**FRANKFURT Germany** **- SMPG meeting: Apr. 23 – 25, 201****3[ ]**

|  |
| --- |
| **Meeting Venue:** **European Central Bank****Eurotower room CI 36th floor** **Kaiserstraße 29****Frankfurt am Main, Germany** |
| ecb_logo_en |

**Dress Code: Business Casual**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tuesday 23rd of April |   |
| **Morning** |   |
|   | 08:30 – 09:30 | Registration at ECB ground floor |
|   | 09:30 – 10:45 | **General Session (Room CI 36th floor)**1. Welcome address *(Karla Mc Kenna – Citi, SMPG Chair & Marc Bayle - ECB, T2S Programme Manager)*2. Meeting schedule overview *(Jacques Littré – General Secretary)*3. Regional Updates- T2S – Status update/harmonisation progresses *(Marc Bayle - ECB, T2S Programme Manager*)- CA JWG and General Meetings principles/market practices and E-MIG progress *(Christine Strandberg – SEB, SMPG EMEA Regional Director)*- New Financial Transaction Taxes, operational challenges from an SMPG perspective (*Axelle Wurmser - BP2S & Rudolf Siebel – BVI, SMPG Vice-Chair*) |
|   | 10:45 – 11:00 | Coffee Break |
|   | 11:00 – 12:30 | **General Session (Continued)**SMPG Steering Committee members election for Vice-Chair, EMEA, Americas, and APAC regional Directors |
|   | 12:30 – 13:30 | **Lunch** **(Foyer CI 36th floor)** |
| **Afternoon**  |  |
|   | 13:30 – 15:15 | Investment Funds WG**(Room CI - 36th floor)** | Corporate Action WG**(Room CVI.1 - 2nd floor)** | Settlement and Reconciliation WG**(Room CVI.2 - 2nd floor)** |
|   | 15:15 – 15:30 | Coffee Break |
|  | 15:30 – 17:30 | Investment Funds WG | Corporate Action WG | Settlement and Reconciliation WG |
| **Evening** |
|   | 18:00 – 20:00 | **- SMPG Event Ebbelwoi-Expreß -** **Offered by Clearstream** |

|  |
| --- |
| Wednesday 24th of April |
| **Morning**  |
|   | 09:00 – 10:45 | Investment Funds WG**(Room CVI.2 - 2nd floor)** | Corporate Action WG**(Room CVI.1 - 2nd floor)** | Settlement and Reconciliation WG **(Room CI - 36th floor)** |
|   | 10:45 – 11:00 | Coffee Break |
|   | 11:00 – 12:30 | Investment Funds WG | Corporate Action WG | Settlement and Reconciliation WG |
|   | 12:30 – 13:30 | **Lunch** **(Foyer CI 36th floor)** |
| **Afternoon**  |
|   | 13:30 – 15:15 | Investment Funds WG | Corporate Action WG | Settlement and Reconciliation WG |
|   | 15:15 – 15:30 | Coffee Break |
|   | 15:30 – 17:30 | Investment Funds WG | Corporate Action WG | Settlement and Reconciliation WG |

|  |
| --- |
| Thursday 25th of April |
| **Morning**  |
|   | 09:00 – 10:45 | Investment Funds WG **(Room MCG02 - Ground floor)** | Corporate Action WG**Room CI - 36th floor** | Settlement and Reconciliation WG **Room MCG07 -** **ground floor** |
|   | 10:45 – 11:00 | Coffee Break |
|   | 11:00 – 12:30 | Investment Funds WG | Corporate Action WG | Settlement and Reconciliation WG |
|   | 12:30 – 13:30 | **Lunch** **(Foyer CI 36th floor)** |
|   |  | **End of meeting** |

**Frankfurt April 2013 – SMPG Corporate Action – Detailed Agenda**

| **Item No** | **Short Description** | **Description and Pending Actions** | **Owner** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | Meeting Minutes | Appoints additional minutes taker/helper | CA SMPG |   |
| **2** | Next meetings | Confirm dates for 2013 Conference calls | CA SMPG |   |
| **3** | Approval of March 25 conf. Call Minutes |  | CA SMPG |  |
| **ItemNo** | **Short Description** | **Description and Pending Actions** | **Owner** | **Comment** |
| **Priority 1 Items** |
| **CA239** | SR2013 Maintenance WG follow up items | Define new Market Practices as requested in the SR2013 CA MWG minutes: Follow up of action items:**Actions:**1. CR393 & CR418 - Kim to send MP to the group as soon as available2. CR421 - Mari to send MP to the group as soon as available3. CR 383 - Sonda’s ISITC colleague to reach out to the Canadian NMPG to request them to create market practice for letters of guarantee.4. CR 411 - DE to report at next meeting5. CR 386 - Jacques to reach out to the Canadian NMPG for their rejected CR regarding special warrants.6. CR 439 Mari/Matthew to revert on an alternative solution to their rejected CR regarding capital returns. | GMP Part 1 subgroup (Veronique) | **Telco Mar 25, 2013:**Follow-ups from MWG CRs for SR2013 (please refer to the “Open Item” file in tab “SR2013 SMPG Actions”:• CR393 & CR418 - Kim reports the French CRs follow up status: FR MP on fractions and instructions will be sent to the group next week.