

<b>General Information (Origin of Request)</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> User Requirements (URD) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other User Functional or Technical Documentation (SYS)		
<b>Request raised by:</b> 4CB	<b>Institute:</b> 4CB	<b>Date raised:</b> 12/07/2016
<b>Request title:</b> Managing overlapping of Restriction Types for Security Accounts		<b>Request ref. no:</b> T2S 0627 SYS
<b>Request type:</b> Common		<b>Urgency:</b> Normal
<b>1. Legal/business importance parameter:</b> High	<b>2. Market implementation efforts parameter:</b> Low	
<b>3. Operational/Technical risk parameter:</b> Low	<b>4. Financial impact parameter:</b> No cost impact	
<b>Requestor Category:</b> 4CB	<b>Status:</b> Authorised at Steering Level	

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

The current implementation of the Securities Accounts functionalities foresees that, when creating/updating the associated Restriction Types, the same Restriction Type cannot be applied twice in the same period of time. A specific check is performed in order to avoid that the validity periods of the same Restriction Type can overlap.

This check should be more restrictive when an Earmarking is applied. In fact, the system should prevent the possibility to earmark the Securities Account applying two distinct earmarking restrictions at the same time.

**Description of requested change:**

The current implementation of the Securities Accounts functionalities foresees that, when creating/updating the Restriction Types, the overlapping period is checked as follows:

“In case of request for creation/update of Securities Account Restriction, the restriction type must not overlap with any other Securities Account Restriction already defined or in input flow having the same [Restriction Type]”.

The check for the Restriction Types having the "Securities Position" Object Restriction Type should avoid to overlap any other possible Restriction with the same Object Restriction Type.

For the Restriction Types with Object Restriction Type equal to “Securities Account”, the current check must remain as it is now.

**Submitted annexes / related documents:**

**Proposed wording for the Change request:**

The relevant Business Rules must be amended in the chapters “4.1 Index of Business Rules and Error Codes” of the UDFS and “6.4.2.155 Securities Account - New/Edit Screen” of the UHB.

**DAC1025**

When performing a Securities Account Create request, in case of request for creation of Securities Account Restriction having Object Restriction Type equal to Securities Account, the created restriction type must not overlap with any other Securities Account Restriction in input having the same {Restriction Type}. In case of request for creation of Securities Account Restriction having Object Restriction Type equal to Securities Position, the created restriction type must not overlap with any other Securities Account Restriction in input having the same Object Restriction Type.

**DAU1025**

When performing a Securities Account Update request, in case of request for creation/update of Securities Account Restriction having Object Restriction Type equal to Securities Account, the restriction type must not overlap with any other Securities Account Restriction already defined or in input flow having the same {Restriction Type}. In case of request for creation/update of Securities Account Restriction having Object Restriction Type equal to Securities Position, the restriction type must not overlap with any other Securities Account Restriction already defined or in input flow having the same Object Restriction Type.

**High level description of Impact:**

In the Securities Account create and update functionality, the processing for Business Rules DAC1025 and DAU1025 must be amended in order to avoid overlapping of two Restriction Types having Object Restriction Type equal to Securities Position, whatever their Restriction Type is.

---

**Outcome/Decisions:**

\* CRG on 14 July 2016: During a written procedure from 12 – 14 July 2016, the CRG recommended to launch the detailed assessment on the Change Request.

\* OMG in a written procedure from 5 to 12 August 2016: The Operations Managers Group confirmed that the Change Request does not have any operational impact.

\* Advisory Group on 18 August 2016: Following a written procedure from 12 to 18 August 2016, the Advisory Group was in favour of launching the detailed assessment on the Change Request.

\* CSD Steering Group on 19 August 2016: Following a written procedure from 12 to 19 August 2016, the CSD Steering Group was in favour of launching the detailed assessment on the Change Request.

\* CRG meeting of 6 September 2016: The CRG recommended the approval of the Change Request and its inclusion in the T2S Release 1.3.

\* OMG on 16 September 2016: During a written procedure from to 31 August to 16 September 2016, the Operations Managers Group did not identify any blocking operational impact of the Change Request. The OMG was in favour of adding the Change Request to Release 1.3.

\* Advisory Group on 20 September 2016: Following a written procedure from 14 to 20 September 2016, the AG was in favour of approving the Change Request and its inclusion on T2S Release 1.3.

\* CSD Steering Group on 21 September 2016: During the CSG meeting on 21 September 2016, the CSG adopted the resolution to approve the Change Request and its inclusion on T2S Release 1.3.

**EUROSYSTEM ANALYSIS – GENERAL INFORMATION**

<b>Impact On T2S</b>	<b>Static data management</b>		<b>Interface</b>	
		Party data management		Communication
		Securities data management		Outbound processing
		T2S Dedicated Cash account data management		Inbound processing
	X	Securities account data management		
		Rules and parameters data management		
	<b>Settlement</b>		<b>Liquidity management</b>	
		Standardisation and preparation to settlement		Outbound Information Management
		Night-time Settlement		NCB Business Procedures
		Daytime Recycling and optimisation		Liquidity Operations
		Daytime Validation, provisioning & booking	<b>LCMM</b>	
		Auto-collateralisation		Instructions validation
				Status management
	<b>Operational services</b>			Instruction matching
		Data Migration		Instructions maintenance
		Scheduling	<b>Statistics, queries reports and archive</b>	
		Billing		Report management
		Operational monitoring		Query management
				Statistical information
				Legal archiving
	All modules (Infrastructure request)			
	No modules (infrastructure request)			
	Business operational activities			
	Technical operational activities			

<b>Impact on major documentation</b>				
<b>Document</b>	<b>Chapter</b>		<b>Change</b>	
Impacted GFS chapter				
Impacted UDFS chapter	4.1 Index of Business Rules and Error Codes		Update the text for DAC1025 and DAU1025 as described in the L2 part	
Additional deliveries for Message Specification				
UHB	6.4.2.155 Securities Account - New/Edit Screen		Update the text for DAC1025 and DAU1025 as described in the L2 part	
External training materials				
Other documentations				
Links with other requests				
Links	Reference		Title	
<b>OVERVIEW OF THE IMPACT OF THE REQUEST ON THE T2S SYSTEM AND ON THE PROJECT</b>				
Summary of functional, development, infrastructure and migration impacts				
The check for the Restriction Types having the "Securities Position" Object Restriction Type should avoid overlapping any other possible Restriction with the same Object Restriction Type.				
Summary of project risk				
None.				
Security analysis				
No potentially adverse effect was identified during the security assessment.				