectivity, incl. succesfull and unsuccessfull scenarios. Due to importance, please can you add content in par 2.1. and subs.	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
333	168	3.3.2. Messages description	Please add a paragraph.	A vital report is missing: settlement & reconciliation: please add, incl. description.	Not Applicable	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
334	175	3.3.2.1.3 FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV02 (pacs.008.001.02)	Please add additional AT	Please add AT Local Instrument Code: time critical/non time critical	Rejected	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
335	6	Introduction	"in order to ensure the same level of information for all TIPS Actors the pieces of information relevant for CBs, Participants and Reachable Parties is contained in one single book of UDFS." "Information provided in Chapter 1 on the TIPS feature is mainly user-oriented, but also include some information on the internal TIPS processes, when relevant."	What about Instructing Parties - shouldn't be included? Is there a typo in the extracts "the pieces of information (...) is contained" and "Information provided...but also include"?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
336	7	Reader's guide	"Also section 1.4 Dynamic data model is important to understand how the information are managed in TIPS."	There is a typo in the extract "the information are" - should be "the information is".	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
337	9	1.1. Introduction to the TIPS Service	"TIPS accounts in euro are legally opened in TARGET2 by the responsible Central Bank and have to be dedicated to the settlement of instant payments in TIPS.", "The participants are also provided with two additional functionalities to either recall settled Instant Payments transactions"	I think the unification is needed in the writing manner of terms included in the glossary, e.g. sometimes "Instant Payment" is written with capital letters but sometimes not, like in the quoted extract. I suppose there is a typo in second extract - shouldn't be "Instant Payment transactions"?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
338	11	1.2. Access to TIPS	"TIPS Actors must bilaterally define a relationship with one or more selected NSPs for the purpose of getting connected to TIPS."	What is the business case for establishing connection with more than one NSPs?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
339	12	1.2.3. Access rights	"The entire access rights configuration process is carried out within the CRDM: the CRDM documentation provides additional details on these aspects."	Will the CRDM documentation be dedicated only to TIPS service or it will be common documentation to all ECB systems? Will it be reviewed within TIPS-CG? Will it include the issues concerning the Instructing Party and the rules related to its privileges towards requests and objects concerning respective Participants and Reachable Parties?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
340	14	1.2.4.2. Integrity	"In U2A mode, TIPS offers users in addition the possibility to further ensure the data integrity via usage of a dual authorisation concept, the 4-Eyes principle."	I suppose the respective rules and the scope of usage of the 4-eyes principle (the activities and requests to which it could be applied) will be included in the UHB?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
341	14	1.2.4.3. Availability	"In the event of unavailability of some local nodes of the application cluster or unavailability of an entire site, TIPS adapts its behaviour as far as possible to continue operating, as better described in the High Level Technical Design (HLTD) document."	Is the High Level Technical Design (HLTD) document publicly available?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

342	16	1.3.1.1. Setup of parties for TIPS	Table 2 - Setup of Parties for TIPS	In the diagram is not included CB acting as Participant (using A2A mode as well).	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
343	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	"Any TIPS Actor, meaning any legal entity or organisation participant in and interacting with TIPS"	Is there a typo in the quoted extract?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
344	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	"The Operator...they may operate on behalf of any TIPS Actor", [Central Banks]: "In addition, they can act on behalf of one of their Actors in case of need."	In what particular cases TIPS Operators and Central Banks can act on behalf of the other TIPS Actors? What are the possibilities and what are the business cases?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
345	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	"They can manage CMBs (see section 1.3.2.1.2) linked to their own accounts as well as Instructing Party (see below) roles for Actors acting on behalf of themselves or of Reachable Parties (see below) defined as users of their accounts or CMBs. In addition, they define the access rights configuration of said Instructing Parties."	This sentence is quite long and not very clear ("They can manage...Instructing Party"?)	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
