

<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> Migration Sub-group	<b>Institute:</b> ECB	<b>Date raised:</b> 17/02/2014
<b>Request title:</b> Locking and unlocking of DCP users		<b>Request ref. no:</b> T2S 0451 SYS
<b>Request type:</b> Common	<b>Urgency:</b> Normal	
<b>1. Legal/business importance parameter:</b> Critical	<b>2. Market implementation efforts parameter:</b> Low	
<b>3. Operational/Technical risk parameter:</b> Low	<b>4. Financial impact parameter:</b> Low	
<b>Requestor Category:</b> T2S Sub-group	<b>Status:</b> Authorised at Steering level	

**Reason for change / expected benefits / business case:**

During the migration weekend it has to be ensured by technical means that no instructions from DCPs (migrated and migrating, cash and securities) will enter T2S before the "Point of No Return" (PoNR). For example, settlement instructions from DCPs could lead to an uncontrolled processing and will have negative implications on the reconciliation of settlement instructions of migrating CSDs. This means that reconciliation will take additional time on the CSDs side which could not be estimated and might result in a delay of migration processes or even worse in a stepping out of one CSD or postponement of the whole migration wave. Complex queries run by DCPs during the migration weekend may have adverse impact on the capacity available for CSD / CB processes and therefore increase the time required for the critical path.

To prevent the consequences mentioned above, a technical process has to be established which ensures the rejection of settlement instructions which might be sent erroneously by DCPs before the PoNR by locking out all the users belonging to DCPs. Although the exact number of users belonging to DCPs is not yet known, even conservative assumptions<sup>1</sup> will result in a high number of user accounts that cannot be locked in a manual way anymore. As there is no A2A message that would allow such a change and the DMT is not supporting maintenance activities, a centralized and automatic solution run by the T2S Operator is deemed to be the most effective solution in terms of complexity for the implementation and time needed for the execution. Moreover, the centralized and automatic solution aims to mitigate the risk of adding additional activities for CSDs and CBs on the migration weekend timeline which is already time critical. Manual solutions would furthermore bare the risk that by accident not all users of a DCP are locked.

Other solutions like intra-day restrictions on parties were already considered as not feasible.

**Description of Request:**

The T2S Operator should have the means to centrally change the "lockout status" for all users not directly belonging to a system entity (i.e. CSD, Central Bank or T2S Operator). As there is no fixed timing for locking those users and unlocking users again, a related activity will be included in the Migration Weekend Playbook to ensure a proper management of the dependencies. The timing of locking the users will take into consideration the need of the DCPs' that they perform all necessary activities (e.g. static data upload in the context of client-collateralization) well prior to this approximate timing in order to avoid the risk that their messages will be rejected. If possible from an overall timing perspective, also the sending of internal liquidity transfers between DCAs might be taken into account. The locking and unlocking, respectively, should be done at the same time for all users, without taking into account the former "locking status" (all users will be unlocked even if they were locked before the migration weekend).

<sup>1</sup> As of 16.10.2013, 31 institutions are willing to become a DCP. With the assumption that an average of 32 users may exist per institution, up to 1000 users have to be locked/ unlocked depending on the migration wave.

With the locking of all users belonging to DCPs (migrated and migrating), any communication, not only settlement instructions, originating from DCPs (via U2A and A2A) to T2S will become impossible and all A2A and U2A messages from DCPs with their already migrated CSD, with their migrating CSD (including settlement instructions) as well as with their CB will be rejected immediately (admi.007 message is returned). Any U2A interaction with the T2S-GUI (including queries, reports etc.) would also be impossible during the "lockout". Outbound messages originated in the T2S System will not be affected by the locking.

Locking of DCP users

Requirement ID	T2S MG.LUSR.010
----------------	-----------------

The T2S Operator should be able to lock according to the migration weekend plan all users that do not belong to a system entity (i.e. CSD, Central Bank, or T2S Operator).

Unlocking of DCP users

Requirement ID	T2S MG.LUSR.020
----------------	-----------------

The T2S Operator should be able to unlock according to the migration weekend plan all users that do not belong to a system entity (i.e. CSD, Central Bank, or T2S Operator) without requiring a password reset from the user at the next logon.

---

**Submitted annexes / related documents:**

---

**Proposed wording for the SYS Change request:**

---

**Outcome/Decisions:**

- \* Migration Sub-group on 17-18 February 2014: The Migration Sub-group agreed to raise a CR for locking and unlocking of DCP users. Following a subsequent written procedure, the Migration Sub-group fine-tuned the wording of the Change Request and agreed to submit it to the Change Review Group.
- \* CRG Telco of 14 March 2014: The CRG decided to launch the detailed assessment on the Change Request provided that the Migration Sub-group re-confirms the Change Request at its meeting on 17-18 March 2014.
- \* Migration Sub-group on 17-18 March 2014: The Migration Sub-group confirmed the current scope/wording of Change Request T2S-0451-SYS.
- \* CRG meeting on 28 May 2014: The CRG recommended the approval of the Change Request.
- \* Advisory Group's advice on 20 June 2014: The AG was in favour of the Change Request via written procedure
- \* CSG meeting on 2-3 July 2014: The CSG adopted the resolution to approve the Change Request.