• CR421 - Mari reported on the status of the ACCU UK MP: The UK NMPG expects to publish the template fairly soon after the UK NMPG meeting this week. Sonda reported that ISITC had received a number of questions regarding the use of MT566 without a posting; Mari answered that this choice was made at the MWG meeting. The new item, CA 253 (see further down), is actually also related to this MT566 issue.• CR 383 – Letter of Guarantee indicator - Nothing has been received from Canada so far.• CR 411 – Real Estate Property Income - DE was supposed to ask for input from the IF WG and UK, but no German member attended the call today.• CR 386 – Special Warrant - Nothing has been received from Canada so far.• CR 439 – Capital Return Event Type - Nothing has been received so far from UK. **Telco Jan 24, 2013:**GMP Part 1 will be finalised today and sent for review to teh whole CA SMPG group.**Telco Dec 13, 2012:**Veronique reports: Meeting on Monday with two more calls scheduled before January 10. Work is ongoing, and most of the SR2013 MWG actions have been completed. Some of the actions assigned to GMP1 will be handed back to the CA-WG. |
| **CA167** | Consent Events /+ Schemes - Clarifty business flows. | Originates from SR2010 CR III.71 on Consent Event. SMPG to review the context around Consent events / Schemes of Arrangement and clarify the business flows in which these events can be used.**Actions:**1. NMPsG to send comments, if any, to Bernard within the next two weeks – Deadline for comments is April 15 to be sent to Bernard/Jacques.2. Jacques: Ask the PV sub-group if they would wish to include BMET in the ISO 20022 PV messages. | ISITC | **Telco Mar 25, 2013:**Bernard has updated the document in accordance with the comments made at the Osaka meeting and BIDS has been added together with EXOF and TEND events in one of the scenario since last conference call. The document will be recirculated again for final review by the NMPGs before Frankfurt and it will be finalised / approved at the Frankfurt meeting. If approved, two CRs for SR2014 will have to be produced.**Telco Feb 21, 2013:**Review of the input document, which was sent by Bernard today (not all members seemed to have received it). Action 1: ask the PV subgroup about creation of a BMET event in the PV messages –This was discussed at one of the PV subgroup call. Feedback: yes BMET needs to be distinguished from the other types of meetings if considered as PV. Whether it should be added to the PV messages was not discussed. Decision: primarily remove scenario 5 (Table Line 5). The document will be finalised at the Frankfurt meeting.**Telco Jan 24, 2013:**Bernard has not yet fully completed the “Consent” document, This will be done and sent for review today. The NMPG’s will be asked to review the document and send back their comments asap so as to finalise it for next conference call on February 21st. |
| **CA240** | New CAMV code or Option code for disclosure / certification | Creation of a mandatory CAMV code with disclosure/certification and/or the creation of a new CAOP option codes for ‘disclose/certify and receive entitlement’ and ‘do not disclose/certify and forfeit entitlement’(It is acknowledged that this is a big development but this issue was left unresolved for several years and we need to tackle it at a certain moment. If we agree to it, it can be reused in other situations where we also have a problem today like for certifications etc.)**Actions:**NMPGs to rediscuss and comment the above open item summary and also indicate if you have any such mandatory events with required actions in your market. Your feedback is requested by April 17 to be sent to Christine/Jacques | Bernard | **Telco Mar 25, 2013:**Christine has sent today an email to the SMPG members with a summary of the open item: The final decision will be made at the Frankfurt meeting (see minutes of meeting for the summary).**Telco Feb 21, 2013:**Discussion of the existing proposal, and the US initial feedback (do not agree with CAMV solution). The new CAMV code should not be exclusively for disclosure/certification, but rather for mandatory events with only one option but where some action needs to be performed in order for this default option to take place. Similar to the US “Cash in lieu tender” where it is a MAND event but an instruction is required.Also the certification indicator code CETI could also be used in addition to the new CAMV code to specify that it is for certification purpose. Decision: Christine to email the SMPG, explain the possible uses and ask for additional scenarios/NMPG feedback. Deadline to be several weeks before the Frankfurt meeting in order to have a proposal ready for discussion and approval at the meeting.