

ASX CHESSE Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHESSE Replacement response
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	130_001_08_sese_032_001_07	/SettlementParameters/SettlementTransactionCondition/Proprietary/Identification/Novated_Rescheduled_Instruction	1	Please confirm whether/how the following uses of 130 message with Settlement Transaction Condition "NRIN" will be distinguishable: 1. Rescheduling fully or partly failed NNDP ("brand new" NRIN). 2. Notifying settled portion of failed, existing NRIN (partly failed, or fully failed with SSP adjustment). 3. Rescheduling fully failed NRIN where there is no SSP adjustment. We need a straightforward way of distinguishing these cases.	Craig Gray	1) When a new NRI is created as a result of a full or partial failure of a NNDP, the Reason will be populated as: (a) Settlement Instruction Generation Notification (SING) where the NNDP has failed as a result of a unit failure; (b) Failed Settlement - Funds Failure (FSUS) or Offsetting Transaction Arrangement (OTAR) where the NNDP has failed as a result of a funds failure. 2) In the event that a NRI (scheduled to be settled) has partly or fully failed in the current batch settlement cycle, the sett_130 will be generated for the part settled component or the SSP component settling in the fully failed case (including where it is zero) and the Reason populated will be Partial Settlement (PART). The SSP component will be incorporated into the settlement amount and settled within the current batch settlement cycle. 3) In the event that a NRI (scheduled to be settled) has partly or fully failed in the current batch settlement cycle, the sett_139 message will be generated for the rescheduled component. In the event an NRI is rescheduled because it is ineligible for settlement (Security in a Suspended State) or the batch settlement cycle is cancelled, a sett_130 will be generated and the Reason populated will be Security Suspended (SRSP) or Batch Cancellation (CANC) respectively.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	130_001_08_sese_032_001_07	/SettlementParameters/SettlementTransactionCondition/Proprietary/Identification/Gross_Market_Trade	1	Will we ever see a 130 message with Settlement Transaction Condition "GMTD"? If so, under what circumstances?	Craig Gray	In the event that the first settlement date is after the accrual date or diary adjustment date, then the sett_130 message would target the Gross Market Trade. In addition to this, ASX Operations have the ability to reschedule obligations (including GMTDs). In the event the GMTD is rescheduled prior to its first settlement date, the CSP will generate and send a sett_130 to advise of its new settlement date.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/SupplementaryData	2	Inclusion of related settlement instruction (sett_105) Origin Transaction Ids within Supplementary Data would be very helpful to reconcile sett_105 messages sent by a participant, at minimum for BSSI and USSI.	Darko Mohenski	To deliver a scalable and efficient batch settlement process that is not impacted by increases in instruction count, the Transaction Id of individual instructions cannot be provided in the sett_136
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/NetSettlementMovementAttributes	3	Identification of individual transactions settled would be very helpful, at minimum for BSSI and USSI.	Craig Gray	Obligation Ids for each Movement Type will not be incorporated into the sett_136 as this will make the settlement process unscalable. The purpose of the sett_136 is to report the net movement of units which have been settled in the current batch settlement cycle. The CSP follows a DVP model 3, where movements within batch occur at a net level.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/SupplementaryData	1	CommSec notes that ASX has introduced the supplementary data extension to this message definition. This allows flexibility for other data elements to be included if there are business requirements - see request for Obligation Ids to Movement Type block	Darcy Wright	Obligation Ids for each Movement Type will not be incorporated into the sett_136 as this will make the settlement process unscalable. The purpose of the sett_136 is to report the net movement of units which have been settled in the current batch settlement cycle. The CSP follows a DVP model 3, where movements within batch occur at a net level.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/NetSettlementMovementAttributes/MovementType/Gross_Matker_Trade	2	Is the Isolate Counterparty re-instatement included in the GMTD totals and NNDP total? If not can this be treated the same as Settlement Adjustments and excluded from GMTD totals?	Darcy Wright	When a (failed) novated instruction has been isolated, the CSP will establish a NRI for the isolated component. These NRIs won't be included within the NNDP totals, they will be separate NRIs contributing to the totals and counts of the instruction type of NRI.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/NetSettlementMovementAttributes	2	2. Multiplicity should increase if request for movement types for mFund and/or Settlement Adjustments (separated from GMTD) are adopted	Darcy Wright	The sett_136 will be generated per Account (HIN), Security, and Basis of Movement combination and will contain the overall net movement of units identified by the Movement Type NETT (including the funds component and count of settlement obligations contributing to the overall net movement). The sett_136 will also contain a breakdown per settlement instruction type (contributing to the overall net movement) which includes a count of instructions, net settled unit quantity and net settlement amounts relating to each instruction type. The instruction types will consist of Novated Gross Market Trades, Novated Settlement Failures, Novated Rescheduled Instructions, Non-Novated Gross Market Trades, Unilateral Scheduled Settlement Instructions, and Bilateral Scheduled Settlement Instructions. mFunds Applications and mFunds Redemptions do not have unit movements within batch settlement processing. These types of instructions will not be incorporated into the sett_136. mFunds also have separate Payment Facilities (to the other obligation types settled in batch) which are used to settle the cash components of mFund orders.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/NetSettlementMovementAttributes	1	CommSec supports the inclusion on the underlying Obligation Ids for a Movement Type (other than Overall) that adds control and auditability to the sett_136 net settlement definition.	Darcy Wright	Obligation Ids for each Movement Type will not be incorporated into the sett_136 as this will make the settlement process unscalable. The purpose of the sett_136 is to report the net movement of units together with the related funds amounts which have been settled in the current batch settlement cycle. The CSP follows a DVP model 3, where movements within batch occur at a net level.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/SupplementaryData/Envelope	1	XML best practice is for supplementary data extensions should be described as STRICT not lax so ensure the MyStandards/Readiness Portal tool validates the schema data rules. LAX results in false positives as the only validation is that an extension schema is found - not the xml complies with the definitions.	