



EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK

EUROSYSTEM

T2S CHANGE REQUEST FORM		
<b>General Information (Origin of Request)</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> User Requirements (URD) or GUI Business Functionality Document (BFD) <input type="checkbox"/> Other User Functional or Technical Documentation (SYS)		
<b>Request raised by:</b> Clearstream	<b>Institute:</b> CSD	<b>Date raised:</b> 19/11/2019
<b>Request title:</b> Introduce Reason Code as Parameter for T2S Message Subscription Logic		<b>Request No.:</b> T2S 0723 URD
<b>Request type:</b> Common	<b>Classification:</b> Scope Enhancement	<b>Urgency:</b> Normal
<b>1. Legal/business importance parameter:</b> High <sup>1</sup>		<b>2. Market implementation efforts parameter:</b> Low <sup>2</sup>
<b>3. Operational/Technical risk parameter:</b> Low <sup>3</sup>		<b>4. Financial impact parameter:</b> high <sup>4</sup>
<b>Requestor Category:</b> CSD		<b>Status:</b> Proposed for a Release

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

T2S Message Subscription Logic supports a wide set of parameters that can be used within a message subscription. Amongst them are “Message Status” and “Instruction Status”:

- Via “Message Status”, a T2S Actor can subscribe (or unsubscribe) to messages which report a specific status. E.g. for sese.024 Securities Settlement Transaction Status Advices it is possible to subscribe to messages which report processing status, or to messages which report matching status or to messages which report settlement status.
- Via “Instruction Status”, a T2S Actor can subscribe (or unsubscribe) in a more granular way for specific status values, e.g. for matching status to messages reporting “matched” status only (i.e. no “unmatched” matching status<sup>5</sup>), or for settlement status for messages reporting “pending” status only (i.e. no “failing” settlement status<sup>6</sup>).

An additional differentiation beyond “Instruction Status” is not supported by T2S Message Subscription logic, i.e. for a given “Instruction Status” it is not possible to subscribe (or unsubscribe) to status messages with a specific status reason code. However, such additional granularity would be very helpful to allow fine tuning of the Message Subscriptions on T2S to which types of status messages are really needed on the T2S Actor side.

For example, a T2S Actor might not want to receive status messages relating to a specific status reason code. Possible scenarios (non-exhaustive):

- sese.024 with settlement status “pending/failing” and reason PART: A T2S Actor might want to rely solely on the settlement confirmations sese.025 PAIN which always arrive in conjunction with the sese.024 “pending.PART” and which already imply there is a pending remaining part.
- sese.024 with settlement status “pending/failing” and reason INBC: A T2S Actor might have implemented a pool counting logic internally, and then there would be no need for such messages from T2S.
- sese.024 with settlement status “pending/failing” and reason PRCY if those were instructed already matched by the T2S Actor: In this case, the PRCY status can alternatively be derived from the hold reporting on the counter-leg which will also be sent to this actor in the already matched scenario.
- sese.024 with settlement status “pending/failing” and reason NORE: A T2S Actor might not want to receive such messages, as they contain limited business information.

To enable the T2S Actors to (un-)subscribe to such messages, T2S should enable a message subscription on status reason code level.

<sup>1</sup> Legal/business importance: *High* - By allowing unsubscribing from messages on a more granular basis, the CR could contribute to reduce the volume of messages sent by T2S, but not needed by T2S users

<sup>2</sup> Market implementation efforts: *Low* – no adaptation is needed on T2S actors side

<sup>3</sup> Operation/technical risk: *Low* – The CR is an enhancement of an existing functionality

<sup>4</sup> Financial impact parameter: *400kEUR < High < 700kEUR*

<sup>5</sup> It should be noted that T2S supports two different instruction status values for matching status: “matched” and “unmatched” (introduced with T2S CR614). However, only instruction status “matched” can be used in message subscription rules. See UDFS v4.2, page 212.

<sup>6</sup> It should be noted that T2S supports two different instruction status values for settlement status: “pending” and “failing” (introduced with T2S CR609). However, only instruction status “pending” can be used in message subscription rules. See UDFS v4.2, page 212.

**Description of requested change:**

The list of Message Subscription Parameter Types (UDFS v4.2, table 81) should be extended by one additional parameter:

- Instruction Status Reason Code

This parameter is relevant for outgoing messages only and within those messages (UDFS v4.2, table 83) only for the following message types:

- sese.024 "Securities Settlement Transaction Status Advice"
- semt.014 "Intra Position Movement Status Advice"
- camt.067 "Intra Balance Movement Status Advice"

Within such messages, the parameter would only refer to the reason codes relating to "pending" and "failing" settlement status. In other words, the mapping between applicable parameter types and message fields (UDFS v4.2, table 84) would be as follows:

APPLICABLE PARAMETER TYPE	TYPE OF CHECK	MESSAGE	MESSAGE FIELD
Instruction Status Reason Code	Direct	Sese.024	SctiesSttlmTxStsAdvc/SttlmSts/Pdg/NoSpfcdRsn
			SctiesSttlmTxStsAdvc/SttlmSts/Pdg/Rsn/Cd/Cd
			SctiesSttlmTxStsAdvc/SttlmSts/FIng/NoSpfcdRsn
			SctiesSttlmTxStsAdvc/SttlmSts/FIng/Rsn/Cd/Cd
		Semt.014	IntraPosMvmntStsAdvc/SttlmSts/Pdg/NoSpfcdRsn
			IntraPosMvmntStsAdvc/SttlmSts/Pdg/Rsn/Cd/Cd
			IntraPosMvmntStsAdvc/SttlmSts/FIng/NoSpfcdRsn
			IntraPosMvmntStsAdvc/SttlmSts/FIng/Rsn/Cd/Cd
		Camt.067	IntraBalMvmntStsAdvc/SttlmSts/Pdg/NoSpfcdRsn
			IntraBalMvmntStsAdvc/SttlmSts/Pdg/Rsn/Cd/Cd
			IntraBalMvmntStsAdvc/SttlmSts/FIng/NoSpfcdRsn
			IntraBalMvmntStsAdvc/SttlmSts/FIng/Rsn/Cd/Cd

The fields to be mapped per message type are mutually exclusive, i.e. within a given message, only one of the four possible paths will be filled.

However, the pending and failing reason codes can be repetitive, and can occur in combination with other "Message Status" and "Instruction Status" values. E.g.:

- "Pending" status can occur in combination with "Accepted" status in scenario "Accepted with hold",
- "Pending" status can occur in combination with "Unmatched" status in scenario "Party hold" for unmatched instructions (CR614),
- "Pending" status can occur repetitively in case of various reasons why an instruction is pending (e.g. PREA + CSDH in case an instruction was submitted with Party Hold and with CSD Hold).

To deal with this specific case of potentially repetitive status and status reasons, the following logic should be applied in case of positive and negative message subscription rules that contain "Instruction Status Reason Code" as parameter:

- Positive Rules: here standard logic applies, i.e. in case of a message subscription containing, potentially amongst other parameters, the "Instruction Status Reason Code" with a specific reason value, then the message should be sent if at least one of the reason codes in any of the repetitive sequences for pending/failing reasons equals the subscription parameter.
- Negative Rules: here additional logic is needed to ensure that T2S only filters out those messages which exclusively contain the information that should not be sent. However, if the message contains additional information, e.g. an additional processing status or matching status, then it should not be filtered, i.e. it should be sent. This implies additional conditions on the non-existence of other "Message Status" sequences in the message, and on the non-existence of other reportable status reasons. Namely, in case of a negative message subscription containing "Instruction Status Reason Code" as parameter, the message should not be sent if both of the following conditions apply (else it should be sent – assuming there is a positive rule to that effect):
  - The message contains only "Settlement Status" on message status level, i.e. the message does not report any other message status (such as "Processing Status" or "Matching Status"), unless such

additional status sequences were requested in the subscription rule via additional "Message Status" parameters or implicitly via "Instruction Status" parameters.

- In case the message contains more than one "pending/failing" status reason code, all "pending/failing" status reason codes must match the rule.

In case the Message Subscription rule contains multiple values for the "Instruction Status Reason Code", those should be treated with the normal OR logic in T2S, i.e. the rule is matched if any of those values applies. This means:

- For Positive rules, the rule is matched if at least one of the "pending/failing" reason codes in any of the repetitive sequences is within the requested set of "Instruction Status Reason Codes".
- For Negative rules, the rule is matched if all "pending/failing" reason codes in any of the repetitive sequences are within the set of requested "Instruction Status Reason Codes".

Some artificial examples might illustrate this logic:

**Example 1: Negative Message Subscription rule with one parameter "Instruction Status Reason Code" = "CSDH"**

In this example, an (admittedly theoretical) negative message subscription is configured to not send messages containing pending or failing status reason code "CSDH". The message subscription rule would contain only one parameter:

- "Instruction Status Reason Code" = "CSDH",

The following table shows for some messaging scenarios when the messages should be sent and when not:

Scenario	Evaluation	Explanation
Sese.024 Accepted with CSD Hold, instruction sent unmatched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>• Matching Status = UNMATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement status not exclusive: message contains also Processing and Matching status.</li> </ul>
Sese.024 Accepted with CSD Hold, instruction sent already matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>• Matching Status = MATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement status not exclusive: message contains also Processing and Matching status.</li> </ul>
Sese.024 Accepted with Party Hold and CSD Hold, instruction sent unmatched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>• Matching Status = UNMATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: PREA, CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement status not exclusive: message contains also Processing and Matching status.</li> <li>• Status reason code "CSDH" not exclusive, the message contains also "PREA" reason.</li> </ul>
Sese.024 Accepted with Party Hold and CSD Hold, instruction sent already matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>• Matching Status = MATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: PREA, CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement status not exclusive: message contains also Processing and Matching status</li> <li>• Status reason code "CSDH" not exclusive, the message contains also "PREA" reason.</li> </ul>
Sese.024 CSDH, instruction still unmatched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matching Status = UNMATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement status not exclusive: message contains also Matching status</li> </ul>
Sese.024 CSDH, after the instruction was matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	<b>OK =&gt;</b> <b>Not to be sent</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement status exclusive</li> <li>• Status reason code "CSDH" reported and exclusive</li> </ul>
Sese.024 CSDH, instruction is already matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	<b>OK =&gt;</b> <b>Not to be sent</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement status exclusive</li> <li>• Status reason code "CSDH" reported and exclusive.</li> </ul>

In case the T2S Actor would like to prevent T2S from sending the sese.024 CSDH also in the unmatched case (5<sup>th</sup>

scenario), an additional rule with the additional parameter “Message Status = Matching status” can be configured.<sup>7</sup> The following example shows how such case should be handled by T2S:

**Example 2: Negative Message Subscription rule with parameters “Message Status = Matching Status” and “Instruction Status Reason Code” = “CSDH”**

In this example, the same rule as in example 1 is configured, however, now in combination with “Message Status = Matching Status”. I.e. the rule contains two parameters:

- “Message status” = “Matching status”
- “Instruction Status Reason Code” = “CSDH”,

With this rule, the message should not be sent if it contains a “Matching Status” and in addition the requested “Instruction Status Reason Code” (in the settlement status reporting).

For this rule, the evaluation for the same scenarios as above would show the following results:

Scenario	Evaluation	Explanation
Sese.024 Accepted with CSD Hold, instruction sent unmatched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>• Matching Status = UNMATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matching status reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Beyond Matching status (which was requested in the rule), Settlement status not exclusive: message contains also Processing status =&gt; KO</li> </ul>
Sese.024 Accepted with CSD Hold, instruction sent already matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>• Matching Status = MATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matching status reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Beyond Matching status (which was requested in the rule), Settlement status not exclusive: message contains also Processing status =&gt; KO</li> </ul>
Sese.024 Accepted with Party Hold and CSD Hold, instruction sent unmatched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>• Matching Status = UNMATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: PREA, CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matching status reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Beyond Matching status (which was requested in the rule), Settlement status not exclusive: message contains also Processing status =&gt; KO</li> <li>• Status reason code “CSDH” not exclusive, the message contains also “PREA” reason =&gt; KO</li> </ul>
Sese.024 Accepted with Party Hold and CSD Hold, instruction sent already matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>• Matching Status = MATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: PREA, CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matching status reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Beyond Matching status (which was requested in the rule), Settlement status not exclusive: message contains also Processing status =&gt; KO</li> <li>• Status reason code “CSDH” not exclusive, the message contains also “PREA” reason</li> </ul>
Sese.024 CSDH, instruction still unmatched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matching Status = UNMATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	<b>OK =&gt;</b> <b>Not to be sent</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matching status reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Beyond Matching status (which was requested in the rule), Settlement status exclusive =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Status reason code “CSDH” reported and exclusive =&gt; OK</li> </ul>
Sese.024 CSDH, after the instruction was matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Message does not contain matching status</li> </ul>
Sese.024 CSDH, instruction is already matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Message does not contain matching status</li> </ul>

In case T2S Actors would also like to filter out the messages in the first two scenarios, they need to configure a messages subscription rule with three parameters: “Message Status”, “Instruction Status” and “Instruction Status Reason Code”:

<sup>7</sup> The straightforward approach to implement a rule with “Instruction Status” = “unmatched” is not possible, as this instruction status is not supported in the message subscription rules.