**Osaka November 5 - 7:**Long discussion regarding the scope of the item; should tax-related certification be included or not ? Decision: Keep current scope, with disclosure/certification/additional information required in a MAND event, with MT565 to be received & without including the tax certification issue (for tax relief at source) which is in the scope of the Tax subgroup (via events WTRC / CERT).The tax subgroup has decided that for tax relief related certification it is better to have a separate and linked certification event.Feedback from the NMPGs on the 3 questions raised:1. Do you have this kind of mandatory disclosure scenario in your market?2. Do you have a preference regarding a new CAMV code or new CAOP codes?3. Do you have any other suggestions on how to solve the problem, such as an ADDB code?• BEo 1. Noo 2. No preferenceo 3. No• DEo 1. Noo 2. CAMV code preferredo 3. No. ADDB is at event level so not good alternative to CAMV.• UK&IEo 1. No, except for account details in another CSDo 2. CAMV code less painful optiono 3. No other suggestion• XSo 1. Yeso 2. CAMV code preferredo 3. No other suggestion• FIo 1. Yes but not very ofteno 2. CAMV code preferredo 3. No other suggestion• SEo 1. Only very rarelyo 2. No preferenceo 3. An ADDB might be the most cost-effective solution• ZAo 1. Noo 2. Have not discussedo 3. Have not discussed• RUo Mandatory disclosure for DVCA for nominees only. Processed as a separate event (DSCL). If the nominee does not disclose, the cash dividend will not be paid. This includes foreign nominees.• US (via Véronique)o US have a lot of mandatory events where an instruction/information is needed, since they use the bottom-up method for many processes.Summary of NMPGs feedback: the creation of a new CAMV code to indicate a request of disclosure/certification/additional info (not related to tax certification) in a mandatory event is preferred. |
| **CA226** | Disclosure (DSCL) event - Clarify usage / market practice  | From SR2012 CR 000193 - The MWG recommends also that the SMPG clarifies the usage of the existing DSCL (Disclosure) event in the CA messages and how it differs from the disclosure process described into the T2S shareholder transparency documents as this has generated some confusion.Actions: • NMPGs are requested to review the 8 scenarios and provide input from their market, regarding both use and non-use of each 8 scenarios and any potentially additional scenarios. Your feedback is requested by April 17 to be sent to Bernard/Jacques | XS/ISITC | **Telco Mar 25, 2013:**Bernard described the document. Feedback has been received from Russia as they have a new regulation on this process. Bernard will contact Elena to clarify some points.Christine asked what exactly is meant by “systematic/non-systematic”. Bernard explained that “systematic” is the same as the scenario presented by Paul Bodart 2 years ago for the SR2011 maintenance in the frame of the T2S project. Bernard will update the document with “ad-hoc” instead of “non-systematic”.**Telco Feb 21, 2013:**Decision: The document provided as input in Athens to be updated according to the comments in the open items list and sent for review.**Telco Dec 13, 2012:**Report from Jacques. T2S shareholder disclosure discussions is on hold, due to perceived lack of need and thus no resulting submission for new messages done at ISO20022 level. If a market does have a need for this, please raise concern. **Telco Oct 17, 2012:**Bernard’s proposal from the September call was approved i.e. put CA 226 on hold for the moment and open a new item regarding a possible new CAMV code (refer to CA 240 below).Russia mentions the issue they have today for event with disclosures as the disclosure request is only meant for the nominees and not for holders. In that case, the recommendation is to have different notifications sent on one side to the Nominees and on the other side to the holders.Kim raised the issue of the T2S shareholder disclosure discussions: has there been any progress?