Darcy Wright	Thank you for your comments.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/NetSettlementMovementAttributes/MovementType	4	4. Considering the GMTD movement type, will the sum of net Units equal the T+1 NNDP total (assuming no T+2 cancellations) . Our understanding is some 'spawned' obligations created as settlement adjustments and labelled as GMTD but not included in NNDP. This would represent an exception and weaken the control between sett_136 and sett_137. Please consider separating the Settlement Facility-created obligations from the GMTD movement type so this can be better controlled by the Participant systems	Darcy Wright	The sum of the net units reported for Novated Gross Market Trades within the sett_136 should equal to the NNDP reported on the evening prior to it's scheduled settlement (which it reported after any corporate action adjustments). The NNDP can be altered on the morning of settlement in the following exceptions - ASX Operations may need to reschedule, cancel, suspend, or transfer obligations to manage a default or on request of a regulator or enforcement agency - Change to the first settlement date of a security resulting in the rescheduling of all obligations for that Security - Cancellation of a Corporate Action or change to the ex-period of a Corporate resulting in the change of basis of movement of all obligations for the Security
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/NetSettlementMovementAttributes/MovementType	3	3. Given application and redemption monies in mFund products settle in the same batch settlement payment facility. MFUN movement type should be added to the movement type code list a sett_136 result with this and the overall net amount. Granted mFund settlement may not be linked to the Settlement HIN under CHESSE but this can be added as an artificial link if there is no entropet	Darcy Wright	As part of batch settlement, only application and redemption monies are moved in relation to order for accounts they may or may not necessarily be controlled by the mFund Settlement Participant. The mFund unit movements do not occur within batch settlement processing, and there are no changes to the workflow for these products i.e. mFund settlement participants will continue to receive payment confirmations for the cash settlement leg of each order. mFunds also have separate Payment Facilities (to the other obligation types settled in batch) which are used to settle the cash components of mFunds orders.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/	2	2. Assuming some consideration included in the sett_137 net funds movements will not be included as Amounts in the sett_136, can ASX identify what Amounts are excluded in Technical Specifications and APG's, or include sett_136 for these values.	Darcy Wright	No changes are proposed to the sett_137 message which communicates the net movement of funds at the Payment Facility level. The sett_136 has been enhanced to include amounts where there is a unit movement.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/	1	1. Can ASX please confirm if the sum of all sett_136 Overall Amounts for a Settlement Batch Id will equal the net funds movement (assuming a single payment facility) in the sett_137 Funds Movement	Darcy Wright	Assuming a Settlement Participant has one payment facility for all obligations settled in batch (other than mFund payments), then the sum of the settlement amount (for the Overall Net Movement) across all sett_136 messages received will equal the sett_137 funds movement.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/NetSettlementMovementAttributes/MovementType	2	2. Can ASX please confirm if the sum of signed sub-totals will equal the Overall totals for unit quantity and Amount. If not true, can the outliers be included as a separate Movement Type. Otherwise can these exceptions be identified in tech. spec documentation and APG's to mitigate the operational risk and added complexity for Participant controls?	Darcy Wright	Within a sett_136 message, the unit quantity and amount for the Overall Net Movement will be the sum of the unit quantity and amount (respectively) for all the other Movement Types reported.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/NetSettlementMovementAttributes/MovementType	1	1. CommSec welcomes the inclusion of the obligation Movement Types that provide a breakdown of the "Overall" net totals	Darcy Wright	Thank you for your comment
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/NetSettlementMovementAttributes/Amount/CreditDebitIndicator	1	Please provide the meaning of credit vs debit in term of the sum of settled cash amount i.e. Receive vs Pay in respect of the clearing participant.	Khan Le	Credit = Receiving funds Debit = Paying funds
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/NetSettlementMovementAttributes/MovementType/Gross_Matker_Trade	1	misspell - Matker	Khan Le	Thank you for your comment. The usage guideline has been revised.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_03_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/NetSettlementMovementAttributes/MovementType/Novated_Rescheduled_Instruction	1	Please confirm whether this transaction type include Isolated NRIs & Accrued NRIs	Khan Le	That's correct, the NRI settlement transaction type includes all types of NRIs (including those created as a result of Isolate Counterparty and Accruals).
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	139_001_04_sese_032_001_09	/GeneratedReason	1	Please provide clarification on the expected combinations of Adjustment Reason (Generated Reason / Code / Proprietary / Identification) and Adjustment Type (Generated Reason / Additional Reason Information) for the new use of 139 message where it is adjusting and rescheduling a part failed settlement instruction. ALSO, differences if any in expected combinations that depend on Settlement Transaction Condition (BSSI/USSI versus NRIN).	Craig Gray	Adjustment Reason = Settlement Failure (FAIL) Settlement Failure Reason = Failed Settlement - Unit Shortfall (FSUS), Failed Settlement - Payment Shortfall (FSPS), Offsetting Transaction Arrangement (OTAR), Account Lock Applied (HLCK) The above is true regardless of Transaction Type - BSSI, USSI and NRI
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	139_001_04_sese_032_001_09	/GeneratedReason/AdditionalReasonInformation	1	Please explain the scenarios for Offsetting Transaction Arrangement (OTAR) & Account Lock Applied (HLCK). Will the clearing participant also expect to always receive sett_130 - Settlement Transaction Generation Notification message in conjunction to the sett_139 - Adjusted Settlement Message with Settlement Failure Reason?	Khan Le	* Account Lock Applied (HLCK) is where the Settlement Entrepot is required to deliver units, but the status of the account is locked. * Offsetting Transaction Arrangement (OTAR) is where the Settlement Entrepot was expecting to deliver units (which are available), however due to the funding shortfall where the recipient isn't able to fund the obligation, the novated instruction is rescheduled to the next business date. This instruction will not be subject to an SSP adjustment. Only the Settlement Participant is advised of failures. The Clearing Participant is only advised when an obligation is created (i.e. trade is registered).
