| Institution name | CAIXABANK | [Please provide the name of your institution] |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| Deliverable Name | TARGET Instant Payments Settlement User Requirements | |
| Version No. | 0.1 | 1 - Please fill in your Institution name 2 - Select a Section for your comment |
| Document sent for | 9 January 2017 | |
| review on Feedback by | 24 February 2017 | 4 - Write your comment |
| T COUDACK Dy | 241 Coldary 2011 | |

| No | Commented by | Page | Section | Requirement ID | Name | Comment |
|----|--------------|------|--|--|-----------------|--|
| | | | [Please provide a Section by the use of the 'drop-down' list] | [Please provide a requirement ID by the use of the 'drop-down' list] | | [Please provide your input] |
| 1 | CAIXABANK | 6 | 2.3 LIQUIDITY MANAGEMENT | General | General Comment | Page 13. TIPS service shall allow the transfer of funds between an RTGS account and a TIPS account during the operating hours of the RTGS, provided that both accounts are denominated in the same currency. It may be wise widening Target2 operating hours in order to ensure 'real' 24/7/365 capabilities not only for peer-to-peer payment orders but also for interbank payments. |
| | CAIXABANK | 7 | 2.4 MANAGEMENT OF ACCOUNTS AND REFERENCE DATA | General | General Comment | Page 13. Management of accounts and Reference data. Reachable Parties need to maintain contractual agreements with Participants in order to use their TIPS accounts for settlement. Similarly Participants need to have contractual arrangements with the Instructing Parties who can instruct on their behalf. ECB should consider that how relationships are fixed between different entities could be out of scope of the functional design of TIPS; obviously, TIPS should be aware about the kind of relationship that different Participants have for its correct management but we're not sure that should need to define how this relationship is instrumented. Is TIPS going to check all contracts established bilaterally between Participants or it just have to be informed about linkages agreed? |
| ; | CAIXABANK | 7 | 2.5 QUERIES AND REPORTING | General | General Comment | Queries and reports. Page 13. More definition should be specified on future drafts in order to let eventual Participants analyze whether reports are sufficient for their needs. From our point of view, reports should include balance at a certain moment in time, instant payment orders correctly settled on the period of analysis, IPOs 'in flight' at the closure of the period, graphical analysis of liquidity along the period and some others. |
| | CAIXABANK | 8 | 3.1 OVERVIEW | Figure 1 | Payment process | There is an apparent inconsistency on description of TIPS' workflow between figure 1 on page 14 and flow as described on 2.2. (Settlement of Payment Transaction) page 12, despite complete explanation is provided on 3.1. Description might be harmonized between all figures depicting the workflow of TIPS. |

| 5 | CAIXABANK | 8 | 3.1 OVERVIEW | General | General Comment | Page 14. Step DS-2 for SCTinst does not include any Participant's/Beneficiary's account/CMB dedicated-field and does not seem to mention eventual additional fields to do so. In case that a specific field initially defined to include other kind of information could be used to indicate acct/CMB number, 'User Requirement Document' would need to specify which. |
|---|-----------|----|------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 6 | CAIXABANK | 10 | 3.2 PAYMENT PROCESSING | General | General Comment | There seems to be a different treatment between payment orders transactions as described in point 3.2.2. (page 19) if compared with funding/defunding transactions (4.1page 40). While 3.2.2 . Page 19 Document states 'Prior settlement funds are reserved on the TIPS account to be debited in order to ensure that the settlement process cannot fail at a later stage due to insufficient funds' on 4.1.(page 40) when defining workflow of Outbound liquidity transfers it states that they are 'triggered in TIPS by authorised Participants or Instructing Parties using a liquidity transfer order message. After necessary validations have been performed TIPS transfers the requested amount from the source TIPS account to a (technical) transit account; there is no reservation of funds '. Reservation of funds for payment order transactions and no reservation for liquidity transfers; is that so? |
| 7 | CAIXABANK | 13 | 3.2 PAYMENT PROCESSING | TIPS.UR.03.050 | Authorisation to send payment transactions | 3.2.3. TIPS.UR.03.050. Page 19. Authorization to send payments. If an attempt to effect an Instant Payment by an unauthorized party, occurs, besides rejecting the order, owner of the account that has suffered that potentially fraudulent payment should also be adviced. |
| 8 | CAIXABANK | 15 | 3.2 PAYMENT PROCESSING | TIPS.UR.03.080 | Existence of Beneficiary Participant | TIPS.UR.03.080 Page 21. Existence of beneficiary Participant. We understand that control designed is correct, but it would be very useful for Participants to be provided with a list of reachable entities, so that they could act before issuing the IP (by not effecting the payment through TIPS). |
| 9 | CAIXABANK | 18 | 3.2 PAYMENT PROCESSING | TIPS.UR.03.200 | Waiting for a Beneficiary Participant reply | 3.2.6. TIPS.UR.03.200 'Waiting for Beneficiary Participant Reply'. Page 24. Document states: The payment transaction remains pending until a positive (acceptance of the payment) or negative (rejection of the payment) reply is received and settlement takes place (only for positive replies). This is incorrect: TIPS should reject payment if a time-out due to lack of answer from Beneficiary Participant occurs. Instant Payment transaction cannot be held pending from this answer. Besides it is inconsistent with next Requirement (TIPS.UR.03.210), that states that: In case the timeout is reached, the payment cannot be processed within the required timespan and has to be rejected. |