**Telco June 27, 2012:** No new country feedback received during the summer since the last conference call. No new feedback at the call either. Bernard proposes to put on hold the CA 226 (on the scope of the DSCL event) untill we have solved the question on the new CAMV code - creation of a andatory with disclosure/certification and/or the creation of a new option codes for ‘disclose/certify and receive entitlement’ and ‘do not disclose/certify and forfeit entitlement’. Bernard proposes to create a new open item for this issue in the open item list.Sofia indicates that in Russia disclosure events are becoming more and more important due to recent amendments in the Russian legislation and that it will have a significant impact on all intermediaries who work in the Russian market (i.e. with Russian securities) or deal with Depositary Receipts issued on Russian shares.A one–pager document would be necessary on the DSCL case to summarize what are the issues and questions as well as a decision tree (like the one for the INFO event) so as to clarify the the scope of DSCL. NO feedback: Seldom used, then voluntary. No need to have new CAMV code and option codes.JP Feedback: For Non systematic / Outside event / Not linked to Treshhold / Nominee Level This event is happened irregularly. It happens when issuers request for the "General Shareholders Notification".UK&IE: Not applicable, therefore no commentsFI: Seldom used, and voluntary if used. No need to have new CAMV code and option codes.IT: Not usedCH: Will report at next callUS/ISITC: Have not yet discussed; will report at next callSE: Have not yet discussed; will report at next call-> Item to be discussed at the September conf call. |
| **CA210** | Overelection/subcription market practice review | Review GMP Part 1 section 3.12.8.4 and 4.3 on the market practice of oversubscription and usage of :36B::QINS, QREC and QOVE and 22F::OPTF//QOVE**Actions:**• Véronique to update the document, including the illustration of the MT567 in all scenarios and of the MT565 in flow 3 **-> Done**• NMPG to provide comments/feedback for discussion at Frankfurt meeting. | GMP Part 1 subgroup | **Telco Mar 25, 2013:**Veronique described the document, updated in accordance with the discussions in the GMP1 sub-group.The 2nd flow is theoretical based on what the standards allows but it does not work from an MT567 perspective. A CR for SR2014 might eventually be needed. |
| **CA242** | Placement of Interest Shortfall (SHRT) | The new SHRT rate has been placed in SR2012 in the seq. D whilst it is closely linked to the calculation of the INTP which is located in sequence E2.It would make sense to move SHRT in sequence E2 (and E if not paid) instead of sequence D.[INTP calculation is = INTR \* (DAAC / the number of days of the year based on the MICO method) - SHRT]**Action:**Ask US for feedback since it was one of their CRs submitted for SR2012. | Bernard | **Osaka November 5 - 7**Should SHRT be moved to E and E2, instead of in D? It makes more sense to have it in E/E2 since it is more closely linked to the payment for the period rather than the annual rate (used in mortgage backed bonds). |
| **CA245** | Capital Increase offered to public | **Action:** NMPGs to provide feedback on a new CAEV code and if this scenario (completely open offers) occurs in their market. To be discussed at the Frankfurt meeting | UK & IE | **Telco Feb 21, 2013:**Discussion of this issue. Should PRIO be used for completely open offers ?Decision: No, but a new code could be added.**Telco Jan 24, 2013:**Matthew provided before the conference call 4 examples of capital increase event with some form of priority for existing shareholders in case of over-subscription. Today LSE announced it as both PRIO and OTHR. However no feedback has been provided at the call on how to best announce those events.**Telco Dec 13, 2012:**The UK&IE NMPG have discussed this and have a number of examples of companies announcing a capital increase with some form of priority for existing shareholders in case of over-subscription. The LSE sends the same event as both a PRIO and an OTHR. The price is always the same for existing shareholders or for the public offer. This is becoming more and more frequent.**Osaka November 5 - 7**Mari raised the issue of when an issuer will perform a capital increase but without any preference/priority to existing shareholders (public offer but not an IPO either); should this be announced and if so, how ? |
