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Attendees

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **NMPG** | **Title** | **First Name** | **Last Name** | **Institution** |
|  | BE | Ms | Peeters | Véronique | BNY Mellon |
|  | CH | Mr | Blumer | Michael | Credit Suisse AG |
|  | DE | Ms | Pileri | Andreana | Commerzbank AG |
|  | DE | Mr. | Schaefer | Daniel | HSBC |
|  | DK | Ms | Ravn | Charlotte | VP Securities A/S |
|  | ES | Mr | Steimann | Thomas | Deutsche Bank SAE |
|  | FI | Ms | Rask | Sari | Nordea Bank Plc |
|  | FR | Ms | Phungtran | Kim-Chi | BNP Paribas Securities Services |
|  | HK | Ms | Yu | Yek Ling | HSBC |
|  | ISITC US | Ms | Pimental | Sonda | Brown Brothers Harriman & Co. |
|  | IT | Ms | Deantoni | Paola | sgss spa |
|  | JP | Mr | Oga | Yasuo | Mizuho Corporate Bank, Ltd |
| Co-Chair | LU | Mr | Lenelle | Bernard | Clearstream |
|  | MDPUG | Ms | Fuller | Laura | SIX Financial Information Ltd |
|  | MDPUG | Mr | Hinds | Peter | Interactive Data |
|  | NL | Mr | van der Velpen | Ben | ING BANK N.V. |
| Co-Chair | SE | Ms | Strandberg | Christine | SEB |
| Facilitator | SWIFT | Mr | Littré | Jacques | SWIFT |
|  | UK | Ms | Fumagalli | Mariangela | BNP Paribas |
|  | UK | Mr | Middleton | Matthew | London Stock Exchange |
|  | XS | Ms | Haillez | Delphine | Euroclear |
|  | ZA | Mr | Jayram | Sanjeev | RMB Custody and Trustee Services |

# Meeting Agenda

These minutes are based on the distributed meeting agenda.

See document ”0\_Frankfurt\_2013\_FINAL\_CA\_Agenda\_v2.docx”



NMPG’S feedback/inputs for the meeting:



# Minutes / Notes helpers

Christine

Sonda

Matthew

# Next Telco/Meeting Schedule 2013

All conference calls from 2 PM to 4 PM CET

May 23

June 27

August 29

September 26

October 24

December 12

**Next physical meeting**: From November 12 to 14, 2013 in Johannesburg, South Africa

For the Johannesburg meeting, more information is provided in the presentation posted on the [www.smpg.info](http://www.smpg.info) web site at: <http://smpg.webexone.com/r.asp?a=12&id=32273>

# Approval of March 25 Minutes

No comments received. Minutes are approved.

# CA239 - SR2013 Maintenance WG follow up items – Jacques

1. Action 1: CR 393, Fractional Entitlement (Kimchi)

Kim sent the proposed MP for FRAQ last week. It was included in the input documents sent by Jacques before the meeting.



For the question as to whether one or two MT566 should be used, this is already answered by the MP section 6.5 in GMP Part 1, which reads that both alternatives are equally valid and is at the appreciation of the account servicer.

The French NMPG would like to receive information regarding fractional entitlement in the confirmation from Euroclear France, but this was not supported by the SMPG. If the French participants would like to receive this info they must request Euroclear France to send notifications that include this information.

Sonda asked a question regarding usage of CONB in this FRAQ example. The WG agreed, after some discussion, to use also the original quantity (10 in this case) in CONB in the MT 566 for the cash in lieu posted separately (which was btw. also the decision of the MWG when they approved the CR for FRAQ).

Sonda mentions however that the use of CONB for US drawings/lotteries should probably be different from the use of CONB for fractional entitlement (CINL) as in the first case, CONB should be only the quantity on which the drawing/lottery is applied. To date there is no MP defined on the usage of CONB.

