

| N  | Page | Subsection  | Original Text   | Comment   | Status        | Feedback to CG                                 |
|----|------|---|---|---|---------------|--|
| 11 | 13   | 1.3.1. Technical monitoring                                   | with technical monitoring tool to check the status >  | "with technical monitoring tools to check the status"   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 24 | 14   | 1.5.1. Introduction   | The network infrastructure authenticates the technical sender and authorises the technical sender to connect to TIPS. All A2A communication has to be encrypted and can be compressed. Encryption and compression is handled on communication level by the NSP. | Blank missing between the two sentences   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 12 | 13   | 1.3.1. Technical monitoring                                   | the monitoring of the queue depth and queue age is in place   | what actions are available to the Operator?   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 72 | 16   | 1.5.3. Technical message validation                           | Table 2   | Can you confirm that for all cross-field validations on p. 17 and also for the three last lines the same error code will be used? How can the receiver distinguish between the different cross-field validation errors?   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 20 | 6    | 1.2.3. Connectivity   | Table 1   | How do those SCT Inst messages that are not "settlement-related" fit into this structure? Namely Recalls (camt.056), negative Recall Answers (camt.029) and Beneficiary Replies (pacs.002)?   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 47 | 8    | 1.2.3.4. Common rules for message and file transfer services  | Table 1   | Do the different colors of the table rows imply something?  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 29 | 4    | Introduction  | SHRD.UR.ESMIG.ALL.000.440   | Could you please confirm whether resend functionality is foreseen (especially for not scheme related messages like liquidity transfers and reports)?  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 30 | 4    | Introduction  | SHRD.UR.ESMIG.ALL.000.430   | Could you please elaborate how the duplicate check is performed?  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 31 | 4    | Introduction  | SHRD.UR.ESMIG.ALL.000.420   | Could you please elaborate how the queueing is implemented (if at all)?   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 41 | 6    | 1.1.4. Message forwarding                                     | reference to CRDM UDFS (and any references to other documents within this document)   | currently the link in the document takes the reader to section 1.9 List of referenced documents. This, however, is not very helpful, as this section does not provide any further information. Therefore we suggest to add to the document the links to the referred documents that are published on the ECB website. In addition, you may wish to add a disclaimer that the latest version of the referred document prevails | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 59 | 12   | 1.2.6.1. Confidentiality                                      | reference to "Connectivity - Technical Requirements"  | Please add link similarly to the previous sections where you referred to other documents  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 60 | 12   | 1.2.6.2. Integrity  | reference to "Connectivity - Technical Requirements"  | Please add link similarly to the previous sections where you referred to other documents  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 48 | 8    | 1.2.3.4. Common rules for message and file transfer services  | In the two sections related to inbound communication and outbound communication this is stated: "All settlement related messages [...] and LRDM updates using a message-based network service."   | Could you please confirm that no settlement related messages and no LRDM updates exceed the size of 10 KB? Otherwise, could you please clarify if message-based network service is also used if the size of the communication exceeds 10 KB?  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 2  | 4    | Introduction  | In the context of the consolidation   | which consolidation?  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 19 | 0    |   | General Remark  | Page Numeration is missing  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 23 | 12   | 1.5.2. Inbound and Outbound messages                          | General question:   | If "SHRD.UR.ESMIG.ALL.000.300" (Archiving of inbound and outbound communications) does not apply for TIPS how are inbound and outbound messages archived?   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 25 | 14   | 1.5.1. Introduction   | General question:   | At which part of the process is the technical sending user and the business sending user checked?   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 27 | 4    | Introduction  | General comment   | Please remove double spaces throughout the document. Thank you.   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 28 | 4    | Introduction  | General comment   | Could you please insert page numbers for pages 1-16?  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 39 | 5    | 1.1.3. Validation of the received messages                    | General comment   | Kindly synchronise the style for cross-references within the document. Preferably please refer to the section number and to section name (without "...")  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 46 | 8    | 1.2.3.4. Common rules for message and file transfer services  | General comment   | A definition of the term file or a reference to chapter 1.2.3.4 would ease the understanding of this chapter for readers who are also familiar with T2S. Otherwise the reader may mix the meaning of file (business = multiple messages vs. technical = large amount of data).  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 50 | 8    | 1.2.3.4. Common rules for message and file transfer services  | General comment   | Is our assumption correct that reports which are smaller than 10 KB will be sent via file-based SnF?  