

MARKET CODE / OPERATIONAL CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL

Form
version 2.1

Change Proposal reference
(To be completed by the TP Sec.)

MCCP 125

Version No.

D.1

PART A — SUBMISSION

A.1. GENERAL DETAILS

A.1.a. TITLE

Minor HVI Enhancement

A.1.b. COMPANY

CMA

Change Proposals must be authorised by the person designated by the signatory to the Market Code Framework / Accession Agreement

A.1.c. AUTHORISED
SIGNATURE

NAME

A.1.d. CONTACT NAME

Neil Cohen

CONTACT EMAIL;
TEL/MOB.

Neil.cohen@cmascotland.co.uk
0117 942 3272

A.1.e. ASSOCIATED
MCCP / OCCP

A.1.f. ASSOCIATED
DOCS.

A.1.g. PROPOSED
URGENCY

NON-URGENT

A.1.h. REASONS FOR
URGENCY

The CMA CEO will review this information and make a decision as to whether to take this MCCP / OCCP forward as urgent as defined under Market Code Part 8.9.1

A.2. MCCP / OCCP DETAILS

A.2.a. ISSUE OR DEFECT WHICH THIS MCCP / OCCP SEEKS TO ADDRESS Required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (ii) (b) and 8.8.1 (ii) (b)

CSD 0301 (Annex) identifies the requirement for parties to use unique message IDs for all messages provided to the CMA CS, as follows:

CSD 0301 Annex, Section 3.2 CMA Messages in Detail

The web service operates in an asynchronous manner and is designed to implement long running transactions for the message/response sequences. A Document submitted to the CMA for processing can contain many messages. Each message sent to the CMA and sent back from the CMA must contain a globally unique ID referred to as the Message ID or 'MID'. The Message ID is 16 digits long, the first 6 of which must start with the participants market ID and the seventh should be a '0'. For licensed provider 'PARTIC' an example of valid Message IDs could be PARTIC0000000001, PARTIC0000000002 and PARTIC0999999999. If a message is submitted to the CMA with a duplicate ID it will not be processed.

For LVI submissions, a unique MID is generated (with the form PARTIC1xxxxxxxx).

However, this is not the case for the HVI. If an HVI user sends in a duplicate MID then the CMA CS does not provide notification (other than adding an entry to relevant logging in the CS). This proposal identifies an error message to be provided to the user under a new T009 flow (as the processing for this error differs from that associated with the validation for specific transactions), so that they are aware that a duplicate message ID has been submitted and that such a message will have been rejected by the CS.

A.2.b. DESCRIPTION OF THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE MCCP / OCCP AND HOW IT MEETS THE MARKET CODE / OPERATIONAL CODE OBJECTIVES AND PRINCIPLES FOR THE MARKET DOCUMENTS Required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (ii) (c) and 8.8.1 (ii) (c)

General Description

A T009.4 transaction will be sent to the relevant HVI party if an incoming message from that HVI carries a message ID (MID) that duplicates an existing MID.

Existing functionality will be unchanged, in that a message with a duplicate MID will continue to be rejected by the CMA CS.

Principles and Objectives affected

| PRINCIPLE | AFFECTED (Y/N) | DESCRIPTION |
|--|----------------|--|
| Proportionality | Y | Reduces cost and complexity of using an HVI |
| Transparency | Y | Provides a useful and time-saving message back to HVI users. |
| Simplicity, Cost-effectiveness, and Security | Y | Avoids enquiries following message rejection |
| Non-exclusivity | N | Unaffected |
| Barriers to Entry | Y | Reduces cost and complexity for new HVI users |
| Customer Contact | N | Unaffected |
| Non-discrimination | N | Unaffected |
| Non-detrimental to SW Core Functions | N | Unaffected |
| MC / OC OBJECTIVES | N | Unaffected |