**Action item:** Sonda to ensure that there ISITC MP is updated to document the differences regarding usage of CONB / ELIG / Affected Balances (AFFB) in lottery events (DRAW) in the MT566.

1. Action 2: CR421 - Accumulation Event (Mari)

The ACCU UK MP is almost ready for publication; it will most likely be published next week.

1. Action 3: CR383, Letter of Guarantee Indicator (Sonda)

ISITC US has reached out to the Canadian NMPG; a conference call is planned and will hopefully result in a response during May.

**Action point:** Sonda or the CA-NMPG to revert.

1. Action 4: CR411, DE Real Estate Property Income (REES) rate type code MP (Andreana)

The DE NMPG has produced an MP on this. Germany will implement the new REES rate type code as of November 2013 and will remove the current DSS workaround.

Regulation for taxes on Accumulated fund: Germany will announce the highest tax rate with profit in the MT564 then announce the Tax refund in the MT566. They will use the new ACCU event type also in Nov. 2013. The DE NMPG will submit a new CR for SR 2014 for a new rate type code.

Note that UK will also use the REES code from November 2013 and will include it in their MP and templates.

1. Action 5: CR 386, Special warrants (Jacques)

Jacques has not had the time to contact the Canadian NMPG. Sonda will kindly add this to her discussion with the Canadian NMPG.

**Action point:** Sonda or the CA-NMPG to revert.

1. Action 6: CR 439, Capital return event type (Matthew)

The UK NMPG is not yet ready with an alternative solution for Capital Return. It will hopefully report at the next SMPG conference call.

**Action Item**: UK NMPG (Mari/Matthew) to revert at next call.

# CA167 - Consent Events MP – Bernard

Bernard walked the group through the updated document.

Discussion on the German scenario 5 of certificates: these get to participate at ordinary general meetings, though perhaps with not as many items to vote for. Therefore, it is correctly labeled with MEET codes and does not need to be included in the CONS document.

Discussion on the Korean comments in section 1.d) and in scenario 3 in the table: the Korean comments have been considered. The proposal to use NOAC for a CHOS event was rejected as it is not compliant with usage of NOAC. However, instead it is proposed to use either CHOS with CONY (as default) or eventually VOLU with NOAC (as default).

Sweden wishes to have BMET added to table for scenario 4.

The resulting document is provided below.



**Action item**:

1. Bernard to revert back to Korea NMPG and ask them for scenario 3 to use either CHOS with CONY as default or VOLU with NOAC as default and finalise the CONS document.
2. Bernard to create SR2014 CRs for:

* addition of new event BMET
* creation of a new indicator for distinguishing between scenarios 1a (Change in Terms) and 1b (Due & Payable).
* Modification of the CONS definition as proposed in the document.

# CA240 - New CAMV code or Option code for disclosure / certification - Christine

Only four NMPGs have provided feedback (see input file) as requested before the meeting, but a number of markets have discussed the item too. The US is against the use of a new CAMV, but agree to find a fix for the issue.

Discussions feedback about initial proposed solutions:

1. New CAMV: Would it benefit the process if a new CAMV was used to facilitate the action required back from the client ? - Implementation impact is very high !!
2. MAND with ADDB: In this case, can an instruction be received on a MAND event ?
3. CHOS with ADDB. Will this help collect the information needed from the client? What options would be present? Will there be a deadline?

Besides the initial solutions above, a new potential solution using CHOS or VOLU with specific options is proposed by South Africa.

Christine and Véronique are tasked to create a grid based on the discussions describing the different business scenarios, and the various possible solutions with pros and cons and to present it on Wednesday or Thursday at the meeting. The new solution comparison grid is attached below:



Feedback at the meeting is that the new CAMV code not really felt as the ideal fix, due to the cost of implementing and the ADDB based solution does not provide enough clarity.

However the 3rd option proposed by South Africa for the issue using CHOS with CASH and SECU options, is seen as the best proposal. Although not perfect, it does seem to be working quite well in South Africa.