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 66 | 14   | 1.4.3. File-Based Store and Forward                           | General comment   | Could you please align the spelling of store and forward throughout the document? Thank you.  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 73 | 18   | 1.5.4. Inbound and Outbound messages                          | General comment   | Inbound and outbound messages (not defined in the SCT-Inst scheme) will be received/sent with head.001. Could you please ensure that either TIPS UDFS or ESMIG UDFS provide the head.001 specification?   | Rejected      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 76 | 19   | 1.5.4.3. Receipt/Acknowledgement (admi.007.001.01)            | General comment   | The message name in the text is formatted as a link, but there is nothing behind it. Did you have in mind to add a link to Table 4, which is on the same page?  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 68 | 14   | 1.5.1. Introduction   | Figure 3  | Please refer to our comment on using terms "TIPS Actor vs ESMIG Actor" and align the naming of the left column accordingly. Additionally, is it intended to mention for Cross-Field validation error as message "Respective ISO message"?   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 55 | 10   | 1.2.4.2.1 Authentication of the technical sender              | Figure 2  | Are we missing an ESMIG box between NSP and TIPS? Furthermore, this figure implies that NSP is doing the Technical Sender Authentication, but this would be a technical implementation detail.  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 43 | 7    | 1.2.3.2. Modes of connectivity                                | Figure 1  | From our point of view it would ease the understanding if in the picture User was replaced by TIPS Actor. Then the same term would be used as in the text above and below the picture.  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 21 | 7    | 1.2.3.3. Technical connectivity and network service providers | ESMIG Actors use a network provided by an NSP who successfully passed the compliance checks.  | Compliance Checks? Is there more than one compliance check for a single NSP?  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 77 | 22   | 1.8. List of acronyms   | ECMS, T2S   | Potentially remove acronyms that are not used in the document, i. e. ECMS, T2S.   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 7  | 10   | 1.2.4.1.4 Technical sender                                    | by means of a certificate issued by the one of the compliant NSP >  | "by means of a certificate issued by one of the compliant NSP"  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 16 | 14   | 1.5.1. Introduction   | All A2A communication has to be encrypted and can be compressed..   | While paragraph 1.4.1 states: "In the TIPS context the compression is not used neither for instant messaging nor for file-based transfer." Please clarify.  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 18 | 14   | 1.5.1. Introduction   | All A2A communication has to be encrypted and can be compressed   | About the compression it seems that this paragraph is in contrast with the paragraph 1.4.1. Is the compression allowed?   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |

|    |    |  |   |   |               |  |
|----|----|--|---|---|---------------|--|
| 35 | 5  | 1.1.1. Authentication of the message sender                  | "TIPS Actor"  | Please kindly provide a definition.   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 52 | 9  | 1.2.4. Authentication and authorisation                      | "This section provides information on the authentication and authorisation processes in ESMIG"  | This sentence seems not to be in synch with following sections. E.g. in section 1.2.4.3 it is said that authorisation process is at TIPS  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 32 | 4  | Introduction   | "This means it is in charge of A2A and U2A traffic management providing authentication of all inbound traffic (U2A and A2A) as well as sender (i.e. external party sending communication) authentication and identification."                     | The sentence is difficult to understand, as it is unclear why we have two times authentication in here.   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 4  | 4  | Introduction   | "These features, detailed below, belong to two main areas and can be provided by both the NSPs and the market infrastructure services".   | This is confusing; the features of ESMIG are provided by non-ESMIG solutions?   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 34 | 5  | 1.1. ESMIG Features Overview                                 | "These features, detailed below, belong to two main areas and can be provided by both the NSPs and the market infrastructure services."   | It is a bit confusing that the second sentence in the chapter describing the features of ESMIG is actually stating that things might not be covered by ESMIG. Our understanding is that these features are provided by ESMIG (potentially making use of features provided by the NSPs) unless a market infrastructure service decides not to use them.                    | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 8  | 11 | 1.2.5. ESMIG Portal  | "the user is redirected to the IAM page that asks user to authenticate the access validating his distinguished name (DN)"   | what is it the user should do to validate his DN?   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 37 | 5  | 1.1.2. Participation to the Closed Group of Users            | "The subscription to a group of users, ..."   | Could "group of users" be replaced by CGU? This would ease the understanding for the reader.  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 67 | 14 | 1.4.3. File-Based Store and Forward                          | "The maximum size for the exchanged files is set to 1 GB."  | 1. We understand that ESMIG will be able to process communication with a maximum size of 1 GB. This goes beyond the currently required 99 MB mentioned in SHRD.UR.ESMIG.NFR.100. Could you please confirm that all involved technique (e. g. MQ) will be able to transport communication that exceeds the 99 MB?