Software Provider Readiness Working Group

Questions from working group members| 8 December 2021

The following table provides ASX's response to relevant questions asked by Software Provider Readiness working group members during the session held on 8 December 2021. Please email chessreplacement@asx.com.au if you have any additional questions or require further clarification.

Topic	Question	Answer
ITE1	**If a security code is being changed in ITE1 from open to suspended etc., will the timing be communicated widely?**	From ITE1 opening, software providers will have the ability to request CTS to suspend securities within your test kit. This is done through the assisted testing processing, details of which can be found here. CTS will notify you once the request has been actioned.
ITE1	**Are the new headers mandatory for entry into ITE1?**	The new message settings are mandatory for technical accreditation but not for ITE1 opening. Software providers are recommended to apply the message settings as soon after they are connected to ITE1. Details for the messages setting can be found here.
Corporate Actions	**With Corporate Actions due for the start of January 2022, how does that impact the close date of the first phase of the Corporate Action data?**	The files ASX have disseminated in the test kits do have CA data starting from start of December. When corporate actions are enabled in ITE1, any CA event in the past will be archived. ASX will advise when CA events is enabled in ITE1, expected later in Jan'22
Corporate Actions	**In light of the timeline change in ITE1 will there be any further data enriched in CDE with regards to more regular Corporate Actions?**	No, there will be no additional data. What ASX have done in CDE is we have CA events up to April'22 so as we transition clients they can still test CA events in CDE.

Pagination	Do you have a guide to what 32bk might look like in terms of the variable content?	ASX advised during the session that pagination will be set at ~32kb, details can be found here. Report sizes may be larger or smaller than 32kb as it is based on the number of records in each file; software providers must not code to the number of records in a file, as they are variable and may change and must ensure that they can support file sizes greater than 32kb.

The number of entries per report will vary based on the type of each report type, the configuration per report in ITE1 is below but subject to change.

Report Type (Code)	Report Name	Entry count
CEMV	Cum entitlement movement	15
CEBL	Cum entitlement balance	70
HBAL	Holding balance	60
HMVT	Holding movement	50
HSBL	Holding supposition balance	35
NNDP	Netted obligation report	30
OBLG	Obligation	45

32kb is driven by a few considerations; firstly, SWIFT (InterAct) has an upper limit of 100kb. ASX have a preference to support the same file size across all channels and although AMQP can support larger file size, 100kb is the maximum CHESS Replacement would look to implement.

ASX also undertook a review with other market infrastructures where 32kb is adopted by other systems, other factors where to ensure the benefits of scale were realised, the size of ISO message signature considered and ASX's internal testing.

Topic	Question	Answer
Technical Accreditation	**Optional fields – if we provide an optional field within the accreditation scenario are you saying that the ASX are not validating?**	The CHESS application will validate all fields both mandatory and optional but the accreditation test will not contemplate an optional field in determining if the scenario passes or fails. ASX primarily looks to validate optional fields where they drive business function. When an optional field is set as mandatory in a scenario (for example the inclusion of the e-mail address in account opening) this is clearly marked and will be considered in the test.
Technical Accreditation	**For DRP as an optional function via the accreditation process if we do not test in the optional accreditation process and eventually want to use the DRP & BSP do we have go through the accreditation process before we commence using it?**	Yes, there are mandatory and optional functions, details can be found here. If optional, software providers do not need to develop or request an exception for accreditation. Where you wish to develop an optional feature later it will need to be accredited. As outlined in the session there is one DRP & BSP flow that all clearing and settlement system must support which related to the removal of a standing instruction by an issuer. This is a requirement as the operating rules state an issuer must notify the sponsoring participant of a HIN a standing instruction has been removed.
Technical Accreditation	**Are we able to update/edit the fields in the sheet or just provide information with the test data?**	We discussed the requirement for a participant to provide a business message ID in the prior session and we can confirm this is not required given ASX have automation to track each scenario. Software providers need not compete the spreadsheets, however ASX may undertake spot checks by providing the business message ID and asking software providers to confirm details as part of the technical accreditation process.

Topic	Question	Answer
Technical Accreditation	**We need to provide a checklist to ASX, how many days prior to start of message accreditation testing do we need to notify you? Is it 1 business day or is notification required earlier?**	It would be advantageous to provide a number of weeks advance notice, ASX are not accepting checklist or applications at this point. ASX will notify you prior to the opening of accreditation. ASX are allowing multiple organisations to accredit at the same time. The more notice is better but we will take this away and advise when will open the accreditation forms and notice period we are asking for but the checklist forms are now published.
Technical Accreditation	**Repeating the accreditation test – there are certain conditions mentioned e.g. in the first level we have been doing accreditation testing and ASX has approved but later if there are changes in the CHESS side and there are deployments will the ASX notify the respective groups to perform another round of tests?**	Yes, it would have to be a material change that ASX would require all organisation to re-accredit, but it is a possibility. We are putting more emphasis on re-accreditation in the new system and look to standardise our process with other systems, such as ASX Trade where re-accreditation is much more common. If you have a small defect in you back office system that doesn't impact your interface it is unlikely a re-accreditation would be required, but what's important that if you are in doubt you should reach out to our CTS to discuss.
Technical Accreditation	**If you don't accredit an optional piece of functionality but choose to accredit it later will you have to repeat the whole accreditation process?**	That's possible, adding optional features may have an impact on your core interface and therefore it's important you reach out and discuss with our CTS team, re-accreditation provides a more robust model for both CHESS Users and the ASX. We do recognise the practicalities of making minor changes and doing full accreditation so we will take that into consideration.

Topic	Question	Answer
Technical Accreditation	**In the accreditation scenario's meant for issuers or registry there are some rejection scenarios documented however it is not detailed into the type of rejection code that we have to send from registry. Who is supposed to choose or determine rejection code from registry to be considered for accreditation?**	This is by design that it is not prescriptive the error code because that avoid developers focusing on a specific error, the exact error can be bilaterally agreed during the accreditation process.
Technical Accreditation	**The 5 day timeframe seems rushed in light of us having to play counterparty? Is there flexibility there?**	Our preference is 5 days, if there were drivers that meant that it needs to be expanded beyond that then the tooling we have allows it to be date range driven. We would need to look at what in the 5 days could not be achieved, but we believe 5 days is sufficient time even where a software provider is required to play the role of the counterparty.
Technical Accreditation	**If we had a 5 day accreditation and given ASX has to determine a pass or fail. Will ASX provide the participant the list that has passed for that day?**	We will take this away for consideration. The plan is at the end of the 5 days we have a report indicating what has passed and failed. This will be managed by CTS and the process will be confirmed. It would be noted that prior to day 5, the report would not indicate a scenario has failed purely it has not passed (given a test may be executed on a subsequent day).
Test tools	**When will we have the uplifted self-service tool completed?**	There are some additional mFund tools and performance tools that will be delivered in Q1'22