A.2.c. IMPACT Required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (ii) (d), (f) and (g), and 8.8.1 (ii) (d) and (f)

| CONFIGURED ITEM | IMPACTED (Y/N) | DESCRIPTION |
|--------------------|----------------|---|
| MC / OC | N | |
| CSDs | Y | CSD 0301 to be updated with a new T009.4 transaction, with a new error code |
| Wholesale Services | N | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Agreements | | |
| Licenses | N | |
| CMA Central Systems | Y | Accommodate a new transaction. |
| CMA business processes | N | |
| Trading Party systems | Y | Accommodate a new transaction. |
| Trading party business processes | N | |

A.2.d. DRAFT LEGAL TEXT
 Required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (ii) (d) and 8.8.1 (ii) (d)

CSD 0301 should be amended to include the following additional transaction (also identifying a new data item) and error code:

Transaction

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------|
| Transaction Number | T009.4 | |
| Transaction Name | Error / Notification | |
| From | CMA | |
| To | SW/LP | |
| DI # | Name | FLAG |
| D1009 | Duplicate Message ID | RQ |
| D4004 | Error/Return Code | RQ |
| Description | This transaction notifies the sending party of the rejection of a message with a duplicate MID. | |

Data Item

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Data Item Number: | D1009 |
| Data Item Name: | Duplicate Message ID |
| Data Item Logical Type: | string |
| Member of unique serial set: | no |
| Member of Valid Set: | no |
| Data Group: | System |
| Correction Method: | n/a |
| Data Owner: | n/a |
| Description: | Identifies the MID that has been duplicated |
| Further Details: | n/a |

Error Code

ZZ MID already exists.

| |
|---|
| A.3. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS |
| A.3.a. PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE OR LEAD TIME Timescale must not overlap with the period of consultation with the Commission and should take account of the impacts identified in Section A.2.c. Any quoted lead time should commence from date of Approval. |
| September 2013 Release. |
| A.3.b. ANY LIMITATIONS OR DEPENDENCIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION |
| |
| A.4. ANY OTHER COMMENTS |
| The error code identified (ZZ) may be changed during the release project, to suit the overall error code choices. Any such changes would be captured by MCCP 122, which will consolidate CSD drafting for the release. |

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------|
| PART B — TP ASSESSMENT | | | |
| B.1. ASSESSMENT PROCESS | | | |
| B.1.a. ASSESSMENT START DATE | yyyy-mm-dd | ASSESSMENT END DATE | yyyy-mm-dd |
| B.1.b. IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENT | IA REQUIRED/IA NOT REQUIRED | | |
| B.1.c. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT | TP CONSULTATION REQUIRED/TP CONSULTATION NOT REQUIRED | | |
| B.1.d. ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS (to this Part B) | | | |
| B.2. ASSESSMENT DETAILS | | | |
| B.2.a. CHANGE SPECIFICATION AND IMPACT (if different from that originally submitted) | | | |
| | | | |
| B.2.b. DRAFT LEGAL TEXT (if different from that originally submitted) | | | |
| | | | |
| B.2.c. TP ASSESSMENT | | | |

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Taking into account complexity, importance and urgency, and having regard to whether or not such proposal is within the relevant Objectives and Principles as required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (v) and 8.8.1 (iv) | |
| Impact on Principles and Objectives (if different from that originally submitted) | |
| Cost Estimate | £2-3K |
| Benefit Estimate (L: < 10k, M: £10k to £100k, H: > £100k) | |
| B.3. TP DECISION | TP APPROVED |
| B.4. FINAL TP VIEWS | |
| B.5. PLANNED IMPLEMENTATION DATE | September 2013 Release |

| | |
|------------------------|----|
| WITHDRAWN BY PROPOSER? | No |
| COMMENTS | |
| DATE OF WITHDRAWAL | |

| PART C — COMMISSION APPROVAL | |
|---|----------------------------|
| C.1. DATE FINAL REPORT ISSUED TO COMMISSION | 16 July 2013 |
| C.2. APPROVAL STATUS | APPROVED CHANGE / REJECTED |
| C.3. DATE OF APPROVAL STATUS | yyyy-mm-dd |
| C.4. COMMISSION RESPONSE REFERENCE | |

PART D — IMPLEMENTATION

D.1. IMPLEMENTATION DATE

2013-09-26

D.2. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

(MC version, CSD versions, CMA Central Systems release number, etc.)

CS v3.6