**Action item**:

* ZA (Sanjeev) and CH (Michael) and other NMPG if any to provide more information (MP) on their own solution.
* NMPGs to provide comments / feedback on the proposed solution in the grid.
* The scenario initially included in the grid with the tax breakdown must be rather discussed at the tax subgroup level (to be handled in 1 or 2 events TBD by tax subgroup).

# CA210 - Overelection/Oversubcription market practice review – Véronique

Input document from Véronique:



The WG discussed the two examples (PRIO & EXRI) and the different flows for oversubscription, particularly the use of QREC vs. QINS.

NMPGs feedback on usage of oversubscription:

* IT – Not allowed to oversubscribe
* JP – Priority Offers are not applicable. No oversubscription cases
* US – For Priority Offers, the subscription and oversubscription must be submitted at the same time in the same MT565 as requested by DTCC. (Sonda to follow up on the 567 and 566 process in the US – how to reject oversubscription and accept instruction with one 567 ?).
* FR and SE - Flow 3 is used.
* UK – have the case for buyback of securities

Flow 2 in EXRI should rather be disregarded as there are 2 different quantities for the same CAOP option however leading to two MT567 which is awkward.

Flow 3 in EXRI is by far the most used (almost 1.4 million 565s with QINS//UNIT vs. approx. 550 with QREC//UNIT), but it does represent a misuse of QINS for oversubscription as normally QREC should be used (as per the definition of QREC).

**Action point:** Véronique to draft an MP regarding the use of QINS and QREC for NMPGs to provide feedback for implementation in 2014. In example 2 (EXRI), change the term “flow” by “scenario”.

If the MP is accepted, add spreadsheet in GMP Part 2 to track implementation (similar to RHTS vs. EXRI).

# CA226 - Disclosure (DSCL) event - Clarify usage / market practice - Bernard

The different scenario of disclosures defined in the Excel matrix during the previous meetings (and built by Bernard) have been reviewed and updated with additional information from NMPG’s. The updated file is attached below..



The matrix shows that most scenario are handled outside of the MT56x solution.

Recommendation:

There is only one scenario (the one from the ICSD) for which the recommendation is to use DSCL event. When the disclosure is done in the context of an event, it is recommended to announce using the event CAEV with the disclosure information included.

**Action Item**: NMPGs to review the matrix and provide comments.

Comments From Yek Ling (HK)

I'm unsure if this issue is connected with CA226 or/and CA240 since this is part of disclosure information or/and process that are being carried out during the life cycle of an event.  By one way or the other, I believe the matter in this request is that we need to look at what's the best approach or if we can come up the standards for this regardless of market, regardless of event type.. (mandatory, voluntary or choice) ...  if the proposal will provide opportunities for improved STP and other efficiencies etc.   
  
Please see the below, some common scenarios about this matter regarding CA226 / CA240  ...   
  
eg. in Philippines   
Preferential rates will be given to clients who comply with the issuer’s requirement.  For non-compliance, a maximum statutory tax rate of 30 per cent for           
corporates and 25 per cent for individuals shall apply   
  
On the (distribution of subscription rights), whereby Shareholders are required to sign an investor certification that they are allowed/not restricted to purchase the resultant shares.   
  
eg. in Singapore   
Dividend with options where entitled shareholders who elect for new shares are to certify their beneficial owner are not US or Canada citizen. This certification is submitted to Central Depository on the election submission.   
  
For REITS company distribution (mandatory cash), whereby declaration of beneficial owner of the client wish to receive the distribution net of the concessionary tax rate. Example,individual and local corporate - tax free.  Foreign corporate - 10% , non- compliance - 17%   
  
I understand that while Africa require this to indicate that this is a CHOS related, other markets may not recognize this as appropriate (the case for a Dividend with options event whereas this is already a CHOS event). The inclusion of additional options within a CHOS event to cover disclosure scenario would have a negative impact on the STP , also adding more complexity to the entire reporting as you can well imagine.

# CA242 - Placement of Interest Shortfall (SHRT) - Bernard

ISITC feedback is that they would like to include SHRT together with RLOS (realised gain/loss), which is also in D today.

**Action point:** Sonda to check with ISITC if they would like to create a CR to move SHRT and RLOS to E/E2.

# CA245 - Capital Increase offered to public – Mari/Matthew

This is concerning subscriptions without any rights or any preferential treatment of some sort.

**Decision**: From the NMPG’s feedback, it comes out that it cannot be considered as a corporate action and therefore the SMPG does not support a CR for the creation of a new CAEV for this.

**Action**: Close Item.

# CA246 - Do we need to keep Processing Status INFO (25D::PROC//INFO) – Christine

The US has one case of usage of PROC//INFO, for on-going events such as conversions where conversion is always possible. This is however not really in line with the standard, since instructions are supported though perhaps not in that particular event but as unsolicited.

Germany uses PROC//INFO for possible fund mergers (OGAW / UCITS events) and other events to indicate it is preliminary information as required by law. This event is never cancelled nor withdrawn, but neither is it continued. If the merger actually takes place, then a new event is created. The SMPG thinks that it is rather a misuse of the PROC//INFO indicator and recommends DE to either use PREC or PREU processing status or to use the event type INFO.

Discussion followed about the above usage and the possible actions i.e. change the definition of PROC//INFO and create a new code for specifying different types of CAEV//INFO events.

Decision: Keep PROC//INFO but update its definition as indicated into the action items below. Create a CR to add a new indicator to specify the type of INFO

**Action point:**

1. Sonda to create a draft CR to change the definition of PROC//INFO to be used for on-going events without a fixed pay date, market deadline or response deadline, and send it to the ICSDs for review; to be ready by the conference call on May 23.
2. Delphine to create a CR to request a new indicator for INFO sub-types, using different codes for conference calls,

Illustration of the German OGAW / USITS events:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OGAW IV/USITC IV | **Liquidation of funds**  **+** Announcement of a funds Liquidation | **Prospect Change** Any change of the terms included in a Funds prospect | **Merger of funds** Merger of two or more funds into one of them or a new funds. | **Discontinuation of Redemption of funds** Funds is closed for further redemptions | **Reopening for Redemption of funds** Funds reopens for further redemptions |
|  | **LIQU** | **CHAN** | **MRGR** | **SUSP** | **ACTV** |
|  | **MAND** | **MAND** | **MAND** | **MAND** | **MAND** |
|  | n.a. | :22F::CHAN//TERM | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |

# CA247 - New Date Code when Ex-Date is not announced – Sonda

How to communicate that the ex-date is not announced in a country?

The WG discussed if there were any possible solutions. The group agrees that the best possible solution is to track the support for Ex-Date in the different countries and to provide this information in the existing Record Date tracking table.

The WG reviewed the existing RDTE table in GMP Part 2 and completed it with the missing XDTE information. Results are provided in the following file:



**Action item**: HK (Yek Ling), SG and LU (Bernard) to provide the information about XDTE in their country.

# CA249 - Reinstate format option D for PAYD in seq. E1 and E2 – Delphine

There is no willingness in the WG to re-insert option D for PAYD. Taking the low traffic volume considered, the SMPG recommends keeping using narrative in those cases.

**Decision:** Close the item.

# CA251 - French Transaction Tax  FR – Kim

Kim presented the latest version of the document. The WG questioned a number of items in the document, including the activity diagram in section III and the decision process in section IV. For instance, the first check should be if the event is FTT eligible or not. Since this information is sourced from the issuer, it is not necessary for the Service Provider to determine the scope by ISIN and Event Type. A new field for “in scope” or “out of scope” that is set by the Issuer data may be needed.

The group recommends also that the S&R related information be left out of the document.

The fields used for taxability and exemption were especially questioned, but the problem is that there are no good solutions with the current standards.