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	140_001_04_sese_032_001_07	/	1	No specific comment ion this message.	Craig Gray	Thank you for your comment
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	601_001_03_semt_021_001_06	/StatementGeneralDetails/StatementType/Proprietary/Identification	1	Are all the listed Statement Types actually valid for this request? For example, account notification reports are requested via 602. And the NNDP report is received unsolicited.	Craig Gray	Thank you for your comment. The usage guideline has been revised.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	601_001_03_semt_021_001_06	/StatementGeneralDetails	1	1. Statement Basis block is shown in TC pack as enabled for Movement Type codes but not is not in this version !	Darcy Wright	Thank you for your comment. The usage guideline has been revised.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	601_001_03_semt_021_001_06	/AdditionalQueryParameters/FinancialInstrumentIdentification	5	4. Is "Basis of Movement" a report parameter for the SETT report?	Darcy Wright	Basis of Movement will not be a parameter for the Settlement Statement Report Request
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	601_001_03_semt_021_001_06	/AdditionalQueryParameters/FinancialInstrumentIdentification	4	3a. To clarify point 3 - the "Movement Type" parameter on slide 21 of the TC pack is taken to mean "Basis of Movement" not "Movement Type". Both are present in sett_136. If this is indeed "Movement Type", I have not been able to find this mapping in v3 of rptg_601 but there should be an "ALL" default or option for the report parameter.	Darcy Wright	Movement Type will be added to the rptg_601 to provide capability for the Obligation Status Report (formerly named Settlement Statement) to be requested for all obligations or a specific instruction type (per Account, Security and Settlement Date) as per slide 21 of the T.C. pack. The usage guidelines have been revised.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	601_001_03_semt_021_001_06	/AdditionalQueryParameters/FinancialInstrumentIdentification	3	3. Given movement type has been added to the sett_136 message definition, is it possible to make movement type a report parameter so only settled obligations for specific sub-types e.g. GMTD can be requested to minimise the "work" (ASX generation, time for Participant to consume) can be reduced?	Darcy Wright	Movement Type will be added to the rptg_601 to provide capability for the Obligation Status Report (formerly named Settlement Statement) to be requested for all obligations or a specific instruction type (per Account, Security and Settlement Date) as per slide 21 of the T.C. pack. The usage guidelines have been revised.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	601_001_03_semt_021_001_06	/AdditionalQueryParameters/FinancialInstrumentIdentification	2	2. As a consequence of making Security Code optional, the rptg_608 definition needs to be made repetitive.	Darcy Wright	The Obligation Status Report (formerly named Settlement Statement) may only be requested on a per Account, Security, Settlement Date, and Movement Type basis. The Obligation Status Report is designed for exception only usage in the unlikely event it is required for investigative purposes. The Security Code element will not be made repetitive in the rptg_608 message.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	601_001_03_semt_021_001_06	/AdditionalQueryParameters/FinancialInstrumentIdentification	1	1. There are no business rules present in the element definition but we understand <FinInstrMtd> is optionally mandatory for the 'SETT' report type. CommSec believes the ALL case also applies for generating this report (particularly where there is a funds movement difference between Participant and ASX calculations) and so asks this is revised to be an optional report parameter. This avoids making ~300 individual report requests (per security code).	Darcy Wright	The Obligation Status Report may only be requested on a per Account, Security, Settlement Date, and Movement Type basis. The Obligation Status Report is designed for exception only usage in the unlikely event it is required for investigative purposes. The Security Code element will remain mandatory and the ALL case will not apply to this report.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	601_001_03_semt_021_001_06	/StatementGeneralDetails/StatementBasis	1	In the technical committee, I think this field was used for movement type (USSJ, BSSI, etc) - this should be included in the definition	Sue Schafer	Thank you for your comment. The usage guideline has been revised.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	601_001_03_semt_021_001_06	/AdditionalQueryParameters/Status/CorporateActionEventStage	1	Could this also be made available for the SETT report to match the net movement being reconciled?	Sue Schafer	Basis of Movement or other element to indicate a Corporate Action will not be made a parameter for the Obligation Status Report (formally named Settlement Statement Report) Request. The reason is that where an investigation is required a specific Basis of Movement combination, it is likely the issue requiring investigation may exist for all Basis of Movement combinations. The Obligation Status Report will return instructions for all Basis of Movement Combinations for the requested Account, Security, Settlement Date, and Movement Type and the result set can be filtered by the report requesting participant.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	601_001_03_semt_021_001_06	/StatementGeneralDetails/StatementType/Proprietary/Identification/Netted_Obligation_Report	1	As the NNDP is only available unsolicited, does this need to be defined here?	Sue Schafer	Thank you for your comment. The usage guideline has been revised.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	607_001_02_semt_023_001_01	/	1	No specific comment on this message.	Craig Gray	Thank you for your comment
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	608_001_01_semt_017_001_07	/StatementGeneralDetails/QueryReference	1	No specific comment on this message.	Craig Gray	Thank you for your comment
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	608_001_01_semt_017_001_07	/FinancialInstrumentDetails/Transaction/Tradeldentification	1	1. Per rptg_601 comment on report parameters, is it possible to exclude some settlement obligations by specifying a BoM filter so Participants can request a targeted ad-hoc report that is faster to produce and consume when the BoM is sought (especially relevant as this is ad-hoc and time critical for Participants to complete settlement).	Darcy Wright	Basis of Movement or other element to indicate a Corporate Action will not be made a parameter for the Obligation Status Report (formally named Settlement Statement Report) Request. The reason is that where an investigation is required a specific Basis of Movement combination, it is likely the issue requiring investigation may exist for all Basis of Movement combinations. The Obligation Status Report will return instructions for all Basis of Movement Combinations for the requested Account, Security, Settlement Date, and Movement Type and the result set can be filtered by the report requesting participant.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	608_001_01_semt_017_001_07	/FinancialInstrumentDetails	1	1. CommSec supports expanding the SETT report parameters to include "ALL" security codes. If agreed, the native multiplicity of the Financial Instrument Details element is [1..*] and so the restriction to [1..1] can be reversed	Darcy Wright	The Obligation Status Report may only be requested on a per Account, Security, Settlement Date, and Movement Type basis. The Obligation Status Report is designed for exception only usage in the unlikely event it is required for investigative purposes. The Security Code element will remain mandatory and the ALL case will not apply to this report.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	608_001_01_semt_017_001_07	/StatementGeneralDetails/StatementIdentification/Settlement_Statement_Report	1	Spelling - Settlement	Sue Schafer	Thank you for your comment. The usage guideline has been revised.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	608_001_01_semt_017_001_07	/FinancialInstrumentDetails/Transaction/TransactionDetails/TransactionAdditionalDetails	1	The Value SSP Adjustment will require a separate Pay / Receive indicator because it doesn't need to follow the Pay / Receive indicator of the Settled Amount.	Khan Le	The base ISO message schema does not allow for a Pay/Receive indicator on the Value SSP Adjustment attribute
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	609_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/	1	No specific comment in this message.	Craig Gray	Thank you for your comment
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	609_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/AccountBaseCurrencyAmounts/HoldingValue/Sign	2	Does the false indicate payment and true receipt of cash or is there a link to the short long indicator?	Chris Werry	That is correct. False indicates payment of cash and true indicates receipt of cash. There may not necessarily be a link to the short long indicator for the unit quantity of security because there may be examples where the resultant netted outcome is delivery of units and payment of cash or receipt of units and receipt of cash.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	609_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/SupplementaryData	2	2. CommSec supports the inclusion of the list of Obligation Ids for the "Number of Entries" value to aid control and audit of the NNDP calculation. The CHES process provides the equivalent of this control during netting at end-of-day T where as the proposed model does not allow line-by-line verification until the Settlement report is available following settlement on T+2	Darcy Wright	For every trade that is registered the CSP will provide a sett_101 notification. All market trades registered, excluding crossings, will be novated and netted into a unique NNDP per Account (Settlement HIN), Security, Settlement Date and Basis of Movement Combination. The number of settlement obligations that is included across all NNDPs reported could be used to reconcile to the number of sett_101 notifications received.
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	609_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/SupplementaryData	1	1. CommSec notes ASX is using a supplementary data extension and so it is technically feasible to add additional elements where there is a business requirement.	Darcy Wright	Thank you for your comment
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	609_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/SupplementaryData/Envelope	1	Refer to best practice comment on sett_136 supp data for use of STRICT not LAX	Darcy Wright	Thank you for your comment
Jun-21	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	609_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/AccountBaseCurrencyAmounts/HoldingValue/Sign	1	Please provide details on how the signed amount will work in conjunction with the unit quantity & short/long indicator.	Khan Le	False indicates payment of the Settlement Amount and true indicates receipt of the Settlement Amount. There may not necessarily be a link to the short long indicator for the unit quantity of security because there may be examples where the resultant netted outcome is delivery of units and payment of cash or receipt of units and receipt of cash.
Jun-21		All messages			No issues with the message details	Wayne Murphy	Thank you for your comment
Jun-21		sett_119			The presentation shows this as being removed. Will it continue to be used to advise the successful completion of a bilateral demand settlement instruction (BDSI) settlement? If not, how will this be done?	Chris Werry	The sett_119 message will be retained for the successful completion of a Bilateral Demand Settlement Instruction (BDSI)
Jun-21		sett_136			The presentation states that a sett_136 will be sent "for each Account (HIN), Security and Basis of Movement combination where there are one or more "settled" obligations". However, the Basis of Movement is included in the repeating group Net Settlement Movement Attributes as Trade Transaction Condition. Can you confirm there will never be a sett_136 with different values in Trade Transaction Condition for different movement types? Unlike, the EIS156 or sett_119 the sett_136 does not appear to have a Net Funds Transaction ID. We need this to reconcile the payment amount to the settled and part settled instructions.	Chris Werry	1) Although Basis of Movement is included in the repeating group, there will never be a sett_136 that would contain different Basis of Movement values for different Movement Types. 2) The sett_136 is provided on an Account (HIN), Security and Basis of Movement combination and will include the fund component of the unit movement. The Account (HIN) on the sett_136 could be used to map to the Payment Facility on the sett_137 - noting that the Account is either mapped to a nominated or account specific payment facility as requested by the participant (noting that when a payment facility is setup or updated, the participant is provided with an acct_004 notification)
Jun-21		Sequencing			Can you please confirm what sequence we can expect to receive the settlement message? Is this sequence guaranteed? 1. sett_137 Funds Movement; 2. sett_130 Settlement Transaction Generation Notification (Part Settled USSJ, BSSI or NRIN or NSFJ); 3. sett_139 Adjusted Settlement Instruction (Rescheduled USSJ, BSSI or NRIN); 4. sett_136 Settlement Movement Confirmation; 5. sett_170 Event Notification	Chris Werry	The sequence of message details, Inc. the UMLs, can be found in the netting and settlement workflow changes technical documentation that has been published. It should be noted that all full and partial failures (sett_130s and sett_139s) will be notified prior to the Settlement Movement Confirmation (sett_136)
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	607_001_01_semt_023_001_01	/AdditionalReportParameters/FinancialInstrumentIdentification	1	Please advise when this element will be provided - from the look of the child elements, it appears as though this is only used for APIR codes?	Laik Tan	1) That's correct. AdditionalReportParameters/FinancialInstrumentIdentification/Description will be populated only for APIR codes. And AdditionalReportParameters/FinancialInstrumentIdentification/ISIN will be populated for ISIN and AdditionalReportParameters/FinancialInstrumentIdentification/OtherIdentification for Security Code. 2) This field will be populated only for end of day reports. This field will NOT be populated for ad-hoc reports. rptg_607 message is also sent to the issuers (registries) to inform the completion of various reports. "FinancialInstrumentIdentification" element will be used in the message for following reports: TSBL TCEB HMVT CEMV CEBL
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	607_001_01_semt_023_001_01	/ReportGeneralDetails/QueryReference/QueryReference	1	Annotation states this element is mapped to EIS BP62 Origin Transaction Id. What Transaction ID will be populated in this element for unsolicited reports (i.e. there is on Origin Transaction Id, as the report wasn't requested).	Laik Tan	Transaction Id will be populated with a unique identifier generated by Reporting Service.
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	749_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	1	Please refer to our comments on evt_742 for concerns about the viability of this feature, preference for the Registry synchronised model (not both that and this ad-hoc enquiry) and strong preference for ASX-led population of DRP elections as part of the migration to CSP.	Darcy Wright	Please refer to the response on row 10.
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	749_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	2	Great example of a succinct request message. Shame I think it will be dropped from scope!	Darcy Wright	ASX assume you are referring to evt_749 message. Please note this message has not been descoped.
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	749_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	3	No comments.	Laik Tan	Thank you
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	749_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	4	Apologies - one comment: Please confirm CSP will validate DRP/BSP Election Enquiries to ensure the Issuer has an active DRP/BSP, prior to passing messages on to the Issuer.	Laik Tan	The CSP will evaluate if there are active DRP/BSP, prior to passing messages on to the Issuer. The CSP will evaluate if the account has a holding > 0 in the Security Code
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	/	1	1. The use case for the DRP election enquiry was questioned by TC members and when Participants would request this detail. Our view is this is primarily to supplement the ASX migration of CHES customer data to CSP, and this should be achieved by a ASX-owned enrichment process - rather than rely on Participant ad-hoc requests. 2. If this feature is developed, our view is this should be instead of not in parallel with the notification by registries of direct customer election to the sponsoring Participant. Further our preference is for that synchronisation rather than ad-hoc enquiry. 3. If this feature is developed, the ASX ISO Message Definition needs to be expanded to cover this Participant (not shareholder) enquiry scenario.	Darcy Wright	Participants initially requested that Issuer registries advise controlling participants of any new or updated DRP elections, ASX also uses the messages received from the Issuer registry advising updated DRP election status as a validation check on elections processing; minimising false messages to issuer registries. At a later date, the DRP election enquiry function was requested by various participants, ASX on researching the requirements agreed to provide the functionality for the enquiry. ASX will enhance the definition of evt_742 to include a reference to the DRP enquiry feature
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	/	2	The message schema only caters for DRP or BSP (not both) elections. In the scenario where the enquiry is for a HIN that has partial participation for the security holding in both DRP and BSP, we presume the Issuer must send two evt_742 messages to CSP, one for the DRP election and another for the BSP election?	Laik Tan	Option Type' is a choice in an ISO message. The message does not support specifying both in one single message. As a result the Issuer will have to send two separate evt_742 messages in case there are partial participation for the security for that HIN.
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction/OptionType/Code	1	We note the Functional Specification states CASH is a valid code for the DRP/BSP Election use case. We disagree with this - if a HIN does not have a DRP/BSP election for the security which the enquiry relates to, then we would reject the enquiry with an evt_743 rather than responding with an evt_742 with the code 'CASH'.	Laik Tan	The purpose of this functionality is for the participant to know if the HIN has a CASH/DRP/BSP election. We note that the majority of the plans default to CASH and therefore enquiry results for CASH will be in the majority which need to be supported. Similarly if the default of the plan is DRP/BSP and the investor elects CASH, this needs to be supported as well.
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction/SecuritiesQuantityOrInstructedAmount	1	Please expand business rule for enquiry - when it is unknown if the DRP is full or partial number/percent. Is there a default/Fixed value (QALL) in this case?	Darcy Wright	Anything that is not QALL (Full), should have either unit quantity or percentage (In case of partial). Instructed Quantity can be a number greater than or equal to zero. Where the 'Instructed Percentage' is provided the 'Instructed Quantity' must equal zero.
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction/SecuritiesQuantityOrInstructedAmount	2	Oops - unable to edit post. Realise this is the response so actual election will be known. Please disregard!	Darcy Wright	Thank you
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction/SecuritiesQuantityOrInstructedAmount/SecuritiesQuantity/InstructedQuantity/Quantity/Unit	1	Noting this element is not used if FV QALL applies. Will a new rejection reason be needed?	Darcy Wright	/CorporateActionInstruction/SecuritiesQuantityOrInstructedAmount/SecuritiesQuantity/InstructedQuantity is a choice element. Participant will not be able to supply this element if QALL is selected.
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction/SecuritiesQuantityOrInstructedAmount/SecuritiesQuantity/InstructedQuantity/Quantity/Unit	2	Please ignore as unable to remove above. Was thinking request not response	Darcy Wright	Thank you

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	/SupplementaryData/Envelope	1	Noting the process type is LAX (not strict). From memory this must be Strict or the XML validation does not cover the supp data when parsing against the schema. Still believe that is XML recommended best practice	Darcy Wright	Thank you ASX tested combinations on a lax schema: 1) adding an element which is not defined in the schema, xmlSpy reports an error in this case. 2) renaming the schema to a different name to check if the schema validations are skipped. However xmlSpy reports an error in this case. 3) Confirmed with our technical team, the platform will fail the validations in case the schema is not found or an undefined element is present in the message. There are some messages where we have defined the supplementary data schema as 'lax' however considering the above observations we are not proposing to change them to strict.
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	743_001_04_seev_034_001_09	/	1	No comments.	Laik Tan	Thank you
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett_TC_07APR	138_001_01_DRAFT1camt_093_001_01	/	1	ASX ISO Message Definition needs expanding for the use case to the PayProvider	Darcy Wright	Agree. This will be updated in the next release.
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett_TC_07APR	138_001_01_DRAFT1camt_093_001_01	/CancelledObligation/NetPositionIdentification	1	To avoid doubt - is this linkage to the Tx Id of the '310' request to Participant and PayProvider or '311/313' response from the Pay Provider? Want to make sure the linkage makes sense to both types of recipients	Darcy Wright	This is a linkage to the funds obligation message sett_133 (EIS 310)
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett_TC_07APR	138_001_01_DRAFT1camt_093_001_01	/CancelledObligation/NetPositionIdentification	2	Should the MITI/Obligation Id be added as a common reference if the Txid linkage is different between Account Servicer And Account Owner?	Darcy Wright	NetPositionIdentification' which is a 'transaction Id' from a funds obligation message (sett_133) is the common linkage. Sett_133 message does not have obligation Id on it hence even if it is used in sett_138 payment providers will not be able to use it as a link.
May-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett_TC_07APR	170_001_02_admi_004_001_02	/	1	No comments.	Laik Tan	Thank you
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	002_001_08_acmt_002_001_07	/	1	No issues with this format	Wayne Murphy	Thank you.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	002_001_08_acmt_002_001_07	/AccountParties/OtherParty/OtherPartyDetails/Party/Organisation/PostalAddress/AddressLine	1	Enabling address lines 4 and 5 at "account" level means potential receipt of data that is incompatible with the modification message. This introduces a costly asymmetry to processing logic. Is there no other solution?	Craig Gray	Please refer to the "Migration of accounts and holders to ISO 20022 standards" paper attached to the April Technical Committee pack.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	002_001_08_acmt_002_001_07	/AccountParties/OtherParty/OtherPartyDetails/PrimaryCommunicationAddress/AddressType/Proprietary/Identification	1	Seem to have merged the old (CHES) Email Purpose into the new Communication Preference, a bit awkwardly. Presumably, ELEC means "electronic for ASX and issuer", POST means "post for ASX and issuer", ELEA means "electronic for ASX, post for issuer" and ELEI means "post for ASX, electronic for issuer"? Does it?? Neither the codes nor the descriptions make that entirely clear. I understood that the original two-value scheme (POST and ONLI) was adequate because Communication Preference was only relevant to the issuer. Was that the case? Has something changed? Or was the two-value scheme a mistake?	Craig Gray	Your interpretation of the codes and their meaning is correct. These codes are relevant to both ASX (CHES holding statements) and Issuer. Following a privacy review, it was determined that the communication pref needed to be more granular hence the additional codes have been added.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	003_001_07_acmt_003_001_07	/	1	Comments here relate to acct_006 as UG not published in draft_acct collection. 1. Noted EIS203 cancellation is also applied at end-of-day so agree with timing for acct_006	Darcy Wright	We assume you are referring to acct_018_acmt_006. This message will be sent to the participant by CSP on receipt of the Account cancellation request as the cancellation is done at end of day.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	003_001_07_acmt_003_001_07	/	2	Seeing Holder Type can now be modified, CommSec believes a Holder Type change must be supported between Individual and Company for Day1 of CSP. The need to change Holder Type from Unknown is a change forced on Sponsoring Participants because the ASX conversion of CHES Registration details is not addressing the Individual/Company type of Holders. It is an omission that during the forced edit of the 'dummy' Holder Type, a manual error can result the incorrect Holder Type that can not be corrected. There seems to be is no CSP remedy but to cancel the HIN. When there are active holdings, this results in a large operational effort/costs and a very negative client experience - communications that will result and loss of standing instructions at the registry. It's also possible a deemed CGT event results.	Darcy Wright	Please refer to the "Migration of accounts and holders to ISO 20022 standards" paper attached to the April Technical Committee pack.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	001_001_07_acmt_001_001_07	/	1	As notified by email submission, CommSec is concerned about the expansion of account address for unconverted CHES registration addresses. This change creates rework and replanning for both Vendors and Participant/Registry members. We expect this solution to be justified against alternatives, and pro/con of each option as part of this consultation. Especially as these changes have been published in the Feb release, this rework becomes a breaking change for CDE7. CommSec requests further consultation and industry endorsement before this change is adopted.	Darcy Wright	Please refer to the "Migration of accounts and holders to ISO 20022 standards" paper attached to the April Technical Committee pack.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	001_001_07_acmt_001_001_07	/	2	As an alternative to relaxing the mandatory TownName, this element could be made a conditional mandatory business rule linked to the 'Unknown' Holder Type (for Holder 1 if at different level). This approach would not introduce structural changes for a 'temporary' issue introduced for migration edge-case.	Darcy Wright	Town name change is only applicable for acct_002 message when the CSP notifies creation of migrated accounts. Town name remains a mandatory element for newly created accounts within the CSP. CSP will reject the account creation request in case the town name is not present. This field is mandatory in acct_003 message meaning the participant will have to state the town name when they are updating the address attributes.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_602_001_01_acmt_004_001_05	/	1	No issues with the formatting of this message	Wayne Murphy	
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_602_001_01_acmt_004_001_05	/	2	No Comment.	Laik Tan	
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_604_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/	1	No issues with the formatting of the message, Question - if request sent via RPTG_601 is sent at safekeeping level, will RPTG_604 message be sent at each financial instrument or will it be accumulated into 1 X ISO20022?	Wayne Murphy	In this case, the rptg_604 will be provided at the same level as per request and all the related financial instruments will be populated within a single rptg_604 report (using pagination if required).