<br>2. We understand that this 1 GB size is uncompressed? | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 6  | 6  | 1.2.1. Single access point for the external communication    | "The ESMIG provides Business Continuity measures (e.g. multiple sites, path diversification, persistent information, etc.)."  | according to the Introduction "Messages managed by ESMIG for TIPS are not persistent". Which information is persisted and which is not?   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 69 | 15 | 1.5.2. Schema validation                                     | "The ESMIG enriched schema files serve different purposes: [...] ESMIG provides the TIPS enriched schema file description in several formats: [...]"  | Is there a difference between ESMIG enriched schema files and TIPS enriched schema files? If not, could you please align the wording throughout the document?   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 54 | 10 | 1.2.4.2. Authentication process                              | "The authentication process refers in TIPS to the authentication of the technical sender."  | Please clarify whether TIPS or ESMIG is authenticating the technical sender. Section 1.2.4 starts with the sentence that implies to authentication and authorisation processes are in ESMIG   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 71 | 15 | 1.5.2. Schema validation                                     | "Regarding the use of namespace prefixes, the messages used in ESMIG do not support ..."  | From our point of view it would read for fluent as "messages used for TIPS".  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 33 | 4  | Introduction   | "Operator Service Desk" vs "TIPS Operator" vs "ESMIG Operator"  | Do these actors, used in different sections of the document (e.g. chapter 1.3), all refer to the same entity or to different ones? If to the same entity - please use one term. If to different ones - please clarify the difference  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 74 | 18 | 1.5.4.1. Inbound messages                                    | "No inbound message is directly addressed to the ESMIG for TIPS. All the successfully validated business messages are routed to the TIPS application."  | 1. So far, only the term ESMIG is used, not ESMIG for TIPS. Could you please apply a consistent wording?<br>2. What was your reasoning to put this sentence here? Could you please clarify?   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 49 | 8  | 1.2.3.4. Common rules for message and file transfer services | "Inbound Liquidity Transfers received by TARGET2 do not need to pass through the ESMIG interface."  | Sometimes the term ESMIG interface is used. Our understanding is that the ESMIG itself is the interface between TIPS and the TIPS Actors. Could we simply use the term ESMIG?   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 63 | 13 | 1.3.1. Technical monitoring                                  | "In this context for A2A services the monitoring of the queue depth and queue age is in place to be sure instant message processing is correctly going on at the ESMIG interface level without having any slow down or blocking in the workflow." | Is this monitoring not in place for file-based Store and Forward? If no, why?   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 64 | 13 | 1.4.1. Compression   | "In the TIPS context the compression is not used neither for instant messaging nor for file-based transfer."  | Is this statement compliant with ch. 1.5.1 stating that "All A2A communication has to be encrypted and can be compressed. Encryption and compression is handled on communication level by the NSP."? From our point of view it would make sense to apply compression for reports (file-based communication).  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 42 | 7  | 1.2.3.2. Modes of connectivity                               | "ESMIG supports the connectivity of ESMIG Actors as follows:..."  | Please clarify who are ESMIG Actors. Could it make sense to replace it by the term TIPS Actor throughout the ESMIG <sup>TIPS</sup> UDFS? You could also consider introducing in an earlier section a clarification a la ESMIG is used by participants of several market infrastructures and applications, but in this document you refer to TIPS Actors only.             | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 17 | 15 | 1.5.2. Schema validation                                     | "ESMIG provides the TIPS enriched schema file description in several formats: in XSD, Excel and HTML."  | meaning every file is always available in every format?   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 70 | 15 | 1.5.2. Schema validation                                     | "ESMIG provides the TIPS enriched schema file description in several formats"   | We understand that technically it would be possible to publish the messages already now in MyStandards. As of when are you planning to publish it there?  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 40 | 6  | 1.1.4. Message forwarding                                    | "ESMIG is responsible to forward inbound/outbound ..."  | Typo. "...responsible for forwarding ..."   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 36 | 5  | 1.1.2. Participation to the Closed Group of Users            | "Each NSP defines a CGU for each TIPS environment ..."  | Could you kindly add that the reference to "TIPS environment" in this sentence refers to test and production environments.  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |

|    |    |   |  |   |               |  |
|----|----|---|--|---|---------------|--|