346	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	"Participants and Reachable Parties can act as Instructing Parties."	So ACH which is not either Participant nor Reachable Party cannot act as Instructing Party?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
347	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	"Actors can act as Instructing Parties on behalf of other Participants or Reachable Parties, taking on the subset of functionalities that are available to the Participant or Reachable Party granted them in terms of access rights,"	Is it possible to grant to Instructing Party all the functionalities available to Participants or Reachable Parties? Apart from that, there is a typo at the end of the sentence - a comma instead of a dot.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
348	17	1.3.1.3. Hierarchical party model	"The TIPS Operator is the only party on the top level of the hierarchy and it is in a legal relationship with each party of the second level, i.e. each Central Bank in TIPS. Similarly, legal relationships exist between each party belonging to the second level (i.e. a Central Bank) and all its community (i.e. Participants and Reachable Parties)."	And what about the Instructing Party? On which level is it placed?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
349	18	1.3.1.4. Party identification	"More precisely, the CRDM service identifies each party with the BIC of the party itself and the BIC of the party with which it has established a business relation. Therefore: <input type="checkbox"/> Each Participant and Reachable Party is identified by the BIC of its Central Bank plus its own BIC; <input type="checkbox"/> Each Central Bank is identified by the BIC of the TIPS Operator plus its own BIC. As a general rule (i.e. valid for all Eurosystem market infrastructure services), the CRDM service requires the assignment of 11-digit BICs to parties, with the only constraint that this BIC must be unique within the set of parties having established a business relationship with the same party ⁵ . This results in the possibility, for the same legal entity, on the one hand to establish multiple business relationships with different parties using the same 11-digit BIC." "On top of the general rule described above, TIPS imposes an additional constraint in the assignment of BICs related to its parties, due to the fact the settlement process must be able to infer the accounts to be debited and credit by an Instant Payment transaction based on the BICs of the Originator Participant and of the Beneficiary Participant (see also section 2.2). This circumstance	The usage rules of the BIC11 are not very clear. According to the first extract the uniqueness of BIC11 should be kept only within the same upper-level party, i.e. in the most cases within the same CB. On the contrary, the second indicated extract explains that because of the settlement reason, the uniqueness within the whole TIPS system should be preserved. The difference between these two rules are not clear for me and seem to be contradictory. By the way, I think there is a typo in the fraze "to infer the accounts to be debited and credit" - shouldn't be "credited"?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
350	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	The diagram situated just under the commented point.	I think the description of the diagram could be helpful to understand properly the database model which it presents.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
351	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	"Each Central Bank party may be linked to one and only one Transit Account"	"one and only one Transit Account" but only per determined currency? So, in the future if TIPS will become multicurrency system, each CB will be able to have many Transit Accounts, one per each currency?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
352	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	Table 4 - Instructing Party reference data: "It specifies whether the link between the DN and the BIC authorises the Instructing Party to act as Originator (inbound routing) or as Beneficiary (outbound routing)."	Does it mean a given TIPS Participant/Reachable Party cooperates with one Instructing Party in cose of the inbound direction and with the other one in case of the outbound direction? I think such rules should be included in the UDFS explicitly.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
353	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS	"Conversely, one Originator BIC may be linked to many Distinguished Names, which means one Participant or Reachable Party may authorise many entities to play the Instructing Party role, for one or many of their BICs."	What is the business case for such a model? I think the explanation of such a usage would be helpful.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
354	19	1.3.1.5. Reference data for parties in TIPS		I think some clarification on the use of DNs and BICs and their relationships would be useful.	To be clarified by the requestor	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
355	21	1.3.2. Accounts structure and organisation	The diagram situated just under the commented point.	I think the description of the diagram could be helpful to understand properly the database model which it presents.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

