

General Information (Origin of Request)		
<input type="checkbox"/> User Requirements (URD)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other User Functional or Technical Documentation (SYS)		
Request raised by: 4CB	Institute: 4CB	Date raised: 16/03/2015
Request title: Editorial change request for UDFS		Request ref. no: T2S 0511 SYS
Request type: Common	Urgency: Normal	
1. Legal/business importance parameter: Low	2. Market implementation efforts parameter: Low	
3. Operational/Technical risk parameter: Low	4. Financial impact parameter: No cost impact	
Requestor Category: 4CB	Status: Authorised at Steering Level	

Description of the requested Change

Editorial changes regarding UDFS 2.0 stemming from tickets correction and market comments.

Reason for change / expected benefits/business case:

- 1 [511_001] EUROSISTEM UPDATE Page 55, lines 8-9 (Section 1.2.1.8 'Restriction Types') 1
- 2 [511_002] EUROSISTEM UPDATE Page 176, lines 8-10 (Section 1.3.4.1 'Message Subscription Configuration') 3
- 3 [511_003] EUROSISTEM UPDATE Page 1145, lines 27 (Section 3.3.6.16 "PartyModificationRequestV01 (reda.022.001.01)": Addition of a missing business rule reference. 3
- 4 [511_004] EUROSISTEM UPDATE Page 954, (Section 3.3.3.9 'GetBusinessDayInformationV03 (camt.018.001.03)') 4
- 5 [511_005] EUROSISTEM UPDATE: Page 1270 (Section 3.3.7.21 "SecuritiesAccountPositionResponseV01 (semt.040.001.01)": Update of message documentation in MyStandards. 4
- 6 [511_006] EUROSISTEM UPDATE Page 1366, lines 5 (Section 4.1 "Index of Business Rules and Error Codes". Update of business rule reason code due to incomplete modification if CR485. 4
- 7 [511_007] EUROSISTEM UPDATE: EUROSISTEM UPDATE Update of Mystandards documentation for reda.006 and reda.007..... 5

Proposed wording:

- 1 [511_001] EUROSISTEM UPDATE Page 55, lines 8-9 (Section 1.2.1.8 'Restriction Types')

The wording of the results of the example is ambiguous and should be made clearer to explain the example correctly.

1.2.1.8 Restriction Types

[...]

EXAMPLE 1 – DEFINITION OF A RULE SET FOR A NEW POSITIVE RESTRICTION TYPE (C)

Rule Set	Valid From	Valid To	Securities Movement Type	Payment	Transaction Identification	Party Type (of the account owner)	Party Type (of the instructing party)	Party	Security	Matching Status	Debited Position/Balance	Credited Position/Balance	Securities Account	T2S Dedicated Cash Account	Credit Debit Indicator	Country of Issuance	T2S Dedicated Cash Account Type	Settlement Currency	Securities Tax Status	Securities Account Internal Classification	
Rule 1	2016-04-01	2016-06-30																			Proprietary

The negative restriction type is defined as follows.

EXAMPLE 2 – CREATION OF A NEW NEGATIVE RESTRICTION TYPE (C)

Restriction Type

Restriction Type: RNEG
Restriction Description: This restriction type applies on settlement instructions and excludes from rejection the ones sent by CSDs.

Valid From: 01-April-2016
Valid To: 30-June-2016

Object Restriction Type: Settlement Instruction
Restriction Processing Type: Rejection
Positive / Negative Parameter Set: Negative

In addition, the CSD implemented a rule for this Restriction Type including only one parameter configuration: Party Type = "CSD" as shown in the example below.

EXAMPLE 3 – DEFINITION OF A RULE SET FOR A NEW NEGATIVE RESTRICTION TYPE (C)

Rule Set	Valid From	Valid To	Securities Movement Type	Payment	Transaction Identification	Party Type (of the account owner)	Party Type (of the instructing party)	Party	Security	Matching Status	Debited Position/Balance	Credited Position/Balance	Securities Account	T2S Dedicated Cash Account	Credit Debit Indicator	Country of Issuance	T2S Dedicated Cash Account Type	Settlement Currency	Securities Tax Status	Securities Account Internal Classification	
Rule 1	2016-04-01	2016-06-30					CSD														

As a result of the combined effect of the two restriction types when the two validity periods overlap, T2S rejects all Settlement Instructions sent by a CSD, all Settlement instructions on non-proprietary securities accounts, and Settlement Instructions on proprietary securities accounts not only if they are sent by a CSD.

2 [511_002] EUROSYSYSTEM UPDATE Page 176, lines 8-10 (Section 1.3.4.1 ‘Message Subscription Configuration’)

There is a sentence which is not completely in line with the rest of the chapter. The described behaviour for copies does not apply when the copy is of an incoming message (e.g. sese.023, semt.013 and camt.066) in which case it is possible for a T2S Actor to receive the copy of an incoming message which was originally instructed by themselves.

1.3.4.1 Message Subscription Configuration
[...]

The configuration of subscriptions of messages (and copies of messages) is based on the definition of a set of rules the T2S application uses for outgoing and incoming messages in order to determine to which sub-set of interested party(ies) (or to all if it is the case) the given message has to be sent or copied according to their preferences defined in this configuration. A Copy refers to a message sent to a party who is identified as Interested Party for the specific business case (see Table 75).

3 [511_003] EUROSYSYSTEM UPDATE Page 1145, lines 27 (Section 3.3.6.16 “PartyModificationRequestV01 (reda.022.001.01)”: Addition of a missing business rule reference.

The Business Rule DXAA007 is not included in the business rules table for the involved message.

