

## Change Request form

General Information (Origin of Request)		
<input type="checkbox"/> User Requirements Document (URD) <input type="checkbox"/> User Detailed Functional Specification (UDFS) <input type="checkbox"/> User Handbook (UHB) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other User Functional or Technical Documentation (SYS)		
<b>Request raised by:</b> Deutsche Bank AG	<b>Institution:</b> TSWG member	<b>Date raised:</b> 20/09/2021
<b>Request title:</b> Functionality to resend of TIPS reports via workstation.		<b>Request ref. no:</b> TIPS-0046-SYS <sup>1</sup>
<b>Request type:</b>		
<b>1. Legal/business importance parameter:</b> Medium	<b>2. Market implementation efforts parameter – Stakeholder impact:</b> Medium/Low	
<b>3. Operational impact:</b> Medium	<b>4. Financial impact parameter:</b> Low	
<b>5. Functional/ Technical impact:</b> Medium/Low	<b>6. Interoperability impact:</b> Low	
<b>Requestor Category:</b> TIPS Actor		<b>Status:</b> On hold

### Reason for change and expected benefits/business motivation:

TIPS participants use delta CAMT.053 and full CAMT.053 (at EOD) reports for transaction reconciliation and nostro account reconciliation respectively. In case of a non-receipt of any of these files via normal STP process, a resend is to be requested via e-mail to TIPS which is observed to be a time-taking process.

There is always an underlying incident causing non-receipts of reports.

### Description of requested change:

Request is to provide user a functionality to request 1) resend and 2) download of any reports (**not only CAMT.053s**) that a TIPS participant may use. In addition to this

- On submission of request from workstation, reports are expected to flow through the normal network route
- Download format to be consistent with the one sent over the network in normal circumstances.

TIPS participants use delta CAMT.053 and full CAMT.053 (at EOD) reports for transaction reconciliation and *nostro* account reconciliation respectively. Non-receipt of any of these files breaks the STP process on TIPS participant side, leading to manual effort around investigation, request for files from TIPS via e-mail and finally uploading files manually. Which leads to delay in customer booking (sometimes), *nostro* booking and reconciliation.

<sup>1</sup> XXXX = ECMS /TIPS / CONS, NNNN = 9999, DDDD = URD/UDFS/UHB

## Change Request form

---

### Submitted annexes / related documents:

---

### Proposed wording for the Change request:

To be clarified during the Detailed Assessment. Stemming from the current PA, a functional impact on both the TIPS UHB and CRDM UDFS has been detected in case option 1 is implemented.

---

### High level description of Impact:

#### Preliminary assessment:

The current implementation, concerning reports, envisions already several mechanisms to mitigate the risk of a failure in the delivery of report towards its recipient. Nevertheless, it is worth reminding that the delivery of a message to its ultimate counterpart is intermediated by the Network Service Providers that are in charge of receiving (and acknowledging) the outbound communication by TIPS and transmitting the payload to the correct recipient.

This mechanism could end-up in a failure at different levels, e.g. for the following reasons:

- 1) Failure in generating the report due to incorrect CRDM configuration;
- 2) Delivery failure detected by the NSP when TIPS is attempting to transmit the report, that ends up into a *Nack*;
- 3) No response at NSP level due to an internal issue when TIPS is attempting to transmit the report;
- 4) Delivery failure at NSP level due to an internal issue, after the NSP replied back to TIPS with an *Ack*;
- 5) Delivery failure at end-user level due to an internal issue, after the NSP replied back to TIPS with an *Ack*.

The CR mainly covers two dimensions of analysis:

- 1) Resend functionality for every Report Type envisaged in TIPS
- 2) Download of the Report payload from the GUI

It is worth to remind that, by design, the report transmission makes use of the *Store-and-Forward* functionality, which guarantees the delivery to the recipient. In case of failure, the participant should first request the resend of the report directly to its selected NSP. The current 4CB proposal, based on the following two alternate implementation options, copes with residual failure scenarios.

#### Option 1: "fully-fledged" implementation

**Cost Impact:** medium

**Impacted modules:** A2A interface, U2A interface, reports, CRDM.

#### **Findings:**

- A new screen shall be developed in the TIPS GUI.
- A new privilege shall be defined at CRDM level.
- Both TIPS UHB and CRDM UDFS would require an adaptation to take on board the proposed changes.
- From an operational standpoint the existing roles shall be amended in order to include the new privilege.
- It should be carefully considered that, potentially, some report types (namely the "Statement of Account") may have a huge size and the file transfer may lead to a very long waiting time for the end-users, with possible high disk occupancy on their infrastructure. This could make necessary to prevent some reports from being downloaded.
- The need to re-access the report content, imply the need to store it into a database accessible through all the TIPS nodes and sites. This lead to further disk space need and an increase of the licensing cost for the database.
- During the preliminary assessment no impact of this CR could be identified on T2S, CSLD and ECMS.
- During the preliminary assessment no security impacts were detected.

## Change Request form

### Open issues/ questions to be clarified by the originator:

- It is deemed helpful for the detailed assessment to assess the list of root-causes that could lead to the generation of a *Nack* from the NSP in order to verify if any improvement in terms of automation can be provided for the above-mentioned scenario 2.

### Option 2: Resend triggered via operational procedure, without provision of the download function

**Cost Impact:** low

**Impacted modules:** A2A interface, reports, new operational tool.

### Findings:

- No need to adapt the functional Scope Defining Documents for both TIPS and CoCo.
- In order to mitigate the performance and usability issues stemming from the management of download functionality via GUI, the option 2 envisions not to offer the download functionality.
- The resend function shall be provided by means of an operational procedure relying on a service request. This solution will be put in place without the need to develop a new dedicated screen.
- The resend is therefore initiated, upon request of the customer, by the TIPS Operator and technically operated by the second level support team.
- In order to reduce to the maximum extent the usage of *Last Level intervention*, the look up and resend functions shall be managed by means of a new operational tool that has to be developed.
- Despite the need of developing a new operational tool, this option will bring a significant reduction of costs compared to option 1, while contemporary removing the risk of performance and usability issues stemming from the download functionality.
- During the preliminary assessment no impact of this CR could be identified on T2S, CSLD and ECMS.
- During the preliminary assessment no security impacts were detected.

### Open issues/ questions to be clarified by the originator:

- Owing at the cost reduction while keeping the solution reliable from a reconciliation viewpoint, the alternate option 2 is proposed, upon condition to be confirmed with the governance body that the download function from the GUI is not deemed critical for the reconciliation activities and can be decommissioned from the scope of this CR.
- Dropping the “download” functionality and implementing the “resend” functionality only would make possible the provision of a re-send mechanism that relies on a new operational procedure involving the Service Desk.

---

### Impacts on other projects and products:

No impact on the other TARGET services is envisaged.

---

### Outcome/Decisions: