**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 – 14:00 | **Lunch** **(Foyer CI 36th floor)** |
| **Afternoon**  |  |
|   | 14:00 – 15:15 | Investment Funds WG**(Room MCG05 - Ground floor)** | Corporate Action WG**(Room CI – 36th floor)** | Settlement and Reconciliation WG**(Room MCG07 - Ground 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** |

**Meeting Agenda**

1. IPO and DR processes (C.Foo)
2. a) MT54x/MX cash amount qualifier usage matrix (see draft attached)

b) Financial Transaction tax (All) – Dedicated qualifier?

c) Debit/Credit Usage 15022 vs 20022 – Clarification on N Sign Usage

1. Summary Matrix – field95a DEAG/REAG (Usage of BIC vs Local Code) (see draft attached)
2. Field 97a Option A and Option E (Evelyne)
3. MT 535 Business Case for discussion (see attached)
4. Market Practices (Status)
	1. Review of list of MPs still to be reshuffled
	2. SMPG Buy Sell Back MP for global approval (see attached)
5. Specifics from ISITC (Jason)
	1. MT 396 FX status MUG – Conversion into SMPG MP?
	2. SMPG Security Collateral MP – Discuss consolidation of bi-lateral vs. tri party segregated collateral MP documents
	3. SMPG MT304 Spot/Forward FX MP – Draft document presented Summer, 2012. Discuss consolidation of NDF MUG document vs. breaking out into own document
	4. SMPG securities payments MPs – Discuss consolidation of MT202/210/103 and MX equivalents into one document instead of MT202/210/MX equivalent vs. MT103 doc
	5. Indian Bidding Process
6. Markets Practices on MyStandards (Evelyne)
7. Translation Rules (Evelyne)
8. AOB
	1. Market Practices in the “T2S world” (Helle)
	2. Repo/Reverse Repo Market Practice Matrix (Simon)
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| Axelle Wurmser (AW) | axelle.wurmser@bnpparibas.com | France |
| Simon Burke (SB) | Simon.T.Burke@jpmorgan.com | UK & Ireland |
| Denis Andrejew (DA) | denis.andrejew@db.com  | Germany |
| Helle Soe-Jensen (HSJ) | hsj@vp.dk  | Denmark |
| Evelyne Piron (EP) | Evelyne.PIRON@swift.com | Swift |
| Angela Katapodi (AK) | a.katapodi@ttbank.gr | Greece |
| Annemie Loose (AL) | Annemie.loose@euroclear.com | ICSD |
| Jason Brasile (JB) | Jbrasile@statestreet.com | US / ISITC |
| Armin Borries (AB) | Armin.borris@clearstream.com | Germany |
| Taketoshi Mori (TM) | Taketoshi\_mori@mufg.jp | Japan |
| Christine Jozet (CJ) | Christine.jozet@ecb.int | ECB |
| Cindy Foo (CF) | Cindy.foo@swift.com | Swift |
| Unno Shunichiro (US) | s-unno@jasdec.com | Jasdec |
| Sim Eng Thiam (AS) | anthony.sim@sc.com  | Singapore |
| Priscilla Ferri de Barros (PB) | pbarros@bvmf.com.br | Brasil |
| Brian Edward Du Plessy (BD) | briand@jse.co.za | South Africa |
| Christian Pinetz (CP) | christian.pinetz@oekb.at  | Austria |
| Marcin Zawistowski (MZ) | drs@kdpw.pl  | Poland |
| Ton Van Andel | ton.van.andel@nl.abnamro.com | Netherlands |

 |  |

## Meeting Minutes

**General Session: Tuesday, April 23rd**

1. **Welcome**
2. Marc Bayle – ECB/T2S program manager
	* T2S migration update – several waves with country focus (Phase 1 – IT, Phase 2 – FR, Phase 3 – Germany)
	* For detailed information, see “News from the T2S project” available on ECB website (T2S online):

<http://www.ecb.europa.eu/paym/t2s/about/t2sonline/html/index.en.html>

1. Karla McKenna – SMPG chair
	* 15 year anniversary of SMPG
	* MyStandards endorsement as documentation tool for SMPG
	* 16 NMPGs have setup MyStandards groups and are in various phases of implementation
	* NMPG coordination
	* Local issues being fully vetted across as many organizations as possible. CSDs, Sub-custodians, Asset Managers, Vendors/Utilities and Broker Dealers
	* Global issues being discussed and feedback provided regardless of individual market relevance. Expertise from a standards perspective.
2. **Regional Updates (See attachment and smpg website)**
	1. Corp. Actions – Joint WG (Christine Strandberg)
* WG agreed on three basic categories of CA events - Distributions, Reorgs and Transaction Management. There is also informational type events that do not necessarily require processing so were not classified as part of this exercise
	+ 1. Distributions – Cash (cash dividend, interest payments), Securities (stock dividend, bonus issue) or Distributions with Options (optional dividend)
		2. Reorganizations – Mandatory, Mandatory with Options, Voluntary
		3. Transaction Management events – Market Claims, Transformations Buyer Protection.
	1. Financial Transaction Tax (R. Siebel) – FR update from Axelle Wurmser
* Scope – Products, Exempted declarable vs exempted non-declarable still unclear
* Penalties – still not clear
* Liable parties – still not clear
* Intra-day vs. end of day netting – FR is only end of day so did not discuss/address intraday netting considerations
* **FR will drop the FTT as soon as the EU tax is put in place**
* Decline in activity on FR securities still being studied. Not clear if this is the result of tax or crisis
* FR NMPG – 2 local market practices (MT54x and MT56x)
	+ Livre Blanc written in FR and English by two market associations (AFTI and AMAFI) has been helpful, but not sufficient
* **FR NMPG proposes to write a regional or global Market Practice**
	1. Explanatory memorandum in Italy (unofficial translation is available online)
		+ Email sent to Italian NMPG representative (still pending response)
	2. Steering Committee Member elections (Armin Borries)
* By-laws update – voting process for by-laws changes and steering committee members
	+ - * + Voting of by-laws at meetings instead of email
				+ Steering Committee –

Two year terms with staggered approach

Interim vote by email should a replacement be necessary

Regional director election will take place locally one month prior to meeting. Results to be provided at next SMPG meeting

All steering committee members not running for subject election + SWIFT standards receive a vote and each NMPG has one vote only.

* SMPG has elected a new Regional Director Asia/Pacific (Anthony Sim) + has confirmed Vice Chair (Rudolf Siebel) and Regional Director EMEA (Armin Borries) -> Press Release available on smpg website

**Settlements and Reconciliation WG Sessions - Tuesday 23 April – Thursday 25 April**

**Preliminary Note - New S & R Co-Chair:**

Angela Katopodi announced that she steps down as one of the S & R WG Co-Chairs and all members in the Group voted in favour of Axelle Wurmser as the new Co-Chair.