ATAX will be used in France to report the transaction tax amount (to be checked with SMPG settlements - can we align the same code?).

The group recommends to wait for the European transaction tax to be clarified before making any final decisions. This should occur in June.

The SMPG will create a sub group for Financial Transaction Tax with representatives from S&R, CA & IF.

**Actions:**

1. Kim to update the document and send it for publication as “temporary” pending results of the discussion at the SMPG FTT subgroup (cross WGs) level.
2. Jacques to ask whether SWIFT could accept a late regulatory CR on FTT if around beginning of August while more detailed info on European Transaction Tax will be available.

**Decision:** Close the item; leave the issue of FTT to the proposed SMPG FTT joint sub-group.

# CA252 - New SOFF CHOS without rights distribution – Laura / Peter

Laura provided the background. The example provided is in Bermuda. No other markets have seen this scenario except one in India. It is therefore considered an exception case.

The MDPUG were requested to output as best as possible.

**Decision**: The SMPG declined to add anything to GMP regarding this.

**Action**: Close the item.

# CA253 - Use of MT566 with posting amount = 0  Bernard

Bernard has not received the requested info. The item is postponed to a future call once the document is provided.

**Action**: Bernard to provide input.

# CA254 - use of MT564 CANC for Elig = 0  Bernard

Bernard described the 2 following scenario:

Scenario 1  
Client A held position and received NEWM 564 (PREU or PREC or COMP). Client A sells entire position prior to eligibility date. What needs to be sent on Eligibility Date?   
+ a REPL/REPE with balance 0 ?   
+ a CANC of the previous message due to the client being no longer eligible ?

+ nothing

**Decision**: It is agreed that CANC is incorrect and that no MT564 should be sent. Client has no eligible holding so, no need to send 564 with 0 balance. Depending on SLA with Service Provider, Client A may have received a real time position change notification.

Scenario 2

Same scenario as above but there are pending receipt (PENR) or pending delivery (PEND) balances at eligibility date.

In this case, an MT564 and MT566 should be sent and this should also generate a Market Claim.

**Action item**: Bernard to write a MP based on the above to be reviewed at the next call.

# CA255 - Harmonised local MP for processing of fictitious CAONs in Instruct – Christine

Sonda and Christine described the issue: following the introduction of the US MP on option numbering in MT565 allowing the use of 999 or UNS, a number of Participants are now using this MP and it is now being seen more and more in other markets.

Therefore, in lieu of global standardization for option numbers, Christine and Sonda propose that the SMPG supports a new global MP based on the ISITC Market Practice that contains a guideline allowing the use of 999 or UNS when option number cannot be played back to the Service Provider.

Initial feedback from the NMPGs was inconclusive as the opinions are very different. The discussion was heated, and some representatives questioned (again) if this is not counter-productive, in addition to a misuse of the standard.

UK did raise the question of whether the US MP should be removed and mentions that the current position of the SMPG has now become more than unclear on this issue and that that unclarity is not sustainable.

Italy representative did not agree with the proposal at all as it is clearly not in line with the CAJWG principles. It was also mentioned by BE that this issue is not a market issue but rather a specific problem between IMs and custodians.

However, the current MP to reject MT565s with incorrect combination of CAON/CAOP is not used, and the problem is growing.

It is also needed to consider the 567 (look back at the CR for a new pending reason code for the 567).  
On the 567, the Service Provider sends back the option number that they processed the instruction for.

Post Meeting Minutes comments:

DE, BE and LU do not agree with the above decision and action points as they think it does not reflect correctly the conclusion reached at the meeting.

Lu and DE think that at this stage the action point is first to ask whether the NMPGs agree or not with having a new MP on the CAON in Instructions to allow usage of 999 when option numbering is not supported by the Account Owner.

BE wants to insist on the fact that this Option Numbering issue is of a global nature and should not be resolved by a Market Practice decision.