| **CA246** | Do we need to keep Processing Status INFO (25D::PROC//INFO)  | Since the creation of the new INFO event for SR2013, the need for the PROC/INFO indicator is questioned. The MWG has tasked the SMPG to further analyse the actual usage of this code and eventually propose to delete it.**Action:** NMPGs which have not yet responded to provide feedback by the next conference call. | SMPG | **Telco Feb 21, 2013:**Feedback from the NMPGs: Only the US market (so far) has reported use of PROC//INFO and has given two examples; the second of which will become invalid once NOSE is added in SR2013. Comment post-meeting: NOSE exists already.Decision: to be further discussed in Frankfurt**Telco Jan 24, 2013:**Do we need to keep PROC//INFO ? Feedback received at the call: UK&IE: Not used. CH: Not usedZA: Not used. Decision: Keep item as open, allowing more markets to provide feedback before we decide to create a CR to remove INFO as a PROC code.**Osaka November 5 - 7**German use of PROC//INFO: SMPG recommends use of PROC//PREC (or PREU, as applicable) and use of RCHG (or correct options, if provided by issuer) with the appropriate CAEV code (e.g. MRGR or CHAN) |
| **CA247** | New Date Code when Ex-Date is not announced | Related to SR2013 CR000400 (rejected CR)SMPG - to also look at how to deal with events that are dealt with on different markets. The SMPG should therefore also look at the 2 following issues:1. the applicability and scope of reach for the EIG 2. clarify the usage of “unknown” in general and more specifically for ex-date and analyse the impact this can have on a recipient. | ISITC | **Telco Feb 21, 2013:**Not covered due to lack of time. |
| **CA249** | Reinstate format option D for PAYD in seq. E1 and E2 | Related to SR2013 CR000389 (rejected CR) | XS | **Telco Mar 25, 2013:**The item was postponed since Delphine is on holiday.**Telco Feb 21, 2013:**Not covered due to lack of time. |
| **CA251** | French Transaction Tax | Related to SR2013 CR000416 CA MWG August 2012 conclusions and follow up:Action for France:- Check whether there is a need to add 22F::ETYP to MT 564.- Provide the AFTI paper listing for each CAEV the appropriate exemption code- The reporting of the tax is a separate subject; no changes are required for now to the MT 566. This issue should be further discussed at SMPG market practice level.- Nothing needed (for now) for SR 2013 regarding this end of the month tax amount debit.- FR NMPG will need to be create a market practice to explain the use of the qualifiers in the context of FFT in France.**Actions:**Kim to draft a document based on the French discussions and send it by April 17 to the group. | FR | **Telco Mar 25, 2013:**The MP for the French FTT has been almost finalised, but has not been distributed to the SMPG yet. This will be done as soon as the FR NMPG has approved. Narrative will be used, since there is no dedicated qualifier for the tax amount.Kim asked a question regarding impact on S&R: how to coordinate, both in the NMPGs and at the SMPG level.  |
| **CA252** | New SOFF CHOS without rights distribution | **Actions:**NMPGs are requested to investigate if this type of event has occurred in their market (or another), and if they would like to add a new line to the GG for SOFF CHOS without rights ?Provide feedback to Jacques by April 17. | MDPUG | **Telco Mar25, 2013:**Has any NMPG experienced a SOFF CHOS with a SECU option and a CASH option, but without a rights distribution ? MDPUG case with such a SOFF CHOS originated from HK.**Telco Jan 24, 2013:**There has recently been a SOFF CHOS event (which is n/a in the EIG+ GG column) with securities and cash options without any rights involved whilst for the other cases of SOFF CHOS in BE and in DE columns, rights seemed always involved.  |