1. IPO and DR processes (C.Foo)
	1. IPO Market Practice
		* India NMPG authored document with the help of SWIFT Standards to identify the IPO process globally
		* Group challenged the fact that the document can’t be global MP at this stage (too India specific). It should remain local for India (with comments from the SMPG).
		* Bonds to be added to the scope of financial instruments covered in this MP
		* A statement should be added to mention that prefunding for IPO is required in some markets and the prefunding information should be added to the MP
		* In Section II Background, there was mention of many parties involved in an IPO process. However, the MP document only focused on 2 parties – the Custodians and Investors. More information on the other parties should be included in the MP document.
		* Anthony shared that he will seek the inputs on the IPO Global MP document from the APAC region
		* There was a suggestion raised by the Group to explore using MT567 (or even a new message within the TIC space) instead of MT564 for the notification of effective listing date
		* Regarding the utilisation of a Corporate Action message to notify on the effective listing date of the IPO, there is a need to consult and seek prior agreement from the CA WG. There will be a need to find an alternative solution should the CA WG disagree.
		* For open issues on the IPO process in the India market, a call will be scheduled between Jason, Simon and Cindy to clarify with the representatives from the India market.
		* Detail on bidding process specific to India market to potentially be documented separately and include OFS, IPO, IPP, Bid Fees and the FX processing aspect documented in the ISITC OFS business case. Different prices paid by bidders? Need for multiple bids? If bid below, wouldn’t client be cut out of allocation already and too late to modify bid higher? Multiple bids within one MT502 or is it better to use multiple MT502’s (1 for each bid)? How do you address cancellation of one of the bids?
		* If India market would like to instruct multiple bid options in a single MT502 (ie. utilisation of MAXF and MINI), there is a need to document an additional cancellation process in the event that a bid within that instruction needs to be cancelled.
		* Regarding India market’s request to raise a CR for the rectification of the misusage of MAXF, India market can proceed to raise the CR without the prior agreement of the Group.
		* Denis suggested that each NMPG representative add the IPO specifications for their respective market to this draft MP document and send to Cindy for the identification of commonalities between the different markets.
		* For subsequent discussions on the IN IPO MP, there has to be participation from the representatives from India market so that any open question on the India IPO process can be ironed out. It is planned to review updated version at next SMPG meeting in Johannesburg (rep from India should be present).
	2. Depository Receipts Market Practice
		* ADRs and GDRs most common. Euro DRs denominated in Euros
		* Written by Korean market with input from the three major US depository banks (Citibank, JPM, Deutsche Bank)
		* Simon’s US colleagues have provided feedback on the DR MP documents which will be accepted into the document and shared with the Group
		* The description of the Deposit Agreement in the MP document will be simplified to make it more concise
		* Jason raised the issue about the representation of Private Placement DR in a SWIFT message as the security identifier of a Private Placement contains special characters. A remark has been added to the sample message templates to indicate that ISIN is not available for Private Placement and CUSIP will be used instead.
		* Overall, the Group is agreeable on the format of the DR Global MP document, the Main Activities descriptions, the Flow Diagrams and the Sample Message Templates.
		* The MP document will be updated following the discussion and recirculated to the Group for review
		* The Group agrees that there is currently no need to set up a DR WG
2. a) MT54x/MX cash amount qualifier usage matrix
	* + Evelyne reviewed the Summary Matrix spread sheet with the Group: Network feedback received from State Street was not sufficient in highlighting required vs. optional usage of qualifiers
		+ Brian commented that he will review the requirements for South Africa and revert again to confirm.
		+ The document with the mapping of charges will be shared with all NMPGs who will review for their respective markets.
* **Action item: Get feedback from all NMPGs (SWIFT)**
	+ - Question from Malaysia about the qualifier that should be used for clearing fees. Anthony shared with the Group that in this market, the payment for this charge is taken outside of the settlement instruction. Hence, there is no need for a specific qualifier for this charge. Cindy shared that there will be a re-launch meeting for the MY NMPG taking place on 8 May 2013 and Alex can use the opportunity to discuss about this charge code with the MY NMPG participants then.

b) Debit/Credit Usage 15022 vs 20022 – Clarification on N Sign Usage

* + - Purpose of that exercise was to clarify the Receipt and Delivery norm for the usage of qualifiers available for field 19A in sequence E3 (see spread sheet). Indeed it was agreed that the usage rule in the SWIFT UHB is too vague: “*Sign is used when the Amount is credited while the practice or the transaction type would normally imply that the Amount should be debited (or vice versa)”.* Generally, a loss is represented with a negative sign which is a debit and vice versa for a credit. The “N” indicator representing a debit or credit is optional in ISO 20022.
		- Group felt Credit should be a receipt and Debit should be a delivery to align with the Creditor and Debtor party fields
		- Jason commented that the problem is with the inconsistency in usage of the “N” sign.
		- Simon suggested the need to clarify the definition of a credit and debit. He added that the translation rules do not cover the scenario with the “N” indicator.
		- Denis commented that there is implicit logic in the use of the “N” sign in ISO 15022 and an explicit logic in ISO 20022. The usage of the indicator requires bilateral agreement between the parties involved. The Group agreed that there are 2 options to approach this matter – i. for the Group to make a recommendation on the usage and ii. Leave the usage to bilateral agreement.
		- Unno-san added that in cases where the established rules in the market conflict with the SMPG’s recommendations, the market will ignore SMPG’s recommendations.
		- Group reviewed each 19A qualifier to confirm if implicit (implied) vs. explicit rule as a credit/debit (see attachment)
* **Action item: Request each NMPG to validate columns D and E of the spread sheet (SWIFT).**
	+ - SMPG could decide to include that spread sheet as an appendix of the common MP for example. Still to be agreed with the group (SMPG South Africa).