356	21	1.3.2.1. TIPS accounts	"Each Participant may own one or many TIPS Accounts and they may use them for their settlement activities or to give the possibility to settle to Reachable Parties or other Participants as well as authorising several BICs to operate on the account."	"to give the possibility to settle to (...) or other Participants" - could you please give the explanation of that business case? I think some clarification would be useful. "as well as authorising several BICs to operate on the account" - I suppose it is connected with the Instructing Party role? Is the number of BICs authorised to operate on the account limited (the determiner "several" suggests that it cannot be more than 10)?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
357	22	1.3.2.1.1 Transit accounts	"Transit Accounts may have a negative balance"	Could you please expand the description of this issue? In which cases can it occur?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
358	22	1.3.2.1.2 Credit Memorandum Balance	"Specifically, the sum of all CMB limits on a TIPS Account may be higher than the balance of the same Account at any time."	Could you please include in this section the basic description of the validation rules relating to the defined by a Participant CMBs when instructing an Instant Payment (comprising the relationships between TIPS Account balance and the CMB limit)?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
359	22	1.3.2.1.2 Credit Memorandum Balance	"TIPS Participants create CMBs for their TIPS Accounts."	Is it optional functionality?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
360	16	1.3.1.2. Concept of party in TIPS	The role of Instructing Party allows an Actor to send (or receive) Instant Payments to (or from) TIPS. Participants and Reachable Parties can act as Instructing Parties.	It should be made clear in the documentation that other actors can also be instructing parties. Consider providing a full list.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
361	17	1.3.1.3. Hierarchical party model	Legal relationship between parties in TIPS determine a hierarchical party model based on a three-level structure.	It is not clear which is the 3rd level.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
362	35	1.5.3.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer	Originators of Inbound Liquidity Transfer orders do not necessarily need to be TIPS Participants. For instance, any entity who owns a PM account in TARGET2 may trigger Inbound Liquidity Transfers in euro, even if it does not own an account in TIPS.	It seems unclear who can be originators of inbound liquidity transfers. Can you provide a full list of possible originators?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
363	103	2.5. Inbound/Outbound Liquidity Transfers	Inbound Liquidity Transfer has to be initiated by the RTGS account holder (or any authorised third party) in the relevant RTGS System	"any authorised third party" - for instance an instructing party?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
364	112	2.5.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	Figure 72	Please enlarge the figure. It is difficult to see	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
365	112	2.5.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	Flow in Figure 72	According to the flow sketched in Figure 72, the failed check in 12e implies that the liquidity transfer will be finalized without sending some kind of notification to the TIPS Participant. Please confirm if this is the case.	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
366	146	2.9. Reference data management	Table 25, step 4. If the received message requests to remove a restriction: the system sets the blocking status to "Blocked for both debit and credit" on the specified TIPS Participant data.	According to the wording in step 4, TIPS will set a blocking when requested to remove it. Is that correct?	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
367	103	2.5. Inbound/Outbound Liquidity Transfers	it is possible to transfer from any RTGS Account to any TIPS Account.	Do you mean that it is possible to transfer from any LINKED RTGS Account to any TIPS Account?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
368	103	2.5.1. Inbound Liquidity Transfer	TIPS Account owner which is duly informed if the account is credited and if its balance goes up the configured threshold.	TIPS Account owner which is duly informed if the account is credited and if its balance EXCEEDS the configured threshold.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
369	108	2.5.1.1.1 Successful scenario - Inbound Liquidity Transfer order is settled in TIPS	Figure 65 and Figure 66	Transfer Amount in Figure 65 is EUR 1.000,00 but in Figure 66 it is only EUR 100,00	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
370	110	2.5.1.1.2 Unsuccessful scenario: Inbound LT order is rejected because LT duplicate check failed	Figure 69	Transfer Amount in Figure 69 is EUR 1.000,00 in the Text the Transferred Amount is 100 EUR	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
371	110	2.5.1.1.2 Unsuccessful scenario: Inbound LT order is rejected because LT duplicate check failed	Figure 71	L006 is not included in the list of error codes 4.2	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