| **CA253** | Use of MT566 with posting amount = 0 | In case the proceeds of a CA event are absorbed by the fees or tend to zero due to the eligible balance and/or price being very small, what needs to be sent: + an MT566 confirmation message with a posting amount of 0 or+ an MT564 CANC since the event does no longer take place for him **Action:** Bernard to create a draft document describing a few scenarios for discussion at the Frankfurt meeting. | Bernard | **Telco Mar 25, 2013:**Issue: What happens when the posting amount goes down to 0 ? Should an MT 566 be sent anyway with zero posting amount ?Different scenarios can be distinguished for a posting amount of zero:• The issuer cannot pay the posting amount (credit issue).• The result of the posting amount calculation is zero or very close to zero (like an ELN).Examples of the second scenario:1. Final Redemption: Securities must be debited but cash is null.2. Income – interest payment with floaters: there is no securities movements and the cash amount is null.Potential solutions:- Cancellation of the event -> not desirable at all.- Sending an 564 REPE update -> does not work (especially for INTR as very often there are no announcements) |
| **CA254** | use of MT564 CANC for Elig = 0 | In case a client is notified for a CA event (PREU / PREC), based on his holding and the eligible balance for the same client is 0 on effective /EX-date (due to a transfer out/sale): What needs to be sent then:+ a REPL/REPE with balance 0 or + a CANC of the previous message due to the client being no longer eligible ?  | Bernard |   |
| **CA255** | Harmonised local market practice for processing of fictitious CAONs in instructions | Possible creation of a harmonised market practice for the validation and processing of CA instructions sent with fictitious option numbers. The MP would be optional; local markets/NMPGs would be able to decide if they wish to implement it or require all instructions to contain the account servicer’s CAON and CAOP combination. | Christine |   |
| **CA239** | GMP Part 1 | Corrections of Part 1 message Flows illustrations | Bernard / Jacques |  |
|  | SWIFT Standards messaging Landscape document | NMPGs to provide comments | Jacques |  |
| **Priority 2 Items** |
| **CA203** | Yearly GMP Part 1,2,3 and samples alignement as per SR2013 and yearly summary of changes to MPs | **Final Review of GG in Frankfurt** | CA SMPG |  |
| **CA220** | SO 20022 CAPA, CACO Messages: no more CA Details | Event details have been removed from ISO 20022 versions of CAPA, CACO and event processing status message. This means that some key data like Record Date are no longer in those messages and thereby Record Date had to be reinserted into the DTCC Extensions for the CAPA/CACO/CAPS messages.Actions: Waiting for ISITC feedback. | ISITC | Osaka November 5 - 7ISITC is currently looking at the differences between the CA confirmation in ISO 15022 and in ISO 20022. This should cover the issue in this open item. The GMP part 1 subgroup will review after they have reported their conclusions.Telco Sept 14: Record date, ex-date and RHDI indicator have been identified as necessary in the sub-group.ISITC might still require some more elements. Sonda will revert later. Not for October meeting.Telco June 29: Discussed at the last call of the 20022 sub-group.Record date, ex date and RHDI indicator have been identified as necessary in the sub-group.ISITC are reviewing the other fields to see of there are additional fields that are required. Sonda to revert if they identify more fields.Rio April 5-7:Decision: Decision: SMPG to review which messages we need event details in, and which fields to put back in. We should not include everything, just critical details. |
| **CA248** | DVOP - Enable Instructing on both QREC and QINS Quantities | Related to SR2013 CR000418 (rejected CR) | FR | From SR2013 CR418 |
| **CA229** | Meeting event - meeting time zone | Meeting event - meeting time expressed from the account servicer's time zone or from the local time of the place where the meeting will be held? | PV subgroup |   |
|  | **Tax Subgroup** | Update from April 4 conference Call | Tax Subgroup |  |
|  | **MyStandards** | Group update | MyStandards Subgroup | Start a temporary group to investigate how we should use MyStandards, with Peter, Mari, Bernard, Veronique, Elena and Jacques as members. Start in February, after SR2013 versions of the MP documents have been finalised and address the following points:• Define concrete and realistic objectives for the migration.• Can we move GMP1 and some of GMP2 and 3 into MyStandards and not only as actual documents ?• Define an area where we could start writing MPs directly using MyStandards ?• How to publish documents on MyStandards ?• Who will become editors for the CA-WG ?• Can we harmonise publication of MPs on MyStandards with the other SMPG WGs ? |