

<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> 11/09/2015
<b>Request title:</b> Reuse of historical BICs		<b>Request ref. no:</b> T2S 0553 SYS
<b>Request type:</b> Common		<b>Urgency:</b> Normal
<b>1. Legal/business importance parameter:</b> Low		<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 T2S implementation, as described in business rules DPC1013 and DPU1013, does not allow entering a BIC for a Party if such a BIC is already assigned to another active Party belonging to the same System Entity and having the same Parent BIC.

This includes historical BICs of active Parties. The immediate consequence of this is that it is not possible to reuse a BIC that was used in the past to identify another Level-3 Party in the same System Entity. This is exemplified in the following example.

Party Id	Parent Party Code	Party Code	Party Code Valid From
1	BICABCDEXXX	BICABCDEXXX	2015-06-30
2	BICABCDEXXX	BICDEFDEXXX	2015-06-30

On September 1<sup>st</sup>, Party 1 changes BIC. This leads to the following situation:

Party Id	Parent Party Code	Party Code	Party Code Valid From
1	BICABCDEXXX	BICABCDEXXX	2015-06-30
2	BICABCDEXXX	BICDEFDEXXX	2015-06-30
1	BICABCDEXXX	ABCABCDEXXX	2015-09-01

This means that starting from September 1<sup>st</sup>, Party 1 is identified with the pair BICABCDEXXX/ABCABCDEXXX, while BICABCDEXXX/BICABCDEXXX no longer identifies any Party.

The issue arises supposing Party 2 must be identified with BICABCDEXXX, even from a later date than September 1<sup>st</sup>. The system will reject an attempt to create such a Party code as the same combination already exists in the database.

The same happens if attempting to create a new Party with BIC BICABCDEXXX.

**Description of requested change:**

Given the correct privileges, Party users should be able to modify the Party Code structure by logically deleting historical Party Codes. This would simply set the Party Code deletion status to 'Deleted', keeping the Party Code history for that Party unchanged, but allowing to reuse the BIC for another Party within the same System Entity.

---

**Submitted annexes / related documents**

---

**Proposed wording for the Change request:**

UDFS v2.0 section 4.1 – Index of Business Rules and Error Codes, page 1359

Business Rule DPU1010 to be amended as follows:

When performing a Party Update request, the delete request of a historical (i.e. which has the validity date) "minor" entity (such as Party Name, ~~Party code~~, Party Address) cannot refer to an entity having a past validity date. This does not apply to the Party Code, for which only the currently active entity cannot be deleted.

Business Rule DPU1013 to be amended as follows:

When performing a Party Update request, the 'Party Mnemonic' specified in the Party Code section must not be already assigned, as an active instance, to another active Party belonging to the same System Entity and having the same Parent BIC.

UHB v2.0 section 2.5.1.6 Party - New/Edit Screen - Party code group, page 662

Status: Shows the status of the corresponding party code.

Possible values are:

- Active
- Deleted

Options: Information on functions (icons) can be found in Common Buttons and Icons. Deletion is possible for all items but the current party code. The update is possible for future record only.

UHB v2.0 section 6.4.2.133 – Party – New/Edit Screen (References for error messages), page 2361

Business Rule DPU1010 to be amended as follows:

When performing a party update request, the delete request of a historical (i.e. which has the validity date) "minor" entity (such as party name, ~~Party code~~, party address) cannot refer to an entity having a past validity date. This does not apply to the party code, for which only the currently active entity cannot be deleted.

Business Rule DPU1013 to be amended as follows:

When performing a party update request, the party mnemonic specified in the party code section must not be already assigned, as an active instance, to another active party belonging to the same system entity and having the same Parent BIC.

---

**High level description of Impact:**

---

**Outcome/Decisions:**

- \* CRG meeting of 17-18 September 2015: The CRG recommended the approval of the Change Request and its inclusion to the scope of Release 1.2.
- \* PMG meeting on 13 January 2016: During a written procedure from 30 December 2015 to 13 January 2016, the Project Managers Group was in favour of adding the Change Request to Release 1.2.
- \* OMG on 13 January 2016: During a written procedure from 30 December 2015 to 13 January 2016, the Operations Managers Group did not identify any operational impact. The OMG also was in favour of adding the Change Request to Release 1.2.
- \* Advisory Group's advice on 21 January 2016: The AG was in favour of approving the Change Request and including it in Release 1.2.
- \* CSD Steering Group's resolution on 22 January 2016: The CSG took the resolution to approve the Change Request and to include it in Release 1.2.
- \* CRG meeting of 8-9 February 2016: The CRG recommended to anticipate the Change Request and move it from the T2S Release 1.2 to the T2S Release 1.1.5.
- \* PMG teleconference on 12 February 2016: The Project Managers Group was in favour to anticipate the Change Request and move it from the T2S Release 1.2 to the T2S Release 1.1.5.
- \* OMG on 12 February 2016: During a written procedure from 8 February 2016 to 12 February 2016, the Operations Managers Group was in favour to anticipate the Change Request and move it from the T2S Release 1.2 to the T2S Release 1.1.5.
- \* Advisory Group's advice on 26 February 2016: Following a written procedure from 19 to 26 February 2016, the AG was in favour of the Change Request. The AG also was in favour of moving the Change Request from the T2S Release 1.2 to the T2S Release 1.1.5.
- \* CSG's resolution on 27 February 2016: Following a written procedure from 19 to 27 February 2016, the CSG adopted the resolution to approve the Change Request. The CSG also adopted the resolution to move the Change Request from the T2S Release 1.2 to the T2S Release 1.1.5.