372	125	2.5.2.2. RTGS Alert scenario – No reply from RTGS	After performed necessary validations TIPS transfers the requested amount from the TIPS Account to the Transit Account. After that TIPS informs the corresponding RTGS System about the liquidity transfer and waiting for an answer. In case the RTGS does not give a suitable answer within the above timeframe, TIPS alerts the TIPS Operator which can then initiate appropriate further actions (depending on the reason for this timeout and the current status of TIPS and the RTGS System).	After HAVING performed necessary..... After that, TIPS informs the corresponding RTGS System about the liquidity transfer and WAITS for an answer. ...TIPS alerts the TIPS Operator WHO can the initiate	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
373	125	2.5.2.2. RTGS Alert scenario – No reply from RTGS	The remaining steps are described in Table xx - Outbound Liquidity Transfer Order steps – Missing RTGS answer below	The remaining steps are described in FIGURE 88 - Outbound Liquidity Transfer Order steps – Missing....	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
374	128	2.6.1. Floor notification on account	The system recognises that the account goes under the threshold defined by the customer and it starts the notification process.	The system recognises that the account goes BELOW the threshold defined by the customer and it starts the notification process.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
375	128	2.6.1. Floor notification on account	Figure 90	balances should be on the credit side of the account (amount 900)	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
376	128	2.6.1. Floor notification on account	In this case, the owner of the account receives to separate messages, one notifying about the undercut for CMB and the other notifying undercut for the Account.	In this case, the owner of the account receives TWO separate messages, one notifying about the undercut for CMB and the other notifying undercut for the Account.	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
377	143	2.7.2.1.1 Successful scenario - Payment transaction status query	Figure 105	Is Payment Transaction Status: ACCP correct? In the text it is mentioned that the payment is already settled	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.

378	146	2.9. Reference data management	TABLE 25 Blo/unlock Participant steps 4 If the received message requests to remove a restriction: - the system sets the blocking status to "Blocked for both debit and credit" on the specified TIPS Participant data.	If the received message requests to remove a restriction: the system REMOVES the blocking? (Status: unblocked?)	Accepted	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
379	93	2.3.1.2. Successful scenario – Negative Recall Answer	Figure 52 Recall successful scenario: TIPS identifies the DN of the Assignee (<ou=dept_123, o=prtyabmmxxx, o=a2anet>) and forwards the ResolutionOfInvestigation message to the Assignee DN.	TIPS identifies the DN of the ASSIGNEE (<ou=dept_123, o=prtyabmmxxx, o=a2anet>) and forwards the ResolutionOfInvestigation message to the ASSIGNEE DN. Should the ResolutionOfInvestigation be forwarded to the Assignee or is it correct to forward it to the Assigner	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
380	18	1.3.1.4. Party identification	branches	must the bank indicate all the branches for example as we have 39 indirect participants with 3 - 10 branches or can we indicate RZSBIT%%%	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
381	24	1.4. Dynamic data model	liquidity transfer	the liquidity transfer can made manually or also as a standing ordern ?	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
382	28	1.5. TIPS Features	statement of accounts	are the up dates static at the moment of the subscription (for example every 3 hours ... of the service or can I send XML msg. for example get account ...	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
383	33	1.5.2.2. Recall settlement process	define time for response	it will be necessary to indicate a time for respons otherwise after this time it will be considered as not approved	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
384	36	1.5.3.2. Outbound Liquidity Transfer	automatic transfer	it is possible to indicate an amout for an automatic transfer from tecnical TIPS account to the RTGS account	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
385	42	1.7.1. Service configuration	amount check	will the amount check only the amount of the sending partiy or also for the receiving party	To be clarified by the requestor	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
386	80	2.3. Recall	insert charges	it is technical possible to insert charges for recall	Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
387	97	2.4. Investigation	insert text	will it be necessary to inseret a standard text (SWIFT Certified Application - Exceptions and Investigations)	To be clarified by the requestor	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
388	123	2.5.2.1.3 Unsuccessful scenario – Outbound LT order rejected by the RTGS System	explain please the scenario		Clarification	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.
389	175	3.3.2.1.3 FIToFICustomerCreditTransferV02 (pacs.008.001.02)	it will be useful that the msg. will the indication of EU 2015/847		To be clarified by the requestor	No specific feedback to be provided to the CG.