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_604_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/	2	further explanation on my comments above: will pagination start from page 1 for different securities?	Wayne Murphy	No. The CSP will not create separate pages (pagination) per security. One message can have multiple securities. The pagination will be purely based on the size of the message. The data will be provided within a single rptg_604 report. If the pagination is enabled due to the large size of the report, then the page number will indicate the number of the message of a single report and the last page indicator will have the true value only when the message is last one of this report, otherwise it will be false.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_604_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/	3	Comments on Changing Controlling Participant (as seev_033 not open for comment)... 1. Dividend Election seems a customer data scenario but not the only one that could apply. For instance Bank Account or TFN/ABN could be passed to the new Sponsor. 2. For Dividend Election - can you confirm this will be a list per Holding i.e. security code and not one 742 per holding with DRP. 3. Will the DRP value be the one held at Registry or any submitted by the previous Sponsor and which could have been overridden at registry. If latter this value is not usable by new Sponsor and should be suppressed	Darcy Wright	1. Dividend election is recorded with the CSP and it can be passed on to the new participant in case of change of controlling participant. However CSP does not store TFN/ABN data. It is just a pass-through information that the CSP sends to the issuers. (Same as the current CHES processing.) 2. evt_742 will be sent per security per HIN. 3. evt_742 message is a bidirectional message. Participants can send it to registry via CSP to record the DRP preference OR the registry can send the message to the participant via CSP. If the investor records a DRP preference with the Registry, the registry will send an evt_742 message to the participant via the CSP to inform the participant. This way the CSP records will always be in sync with the registry records.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_604_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/	4	The Holding Adjustments Functional Specification states that Issuers will be given visibility of holding locks, including: Total balance, Available balance, Holding Administration Lock Balance. This report doesn't appear to provide this information - how will this information be sent to Issuers?	Laik Tan	Available Balance will be reported in the HBAL and TSBL Holding Adm. Lock will be available in hold_228
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_604_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/	5	During the TC on 25 Feb 2020, ASX advised the file size limit for each message was still to be determined, but most likely >100kb. Has this been determined yet and if not, when will it be?	Laik Tan	This is under consideration still. Further information will be provided.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_604_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/	6	In the context of CEB reports, how will a user know if a report is the final CEB report for a corp action (i.e. the report for record date CEBs)?	Laik Tan	The unsolicited CEBL will only be produced on record date. The share registry will already know when that date occurs.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_604_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/	7	Please confirm our understanding that for TCEB & TSBL reports, the ""repeated block"" will only occur once and that: - the Unit Quantity (Balance For Account\Aggregate Balance\Quantity\Quantity\Quantity\Unit) element will contain the total Cum/Security balance on the sub-register; and - the Account Identifier HIN (Balance For Account\Holding Additional Details) element will be populated with "NONREF".	Laik Tan	TCEB and TSBL EOD reports will not have enabled pagination option, the "repeated block" will occur only once. The next statements are correct: - the Unit Quantity (Balance For Account\Aggregate Balance\Quantity\Quantity\Quantity\Unit) element will contain the total Cum/Security balance on the sub-register; and - the Account Identifier HIN (Balance For Account\Holding Additional Details) element will be populated with "NONREF". Just to add an information, TSBL report will also contain data for Available balance populated in the field Balance Breakdown\Quantity\Quantity\Quantity\Quantity\Quantity\Unit Comment: ASX_AU_CHS_rptg_604_001_02_semt_002_001_10_RPTG-TCEB.xml
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_604_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/	8	Please provide an example xml of a rptg_604 for report type CEBL where: - there are multiple concurrent corp actions (e.g. 3) - a HIN balance is reported for each corp action	Laik Tan	Samples are: ASX_AU_CHS_rptg_604_001_02_semt_002_001_10_RPTG-CEBL-Pagination_Page1.xml ASX_AU_CHS_rptg_604_001_02_semt_002_001_10_RPTG-CEBL-Pagination_Page2.xml ASX_AU_CHS_rptg_604_001_02_semt_002_001_10_RPTG-CEBL-Pagination_Page3.xml These samples can be found 'ASX_AU_CHS_rel8_sett' collection
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_604_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/FinancialInstrumentAttributes/FinancialInstrumentAttributeAdditionalDetails	1	Looks like Corporate Action Id is being supplied in place of Takeover Code (EIS 502-equivalent use); this is not a surprise. BUT it also looks like it is being supplied in place of Corporate Action Type Id and Ex Date (EIS 520-equivalent use)—we would prefer to receive corporate action type and ex date direct in the message as presently, otherwise, accuracy of processing depends on our accuracy of interpreting the corporate action id, and the comprehensiveness and correctness of our reference data, and so introduces a potential point of error.	Craig Gray	To supply Corporate Action Event Identification together with Corporate Action Type Id and Ex Date the element Corporate Action Event will be provided, containing the concatenation of Corporate Action Event Id Corporate Action Type Ex Date to uniquely identify the Corporate Action Event. It will be provided in the Financial Instrument Attribute Additional Details field.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_604_001_01_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/FinancialInstrumentAttributes/FinancialInstrumentAttributeAdditionalDetails	2	Note that comment #1 by me is particularly significant in context of an incoming change of controlling participant, where it is absolutely imperative that we accurately establish sub-positions and cum entitlement balances.	Craig Gray	As per the comment above.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_601_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	1	No issues with the formatting of this message	Wayne Murphy	Thank you.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_601_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	2	CBA Payment Provider feedback on withdrawal of EIS300/302 (Funds Notification reporting): "CBA does not support withdrawing these reports. These notifications (300/302) provide useful for payment providers to manage liquidity. Without these there could be delays in batch settlement as liquidity management teams might not be able to schedule large funds obligations for release at RBA. This lack of 'early warning' could also result in a higher probability of participant default".	Darcy Wright	We have taken your feedback into consideration and these reports have been retained.EIS300 and EIS302 is mapped and published in the Tec. Doc sett_133
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_601_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	3	CBA CommSec feedback on withdrawal of EIS150. "Given CBA Payments does not support the withdrawal of EIS300/302, CommSec would ask that the EIS150 report is retained if the EIS300 is retained."	Darcy Wright	same as above
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_601_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	3		Darcy Wright	
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_601_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	5	Further to Comment #2 (CBA Payments), the PayProvider has no other visibility of the Participant's settlement obligations. As such it is not possible to create projected positions as a Participant could. Also noted 99% of cash values are known at SoD (1% after S). Hence the projection is largely accurate.	Darcy Wright	same as above
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_601_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	5		Darcy Wright	