**Decision**: Request first NMPGs to give their approval to create a new global MP (that is SLA-driven e.g. like MT564 REPE for voluntary events after MKDT) that would follow the same ISITC guideline when the service provider’s option number cannot be supported. This would prevent markets from following different practices and will allow for adoption by institution.

**Action point:**

1. Christine to email all NMPGs and ask if they approve of a global market practice for processing of instructions with CAON//999, and if so, if they approve of the draft text Sonda and Christine have created and which will be included in the email.

# SWIFT Standards messaging Landscape document comments – Jacques

No comments on the document received.

**Action point:** Jacques to ensure there is a link to the document on smpg.info and close it.

# CA239 - GMP Part 1 – correction of Part 1 message flows illustrations – Bernard/Jacques

Bernard explained that Jacques and himself have reviewed the flow descriptions in GMP Part 1 section 2.2 and found a number of errors. There are inconsistencies in the text and in the illustrations, eg. “Full announcement”, “Entitlement” and “Eligibility”, “Preliminary” and “initial”, ISO20022 illustrations only while should be neutral, “rolling events”, referring to mandatory events in the voluntary section and vice versa, etc..

**Action point:**

1. Bernard/Jacques will create a draft with corrections to chapter 2 of GMP Part 1.
2. The GMP sub-group to review the rest of GMP1 and propose corrections/amendments.

# CA203 - Review of EIG+ GG – Christine

No GG changes proposed for GMP Part 2 SR2013 v 1.1.

FR column to be added. Italy will start to look at their country column in June.

**Action point:** NMPGs that have not yet sent their country column changes for SR2013 are requested to do so by **close of business day May 10**.

# CA220 - SO 20022 CAPA, CACO Messages: no more CA Details – Sonda

ISITC have compared the ISO20022 CAPA (seev.035) and CACO (seev.036) messages with the MT564 and MT566. They identified a gap with ex-date and record date (for matching purposes) and the previous/next factors (for information).

The US would like to request the addition of those elements in the two ISO 20022 messages for SR2014 but have not yet made a final decision. SMPG agreed with Ex-Date and Record Date. Not comment on the factors as they do not apply.

**Action point:** ISITC will eventually create a CR for ISO 20022.

**Decision:** Close the item.

# CA248 - DVOP - Enable Instructing on both QREC and QINS Quantities – Kim

The French NMPG has created a local market practice for communication between the CSD participants and the CSD as a workaround for this.

The issue does not affect clients of CSD participants.

**Action point:** Kim will send the MP document to Bernard.

**Decision:** Close the item.

# CA229 - Meeting event - meeting time zone

For Meeting event, is meeting time expressed from the account servicer's time zone or from the local time of the place where the meeting will be held ?

**Decision:** The time of a general meeting is the time the meeting will be held at that particular place, i.e. not the account servicer’s/sender’s time zone.

**Action**: Jacques to add recommendation to the GMP Part 1 section on Meetings.

# Q1 - Use of DEVI (Declared Dividend Rate) for Depositary Receipts

Is it OK to use DEVI for DRs to give the dividends of the underlying stock when the DR pays a dividend in another currency ?

**Decision:** No. According to the usage rule in the standards reading “*The Declared Rate DEVI may only be used if the dividend or interest declared by the issuer is actually paid in a different currency than the declared one.*”.  
So, DEVI is not to be used for DRs.

Related question from MDPUG: Should DEVI be included in the movements also ?

**Decision:** No, only report DEVI in D and “Unknown” in E2 Gross Dividend. Close item.

# Q2 - EXOF and CAPG Questions

Question 1: On the French Market, we are reviewing the process of reporting of the tenders and offers: EXOF, BIDS and TEND. We would like to apply the global market practice. By combining the “EIG grid” versus the “complex events” grid , we understand that :  
- if the initiator is the Issuer of the underlying security and outturns is CASH , he has to use CAEV//BIDS  
- In all other cases , it will be CAEV//EXOF (SECU only , SECU + CASH or SECU + CASH + CASE)  
Now what about the following case when the initiator is still the Issuer : CASE, CASH, NOAC , is "EXOF" still valid ?