c) Financial Transaction tax (All) – Dedicated qualifier?

* Axelle queried if it is sufficient just to have one field for tax as there are new types of taxes being introduced frequently, resulting in the existence of many types of taxes. There were discussions if there is a need to create a new qualifier or if an old qualifier should be reused for tax.
* Denis commented that for the moment, TRAX is the right qualifier to use for Transaction Tax. Anthony added that TRAX is already being used in APAC without any issues.
* SMPG has made the decision to endorse the usage of the TRAX qualifier for identifying all transaction tax usages (ITT, FTT, EU TT). The group understands that some countries/institutions may already use that qualifier but this can’t penalise the rest of the community.
* The group decided to vote to ensure consensus on the decision and 12 countries voted in favour of SMPG’s recommendation and 2 countries abstained (out of 14 countries represented at the meeting).
* **Action item: All NMPGs are requested to provide feedback on the SMPG recommendation.**
* **Action item: French MPs on FTT (for MT54x and MT56x) will be posted on the smpg website for comments (Axelle)**
1. Summary matrix – field 95a DEAG/REAG (Usage of BIC vs Local Code) (see attachment)
* Matrix review with WG and feedback provided by NMPGs that were represented.
* Updated matrix is sent for review.
* **Action item: Additional markets that were not represented will be followed up (SWIFT).**
1. Field 97a Option A and Option E (Evelyne)
* The Group shared the historical background of this topic.
* Poland is in favour of the removal of option E.
* Japan has no preference but is mindful of the impact of the removal on ISO 20022 and proposed the removal of IBAN from ISO 15022 and not ISO 20022.
* Recommendation from Germany is to submit a maintenance request to remove the 97E format option
* **Action item: SWIFT standards to pull volume of usage of the 97E format option across all messages/fields/qualifiers**
* The Group then discussed about who should be the party to raise the CR for the removal.
* **Action item: The conclusion was for Switzerland and Netherlands to jointly raise a CR for this, if required (CH was the initiator of the CR to create the option E and NL is challenging that option today).**
1. MT 535 Business Case for discussion
* This business case was raised by Standard Chartered Bank.
* Ghana and Bahrain have a dual account structure of a broker trading account vs. registry account. Broker trading account is under exclusive control of broker, while custodian has full control of registry account.
* Request is to be able to provide the MT535 holdings statement per registry account that highlights holdings for each broker trading account. Normally multiple broker trading accounts per registry account.
* Anthony explained that the broker is the party instructing the movement of the securities between the accounts and if the securities are not in the trading account, they are not available for sale. This requirement currently exists in 2 APAC markets – Taiwan and Vietnam.
* Option 2 of using the place of safekeeping field to identify multiple brokers is the workaround.
* The Group raised a question on who is the instructing party for CA related movement of security from one account to another. Jason and Anthony will both check on this.
* Recommendation is to populate the SUBBAL sequence with the 94F::SAFE//CUST/BIC and create an MCR for a new 94F:: BKBR qualifier for the broker trading account ID.
* **Action item: A change request should be submitted for the MT535 (Anthony)**
1. Market Practices (Status)