The text of the Business Rule says :” Only one instance may become effective in the future” and prevents a party object from having multiple future values for historical entities. Historical entities refer to the “minor” entities within a static data object which can have multiple historical values. This applies to Party Code, Party Name and Party Address in the party static data.

3.3.6.16 “PartyModificationRequestV01 (reda.022.001.01)” Business rules applicable to the schema:

MESSAGE ITEM	DATA TYPE / CODE	BUSINESS RULES
PartyModificationRequestV01 Document/PtyModReq	PartyModificationRequestV01	DPU1001 DXAA007
SystemPartyIdentification Document/PtyModReq/SysPtyId	SystemPartyIdentification3	DPU1003
ScopeIndication Document/PtyModReq/Mod/ScpIndctn	DataModification1Code	IIMP101
OpeningDate Document/PtyModReq/Mod/ReqdMod/SysPty/OpngDt	ISODate	DPU1206 IIMP106

Chapter 4.1 Index of Business Rules and Error Codes

BR NAME	DESCRIPTION	INBOUND MESSAGE	REPLY MESSAGE	CODE USE	REASON CODE	ERROR TEXT
DXAA007	<u>Each historical entity may have no more than one future instance.</u>	reda.022	reda.016		REJT	<u>Only one instance may become effective in the future.</u>

4 [511_004] EUROSYSTEM UPDATE Page 954, (Section 3.3.3.9 'GetBusinessDayInformationV03 (camt.018.001.03)')

The data type for a specific field in the camt.018 message example is incorrect and not in line with the message specification in the same section.

3.3.3.9 GetBusinessDayInformationV03 (camt.018.001.03)

[...]

3.3.3.9.3 The message in business context

[...]

Query Type: T2S Diary Query

[...]

MESSAGE ITEM	DATA TYPE / CODE	UTILISATION
Identification Document/GetBizDayInf/BizDayInfQryDef/Crit/NewCrit/SchCrit/EvtTp/Prtry/Id	EventTypeCode_T2S_1 Exact4AlphaNumericText	Event code

5 [511_005] EUROSYSTEM UPDATE: Page 1270 (Section 3.3.7.21 "SecuritiesAccountPositionResponseV01 (semt.040.001.01)": Update of message documentation in MyStandards.

Message examples of semt.040 provided in MyStandards need to be completed in accordance with their description in section "The message in business context". Actually, the level of details in the UDFS description is quite high specifying several positions while the examples (in order not to be so long) were not providing all the repetitions with the whole breakdown.

The two examples are completed:

- Message example 1: semt.040.001.01_T2S_ResponsePositionCurrentDay_Example.xml
- Message example 2: semt.040.001.01_T2S_ResponsePositionPeriodDates_Example.xml

6 [511_006] EUROSYSTEM UPDATE Page 1366, lines 5 (Section 4.1 "Index of Business Rules and Error Codes". Update of business rule reason code due to incomplete modification if CR485.

The Business Rule DSU1700 was modified in the context of CR 485-SYS (Replace dependency of static data updated on auto-collateralisation eligibility by a time-based approach). With this modification, the reason code should have been changed from REJT to QUED since T2S will queue rather than reject the Security Maintenance Request (reda.007)..

BR NAME	DESCRIPTION	INBOUND MESSAGE	REPLY MESSAGE	CODE USE	REASON CODE	ERROR TEXT
DSU1700	When performing a Security Update request, if the request contains updates to Minimum Settlement Unit or Settlement Unit Multiple or Deviating Settlement Unit or Settlement Type, and it is submitted outside of the End of Day period, the creation date of the Security must be equal to the current date or, in case it is in the past, the Security must not be defined as eligible for autocolateralisation in T2S. If the request does not meet these conditions, it is queued and executed at the start of the End of Day period.	reda.007	reda.029		REJT QUED	Securities update has been queued and will be executed during the End of Day period.

7 [511_007] EUROSYSYSTEM UPDATE: EUROSYSYSTEM UPDATE Update of Mystandards documentation for reda.006 and reda.007

In ISO meeting ISO TC68/SC4 (on 12/05/2014) an official decision was made to merge ISO18773 and ISO18774. This resolution will become an ISO decision. ISO18773 will not exist anymore and it will be substituted by ISO18774. Business rules DSC1702 and DSU1702 were amended to reflect this in CR470, but the standard is still referenced on the MyStandards documentation for reda.006 and reda.007. Therefore the field definitions should be changed as below. The underlying checks will not change.

Impacted fields are:

reda.006: Document/SctyCreReq/Scty/FinInstrmAttrbts/ISOsctyShrtNm

reda.007: Document/SctyMntncReq/UpdTp/UpdTp/Add/FinInstrmAttrbts/ISOsctyShrtNm

reda.007: Document/SctyMntncReq/UpdTp/UpdTp/Del/FinInstrmAttrbts/ISOsctyShrtNm

reda.007: Document/SctyMntncReq/UpdTp/UpdTp/Modify/FinInstrmAttrbts/ISOsctyShrtNm

MyStandards documentation for reda.006 and reda.007, field definition for above mentioned fields needs to be modified as follows:

Short name of the security ~~expressed as ISO 18773/18774.~~

Outcome/Decisions:

- * CRG meeting of 12 March 2015: The CRG put the Change Request on hold.
- * CRG Telco of 26 March 2015: The CRG recommended the approval of the Change Request.
- * OMG on 9 April 2015: During a written procedure from 31 March 2015 to 9 April 2015, the Operations Managers Group did not identify any operational impact of the Change Request.
- * Advisory Group's advice on 20 April 2015: Following a written procedure, the AG was in favour of the Change Request.
- * CSG resolution on 21 April 2015: The CSG adopted the resolution to approve the Change Request via written procedure.