**Decision:** Use EXOF for this.

Question 2: Since Jan. 2013, on the French market, the funds have to pay and fiscalize capital-payments to the holders (not only standard incomes, dividends). We cannot therefore use the CAEV DVCA. We think to use CAPG. Is this the correct qualifier to announce such events?

Answer: this depends on the source of the money to be paid to the fund holders; can be either DVCA or CAPD depending on the source (the income account or the capital account of the fund).

**Action point:** The FR NMPG will investigate the source and details and revert.

# Q3 - CAOP//PRUN Unknown Proceeds existing MP question

Please refer to the detailed agenda for the full question.

**Decision:** Keep the current usage rule and MP for PRUN when possible, but recommend use of ADTX for the rare events when the issuer cannot even provide details of the possible movements or have many different alternatives.

# Q4 - Clarification of the definition DISF

Please refer to the detailed agenda for the full question.

1. French market use of RDUP when it should be BUYU.

Round Up (RDUP) is at no cost whilst BUYU is at a cost (buy!)

**Action:**

1. Jacques to create a CR to add ‘at no cost’ to the definition of RDUP and to add “as specified in the definition of RDUP and RDDN’ to STAN (Standards) code.
2. Kim to investigate if French MP specifies use of RDUP instead of BUYU.
3. JP NMPG (Yasuo) to discuss the usage of RDDN instead of CINL.
4. Sonda to check use of voluntary of RDUP; could addition of a TBSP code (account owner to specify how much to round up, in other words give a breakdown) be useful?

# Tax Subgroup update – update from April 4 call - Bernard

Last meeting held on April 4, meeting minutes not yet available.

# MyStandard - Cross WGs meeting report

Jacques reported from the meeting held yesterday evening between a dozen representatives from the 3 SMPG WGs (CA, IF, S&R and all SWIFT facilitators) regarding the way MPs are being created on MyStandards (MS). From the CA group, Bernard, Peter, Laura, Sonda, Sanjeev and Jacques attended.

The participants to this session were usually (from organization being) active users of the MS platform regarding the design of usage guidelines.

The objective of the meeting was to share issues encountered by each group when creating their MPs in MS.

Outcome of the meeting:

1. Workaround for naming convention of usage guidelines presented by Evelyne in order for presentation of individual guidelines within a collection to be alphabetically ordered.

* Group raised same concerns as ISITC that not following recommended best practice on naming conventions will result in search function issues.  Needs to be escalated to MyStandards Project team to build a collapsible tree org. view of collections.

1. Have the possibility to structure the MPs in different sections/folders, for instance distributions and reorganisations, and their sub-types for CA.

**ACTION Item for CA WG**: Decide upon the categories/sections names for structuring CA MPs

1. Ignored vs. Restricted vs. Optional flagging of fields on Editor.

* SnR WG proposed a new check box to state as “recommended” on the editor. However, the IF group provided their approach as an alternative using the “***annotation***” tags.  Create a generic “***annotation”*** called “SMPG Recommended” and apply it to all recommended format options/codewords/qualifiers/fields/sequences. This proposal was also agreed by all.
* It was also agreed that **the “Is Ignored” function will not be used for the creation of SMPG MPs**.

*Example: For 98a::SETT usage:*

* *98A will contain the SMPG Recommended annotation tag*
* *98C will be left with no annotation tag*
* *98E will be restricted as not allowed*

1. There is a need to redo the SMPG MPs which have already been created, based on the agreed restrictions before making them public documents.
2. Evelyne, Jason and Simon will also conduct testing before the MPs are made publicly available so as to check how annotations export to pdf as well as how they export to spread sheet.

**------------------------ End of the Meeting Minutes -----------------**