	* Review of list of MPs still to be reshuffled (see also attached summary sheet)
* Function of the Message – On Hold with SWIFT Standards
* MT535 Final V5.1 – Finalized in 2011, but open question on quantity breakdown to be confirmed by Axelle
* MT548 – June 1st target date to distribute to SMPG
* Bi-lateral Repo – document gaps between ISITC and SMPG MP to be completed. If something is not ready for Nov. meeting this will be put on hold for future consolidation
* Block Trades – UK ready for final review of document. See attachment for comment by end of May
* Auto Registration reporting – Germany will take over the completion of the document
* Sell Buy Back/Buy Sell Back - Document distributed for final review. No further comments received so document will be posted as Final.
* S/R Portfolio Transfer Cust to Cust Communication – Netherlands assigned. Request to have UK add input. Group has requested that NL continue working on that document.
* Partial Settlement – SWIFT standards to draft document
* Tri Party Repo MP – MP will be converted into SMPG doc (SWIFT Standards) Note: Contract/Cash ISITC MP will not be converted into SMPG for now as only applies to US/UK.
* Cancellation MP – SWIFT Standards to complete
* Modifications MP – Draft document to be updated for review (DK and JP)
* **Action item: SMPG members to review the summary sheet and ensure they complete the MP they are responsible for.**
	+ SMPG Buy Sell Back MP for global approval:
* No further comments received so document will be posted as final (done)
1. Specifics from ISITC
	1. MT396 FX status MUG – Conversion into SMPG MP?
* Jason explained that this is not appropriate as an ISITC document and would like to check on the feasibility to convert this into a SMPG document. Armin commented that payment specialists can be asked to help review the document and provide their feedback. Axelle shared that payment specialists may not be experts in FX.
* Sub-group within SMPG to be created specifically around securities related payments/FX to discuss this document. To be formally raised to steering committee for approval.
	1. SMPG Security Collateral MP – Discuss consolidation of bi-lateral vs. tri party segregated collateral MP documents
* Reviewed new segregated collateral flows with WG.
* Confusion between Tri Party Repo Collateral Management draft SMPG MP, Bi-lateral Security Collateral SMPG MP draft and this new Segregated Cash/Security Collateral MP
* Agreed with the group to post all three documents + create a one page overview of all the different collateral documents under discussion as a reference tool to be posted to SMPG as well (see US NMPG website/Collateral Documents)
	1. SMPG MT304 Spot/Forward FX MP
* Draft document presented summer, 2012. Discuss consolidation of NDF MUG document vs. breaking out into own document.
* Group agreed to review SMPG draft template
* Sub-group within SMPG to be created specifically around securities related payments/FX to discuss this document. To be formally raised to steering committee for approval.
* Target dates to be provided on draft review with SMPG/PMPG.
	1. SMPG securities payments MPs – Discuss consolidation of MT202/210/103 and MX equivalents into one document instead of MT202/210/MX equivalent vs. MT103 doc
* Group feels the SEPA MX messages mandatory for 2014 need to be incorporated into the market practice. Use the MT202/210
* Group agreed to review SMPG draft template
* Sub-group within SMPG to be created specifically around securities related payments/FX to discuss this document. To be formally raised to steering committee for approval
* Target dates to be provided on draft review with SMPG/PMPG. Finalization target
	1. Indian Bidding Process:

This was covered in the IPO discussion on 23 April 2013.

1. Markets Practices on MyStandards (Evelyne)

The 3 SMPG WGs (SnR, CA and Funds) held a discussion on 24 April 2013 end of day regarding the way MPs are being created on MyStandards. The participants to this session were from organisations that are the most familiar with MyStandards.

The objective of the meeting was to share issues potentially encountered by each group when creating their MPs in MS. Also the idea was to get CA and IF SMPG feedback on the usage of the restrictions “is ignored” vs “is not allowed” vs “optional”.

* + 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 similar concerns of 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.
* **Action Item: Follow up with MS product manager (Evelyne)**
* Ignored vs. Restricted vs. Optional flagging of fields on Editor:
* SnR WG proposed a new check box to state as “recommended” on the editor.
* Inv. Funds 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.
* It was agreed that for the creation of SMPG MPs, the “Is Ignored” function will not be used. In addition, an annotation named “SMPG Recommendation” could be created for the use of SMPG.

Example: 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

* There is a need to redo the SMPG MPs which have already been created, based on the agreed restrictions before making them public documents.
* **Action item: Evelyne, Jason and Simon will conduct testing before the MPs are made publicly available. Need to verify how annotations export to pdf as well as how they export to spread sheet.**
1. Translation Rules – Presentation of SWIFT new proposed approach (Evelyne)

The objective of that presentation was to explain a new approach for the translation rules that SWIFT is proposing (see slides attached).

Last year in Athens, some issues were identified within the current version of the translation rules and the SMPG requested to have them maintained. At that time, it was not planned to do this due to the huge maintenance cost that this represents for SWIFT.

As a reminder, the old approach was to translate all the fields in a human readable documentation by manual means (this was done in 2010.) As said above this was very time consuming to complete and continue to maintain by SWIFT Standards.

The new approach is to translate the key fields and key scenarios only (80/20 rule). Less often used fields’ translation can be handled by individual projects through consultancy services (for a fee).

* Key scenarios/fields translated will be decided based on the business experience of SWIFT Standards specialists, feedback from the community and traffic analysis where applicable
* Will be maintained annually by SWIFT standards for each SWIFT release

The Group did not have any positive response towards this proposal. Some of the concerns of the Group were the costs involved and the perception that the 20% of contents being translated give little value to the advanced SMPG community. However, the group agrees that this service will benefit smaller/less involved NMPGs and firms that will rely on this translation mapping documents of the commonly used scenarios/fields to migrate. This service needs to continue to allow these players to participate in the MX usage.

There were also a couple of questions raised during the session that Evelyne had to check with the project manager in charge of this SWIFT initiative:

1. *Verify why MyStandards is not being used for this translation through use of the MT/MX base standards*.

MyStandards is a collaborative tool that (amongst others) allows comparing different usage guidelines defined on a single message standard. MyStandards however does not offer today sufficient capabilities to define mappings/translation between different MT/MX message formats hence can’t be used for defining and maintaining translation rules.

1. *How will SWIFT be able to identify the keys fields and scenarios that will be translated?*

This exercise will be conducted through a combination of business expertise from SWIFT Standards experts, feedback received from the community and traffic analysis. SMPG would be an important source of information to identify the most used fields and scenarios.

1. *How much effort would it be to make the translation of the remaining 80%?*By its nature it is not possible to define 100% of the mappings, as different institutions will always use different usage guidelines that hence can never be covered in a standardized translation. The 2010 experience also learned us that we have spent a significant amount of effort to translate fields that in reality are (as good as) never used.

Although we feel that the proposed approach is in general the right one, we do realize too that a “one size fits all” approach might not work, hence that particular tuning might be required for certain business areas. To this extent we are interested in better understanding the use cases of SMPG members in an upcoming conference call.
2. *Why isn’t SWIFT simply re-using what has been done in 2010?*SWIFT will indeed use the work of 2010 as the starting point: for the 20% selected fields we will use the translation rules defined in 2010 as the starting point. Such rules will be reviewed and updated/discarded depending on what has happened with such rule since 2010.
3. *Has the Board approved this new translation approach?*

This concerns a proposal for a new approach, and is as such independent from the existing approach. However, the Board has been notified of the new approach.

1. AOB
	1. Market Practices in the “T2S world” (Helle)
* T2S settlement process will impact existing messages that will heavily impact the local market practices.

-> Need to consider changes to global market practices instead of writing T2S specific market practices.

* Question if SMPG should be driving this market practice vs. locally/regionally managed market practice.

-> Helle clarified that this is a heads up to potential issues which need to be addressed in the future but this is not a problem at the moment. Group agreed. This topic will be re-discussed at the next SMPG meeting in South Africa.

* 1. Repo/Reverse Repo Market Practice Matrix (Simon)
* The question raised was “What is the institutional preference versus the MP?” Simon commented that it depends on the institution’s interpretation of the process.
* Jason mentioned that he will locate a document which had been drafted by Alex K. and circulate it among the Group members. Topic could be revisited at next SMPG meetings.

**End of Document**