**Example 3: Negative Message Subscription rule with parameters “Message Status = Matching Status”, “Instruction Status” = ACCEPTED and “Instruction Status Reason Code” = “CSDH”**

In this example, a negative message subscription rule with three parameters is configured:

- “Message status” = “Matching status”,
- “Instruction status” = ACCEPTED,
- “Instruction Status Reason Code” = “CSDH”.

In other words, a message should be filtered out if it contains a matching status, the “ACCEPTED” instruction status and in addition the requested “Instruction Status Reason Code” = CSDH (in the settlement status reporting).

For this rule, the evaluation for the same scenarios as above would show the following results:

Scenario	Evaluation	Explanation
Sese.024 Accepted with CSD Hold, instruction sent unmatched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>• Matching Status = UNMATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	<b>OK =&gt; Not to be sent</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matching status reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Instruction status “ACCEPTED” reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Beyond Matching status (which was requested in the rule) and Processing status (which is a consequence of instruction status “ACCEPTED” which was requested in the rule), settlement status is exclusive =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Status reason code “CSDH” reported and exclusive =&gt; OK</li> </ul>
Sese.024 Accepted with CSD Hold, instruction sent already matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>• Matching Status = MATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	<b>OK =&gt; Not to be sent</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matching status reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Instruction status “ACCEPTED” reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Beyond Matching status (which was requested in the rule) and Processing status (which is a consequence of instruction status “ACCEPTED” which was requested in the rule), settlement status is exclusive =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Status reason code “CSDH” reported and exclusive =&gt; OK</li> </ul>
Sese.024 Accepted with Party Hold and CSD Hold, instruction sent unmatched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>• Matching Status = UNMATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: PREA, CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status reason code “CSDH” not exclusive, the message contains also “PREA” reason =&gt; KO</li> </ul>
Sese.024 Accepted with Party Hold and CSD Hold, instruction sent already matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>• Matching Status = MATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: PREA, CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status reason code “CSDH” not exclusive, the message contains also “PREA” reason =&gt; KO.</li> </ul>
Sese.024 CSDH, instruction still unmatched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matching Status = UNMATCHED</li> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matching status reported. =&gt; OK</li> <li>• Message does not contain instruction status “ACCEPTED” =&gt; KO</li> </ul>
Sese.024 CSDH, after the instruction was matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Message does not contain matching status.</li> <li>• Message does not contain instruction status “ACCEPTED”</li> </ul>
Sese.024 CSDH, instruction is already matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>• Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Message does not contain matching status.</li> <li>• Message does not contain instruction status “ACCEPTED”</li> </ul>

**Example 4: Negative Message Subscription rule with parameters “Message Status = Matching Status”, “Instruction Status” = ACCEPTED and “Instruction Status Reason Code” = “PREA, CSDH”**

This example illustrates the logic in case the rule contains multiple “Instruction Status Reason Codes”. In this example, a negative rule is configured with three parameters whereby the “Instruction Status Reason Code” has two values, CSDH and PREA:

- “Message status” = “Matching status”,
- “Instruction status” = ACCEPTED,
- “Instruction Status Reason Code” = “CSDH, PREA”.

For this rule, the evaluation for some example scenarios would show the following results:

Scenario	Evaluation	Explanation
Sese.024 Accepted with CSD Hold, instruction sent unmatched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>Matching Status = UNMATCHED</li> <li>Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>Status Reason Code: CSDH</li> </ul>	<b>OK =&gt; Not to be sent</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matching status reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>Instruction status "ACCEPTED" reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>Beyond Matching status (which was requested in the rule) and Processing status (which is a consequence of instruction status "ACCEPTED" which was requested in the rule), settlement status is exclusive =&gt; OK</li> <li>All status reason codes are within the expected set "CSDH, PREA" =&gt; OK</li> </ul>
Sese.024 Accepted with CSD Hold and CVAL, instruction sent already matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>Matching Status = MATCHED</li> <li>Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>Status Reason Code: CSDH, CVAL</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matching status reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>Instruction status "ACCEPTED" reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>Beyond Matching status (which was requested in the rule) and Processing status (which is a consequence of instruction status "ACCEPTED" which was requested in the rule), settlement status is exclusive =&gt; OK</li> <li>Not all status reason codes are within the expected set "CSDH, PREA" (due to the additional CVAL) =&gt; KO</li> </ul>
Sese.024 Accepted with Party Hold and CSD Hold, instruction sent unmatched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>Matching Status = UNMATCHED</li> <li>Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>Status Reason Code: PREA, CSDH</li> </ul>	<b>OK =&gt; Not to be sent</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matching status reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>Instruction status "ACCEPTED" reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>Beyond Matching status (which was requested in the rule) and Processing status (which is a consequence of instruction status "ACCEPTED" which was requested in the rule), settlement status is exclusive =&gt; OK</li> <li>All status reason codes are within the expected set "CSDH, PREA" =&gt; OK</li> </ul>
Sese.024 Accepted with Party Hold, CSD Hold and CVAL, instruction sent already matched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processing Status = ACCEPTED</li> <li>Matching Status = MATCHED</li> <li>Settlement Status = PENDING</li> <li>Status Reason Code: PREA, CSDH, CVAL</li> </ul>	KO => To be sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matching status reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>Instruction status "ACCEPTED" reported =&gt; OK</li> <li>Beyond Matching status (which was requested in the rule) and Processing status (which is a consequence of instruction status "ACCEPTED" which was requested in the rule), settlement status is exclusive =&gt; OK</li> <li>Not all status reason codes are within the expected set "CSDH, PREA" (due to the additional CVAL) =&gt; KO</li> </ul>

### Limitations

The examples above show that with the suggested logic it is also possible to filter out specific messages in scenarios that contain various status information (processing, matching, settlement) in parallel. However, it should also be noted that there might be combinations of status which cannot be covered by such rules. For example, it will not be possible to specifically exclude just the first scenario "*Sese.024 Accepted with CSD Hold, instruction sent unmatched*" only<sup>8</sup>. Such limitations are considered acceptable, to limit the complexity and implementation impact of the CR.

Another limitation is that it will not be possible to filter out only those messages that contain a specific set of more than one status reasons (e.g. only those that have PREA and CSDH reasons). This is a consequence of the OR logic to be applied in case of a rule with multiple "Instruction Status Reason Codes". Again, this limitation is considered acceptable, as the value added of such logic is rather small while the additional complexity would be quite high.

### Submitted annexes / related documents:

---

<sup>8</sup> This is a consequence of the fact that "Unmatched" is an instruction status which cannot be used in subscription rules. Same limitation applied for "Failing" settlement status.

**Outcome/Decisions:**

---

- \* CRG on 27 November 2019: The CRG agreed to launch the preliminary assessment of CR-723.
- \* CRG on 22 January 2020: The CRG agreed to launch the preliminary assessment.
- \* CRG on 26 May 2020: The CRG took note of the results of the preliminary assessment of CR-723, and agreed to recommend the CR for authorisation by the T2S Steering Level.
- \* AMI-SeCo on 8 June 2020: The AMI-SeCo has agreed to the recommendation of the CRG to authorise this Change Request.
- \* CSG on 9 June 2020: The CSG authorised CR-723 for allocation to a T2S release.
- \* NECSG on 10 June 2020: The CSG authorised CR-723 for allocation to a T2S release.
- \* MIB on 15 June 2020: The MIB authorised the CR for ranking and allocation to a T2S release.
- \* PMG on 08 July 2021: the PMG launched the detailed assessment of CR-723 in view of R6.0

**Documentation to be updated:**

---

**URD****11.10.1 Message subscription service**

[ section to be updated in particular the table "List of Attributes for the Entity Message Subscription Rule" ]

**Preliminary assessment:**

---

**Impact:** high

**Impacted modules:** INTF, SDMG (CRDM), LTSI/LEA (DWH/LEA)

**Findings:**

- Currently status messages are sent/not sent if one of the configured message subscription rules matches. It is not foreseen to check on the occurrence of different message fields to decide if the rule should match or not. Therefore a new message subscription logic needs to be implemented with this CR.
- The new logic for the evaluation of negative rules could hamper the performance of the message subscription checks as it will become more complex. The performance impact will be evaluated in detail during the detailed assessment of this CR.
- Inclusion of a new parameter type and cross-validations with possible message types in SDMG will be required.
- During the preliminary assessment no impact of this CR could be identified on TIPS, CSLD and ECMS.

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

- The understanding is that no new cross-validations between different parameters or parameter values are required at configuration level. In other words, as it is the case in the current functionality, it will be possible to input any combination of existing and new parameter types (possibly leading to configurations which do not match any possible message). The correct use of parameter types is left to the user.

**Detailed assessment:**

---