| 75 | 18 | 1.5.4.2. Outbound Messages                                    | "Currently, one outbound message is generated by the ESMIG for TIPS in case of inbound processing rejection as described in the following table. The reason for the rejection is either due to schema validation or message validation as described in the previous sections."   | Can you confirm that ESMIG will send pacs.002 and camt.025 in case of failing cross-field validations? If so, would it make sense to list them in section 1.5.2, too?   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 58 | 11 | 1.2.5. ESMIG Portal   | "Choose the application among the authorised applications accessible by any User-ID he (i.e. any user linked to his DN) can impersonate"   | We would propose to be more specific as follows: "Choose the application among the authorised applications accessible by at least one User-ID linked to his DN"   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 5  | 6  | 1.2.1. Single access point for the external communication     | "and it ensures that the traffic of one backend service may not impact the processing time of messages from or to other services"  | will one backend service get priority over another?   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 62 | 13 | 1.2.6.4. Availability   | "Also the infrastructure and the connectivity model provided by each NSP are highly available ..."   | From our point of view this is a clear requirement to the NSP. Therefore, from our point of view it should read: "Also the infrastructure and the connectivity model provided by each NSP must be highly available..."  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 44 | 7  | 1.2.3.2. Modes of connectivity                                | "All messages exchanged between ESMIG and ESMIG Actors are based on XML technology and comply with the ISO 20022 standards, where applicable."   | Does the exception only apply to ISO20022 or also to XML?   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 57 | 11 | 1.2.5. ESMIG Portal   | "... the user has been granted to enter"   | "... The user has been granted <b>with privileges</b> to enter"   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 51 | 9  | 1.2.4. Authentication and authorisation                       | "... section 1.2.4.1 - "Authentication and authorisation concepts" ..."  | Could you please align the cross-references to other chapters throughout the document?  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 26 | 18 | 1.5.4.2. Outbound Messages                                    | "... one outbound message is generated by the ESMIG for TIPS in case of inbound processing rejection as described in the following table. The reason for the rejection is either due to schema validation or message validation as described in the previous section" and Table 3 (Outbound messages generated by ESMIG) | Table 3 shows the adm.007 message as the only outbound message generated by ESMIG. How does this fit with the last column of Table 2, where pacs.002 and camt.025 messages are shown as output messages? Since the reference "as described in the previous sections" would also include chapter 1.5.3 and Table 2 this seems to be a contradiction. Please clarify. | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 65 | 14 | 1.4.2. Instant messaging                                      | "... is set to 10KiB (1 KiB = 1.024 bytes), [...] The maximum size for the exchanged files is set to 1 GB."  | We see the difference between KiB and KB. However, our understanding is that we should decide to use one common quantity concept. A mix of e.g. KiB and GB should be avoided.   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 56 | 11 | 1.2.5. ESMIG Portal   | "... defined and enforced at NSP level, can communicate with TIPS and CRDM <sup>TIPS</sup> ..." and "... e. g. currently: "TIPS", "CRDM <sup>TIPS</sup> ..."   | Could you please apply same typing rules if TIPS and CRDM <sup>TIPS</sup> are mentioned in the document?  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 38 | 5  | 1.1.3. Validation of the received messages                    | "...no required field is missing."   | Could you please stick to the message term "mandatory" instead of "required"?   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 53 | 10 | 1.2.4.1.4 Technical sender                                    | "...certificate issued by the one of the compliant NSP."   | Typo. "... certificate issued by one of the compliant NSPs."  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 61 | 13 | 1.2.6.3. Monitoring   | "...and shall ensure quick updates of all devices whenever security patches are available."  | We would propose to remove the word "quick" to avoid discussions about timeliness of updates.   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 45 | 7  | 1.2.3.3. Technical connectivity and network service providers | " ESMIG Actors use a network provided by an NSP who successfully passed the compliance checks."  | Please replace the term "compliance check" with its meaning. In our understanding it means the check on an NSP meeting the technical and operational requirements for a TIPS NSP. You may also consider referring to TIPS Connectivity Requirements   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 22 | 9  | 1.2.4. Authentication and authorisation                       | paragraph  | Here something with the links inside the document went wrong. See 1.2.4.2 and 1.2.4.3. Please check   | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 1  | 4  | Introduction  |  | I expected the document to explain the term Market Infrastructure.  | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 3  | 4  | Introduction  |  | Is ESMIG a new solution that is first created for TIPS?   | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 9  | 11 | 1.2.5. ESMIG Portal   |  | Why would a user want or need to have multiple User-IDs?  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 10 | 12 | 1.2.6. Security   |  | Without questioning the importance of Monitoring and Availability, I doubt that these are really necessary for Security. If ESMIG is not available nothing can go wrong. On the other hand I would have expected Authenticity to be recognised as a security aspect. Further I assume that Auditability covers both Non-repudiation and Accountability.             | Accepted      | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 13 | 13 | 1.4.1. Compression  |  | What is meant by "compression" and why is it not used?  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 14 | 14 | 1.5. Communication processing                                 |  | Why is this paragraph limited to A2A and does it not describe U2A communication?  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |
| 15 | 14 | 1.5.1. Introduction   |  | technical sender = NSP ?  | Clarification | No specific feedback to be provided to the CG. |