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_601_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	7	The table in slide 9 of the TC 25 Feb 2020 Presentation has a column named "Report Type" and contains values of either "Ad-hoc" or "EOD". Please confirm that this relates to the "as at" point in time the report details (balance/movement/holder) will be extracted.	Laik Tan	The next validation has been applied as per the As At Date parameter: If the Report Request As At Date parameter is specified with the current business date, the demand report will be generated at the end of day. If the Report Request As At Date parameter is not specified or specified with a date prior to the current business date, the demand report will be immediately generated.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_601_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	8	"The Focus Group presentation indicates that TSB/TCB/HMV/CMV reports will become ""Unsolicited"" and registries will no longer be able to request them. If this is the case, why does the table in slide 9 of the TC 25 Feb 2020 Presentation have these report types mapped to the rptg_601 Holding Balance Reporting Request message? If they are truly unsolicited, on what basis will CSP send each of these report types to Registries? Specifically: - Will balances/movements be extracted ""as at"" EOD? The Focus Group presentation says yes, but the table in slide 9 of the TC 25 Feb 2020 Presentation says HMV & CMV can be EOD + Ad-Hoc??? - Will Holding/Cum Entitlement Movement reports still be sent if there were no movements? - If Registries can no longer request reports, what is the recourse if CSP fails to deliver an unsolicited report?"	Laik Tan	The registries will no longer be able to request the TSB and TCEB reports. The unsolicited reports will be available within rptg_601 request for the internal purposes. Currently the unsolicited reports will get processed only at EOD when holdings are static and before the business date changes. In case of scenario with no movements, the only message to be sent is EndOfReport notification with '0' in ReportEntriesCount field stating that there was no data to be provided for HMVT/CEMV report types. Registries will be able to request the reports (except the TSB and TCEB as highlighted above) on ad-hoc basis with specified as-at-date or start/end dates to restrict reporting to transactions processed to the required status during the defined period.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_601_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/	9	"We note that ISO messages for the following EIS messages have not been drafted: - 505 Report Request Cancellation - 526 Accepted Report Request - 530 Cancelled Report Request - EIS 538 End of Reporting We presume 505/530 Cancellation messages have de-scoped as scheduled reports are no longer allowed? Why haven't ISO equivalents for 526 and 538 been drafted? A user would need to know whether CSP has received and acknowledged a report request (hence the need for an equivalent of EIS526) and if there is no ISO equivalent for EIS538, how will a user know that they have received all reporting for that business day?"	Laik Tan	The EIS 505/530 messages were de-scoped. The EIS 538 message has been mapped to the new rptg_607 End Of Report notification message. The EIS 526 has been de-scoped as well.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_601_001_01_semt_021_001_06	/StatementGeneralDetails/StatementDateOrPeriod/StatementPeriod	1	Business Rule states start/end dates can be provided for CEMV & HMVT reporting requests, which implies these reports can be scheduled. This contradicts the Focus Group presentation which states that: a) these reports will become unsolicited and Issuers can no longer request these; and b) reports will no longer be able to be 'scheduled' Please confirm which is correct.	Laik Tan	The Start/End date parameters provide the ability to restrict reporting to transactions processed to the required status before / on / after these dates. These dates parameters are not used for the reports scheduling purposes.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_605_001_01_semt_017_001_07	/	1	No issues with the formatting of this message	Wayne Murphy	
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_605_001_01_semt_017_001_07	/	2	No Comment	Laik Tan	
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_603_001_01_camt_060_001_05	/	1	No issues with the formatting	Wayne Murphy	
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_rptg	rptg_606_001_01_camt_052_001_08	/	1	via PDF - PCBL is quoted with explanation please explain the CFBL as I could not find this detailed. Other than that: no issues with the formatting	Wayne Murphy	Report Type was corrected to CFBL within the field Balance\Type
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_comm	801_001_02_head_001_001_02	/	1	ASX Settlement's Business Date is an important component of various timestamps including the DVP Timestamp. Especially when the physical 'wall clock' time is different to the logical business date, it is important that transactions are stamped with the business date. Given the base message for comm_801 (head_001) now allows an explicit business date element, it is possible to provide a consistent mapping of Business Date within the project catalogue. However any adoption of the BAH.BusinessDate should be 'backwardly compatible' with the current message definitions. That is where business date had been mapped within the document, this should remain. BAH.BusinessDate should be provided as an optional second source of Business Date.	Darcy Wright	This proposed change is backward compatible. When implemented, this change does not involve removal of any business date attributes from the already designed tobe messages. This parameter will be sent in BAH by CSP on egress messages. This is not applicable to ingress messages from participants.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_comm	801_001_02_head_001_001_02	/BusinessProcessingDate	1	We note addition of Business Processing Date; however, we have not to date identified any requirement for this new element.	Craig Gray	Thank you.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	120_001_01_DRAFT1camt_091_001_01	/	1	This Funds Transfer message is an important trigger for Payment Provider processing and should be included in the CSP Batch Settlement workflow. The timing of this event is different to the EIS312 and it represents both a status update that ALL Payment Provider funds obligations for the Batch Settlement have been processed, and the settlement amount that is demanded for payment using the payment service. One thing that remains unclear is whether the EIS332 Settlement Amount value would ALWAYS match the EIS312 value. It has not been confirmed that in the Default Management case (funds obligation rejection by this or another Payment Provider), whether the EIS332 value could be recalculated. Even if this number is less than the EIS312, the posting of trust and principal monies will be incorrect and a control break will ensue. Hence the need for the EIS332. However if the settlement amount is ALWAYS identical, the EIS332 could be replaced with a status advice.	Darcy Wright	This update will be released in the next Technical Documentation release along with the documentation for payment service. EIS332 Settlement Amount value would ALWAYS match the EIS312 value.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	121_001_01_DRAFT1camt_092_001_01	/	1	No issues with this format	Wayne Murphy	Thank you.
Mar-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	121_001_01_DRAFT1camt_092_001_01	/	2	Use of the EIS333 seems to have ceased in 2015 - possibly as a result of FSS changes that introduced Trust Amounts. As this message is not provided to CHES for batch settlement, it is not clear why CSP should include this message flow. This is especially true if batch settlement is not conditional on receipt of the EIS333. However if say net payers are required to confirm irrevocable transfer of funds has occurred (i.e. release of ESA funds in the RITS queue) this message is only useful if the RITS reporting to ASX was not available. If this control is not required, then it seems the EIS333/sett_121 could be redundant.	Darcy Wright	EIS333/Sett_121 is an optional message. The message has been designed to support the existing business processes amongst the payment provider community.
Feb-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	evnt_747_001_01_sev_036_001_10	/	1	No issues with the formatting	Wayne Murphy	Thank you
Feb-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	133_001_02_DRAFT1camt_089_001_01	/SettlementAgentNetPosition/NetPositionIdentification	1	I disagree with the wording of this field. "Allocated by Participant of a transaction on submission of a transaction to the CSP" CSP advises the Participants of the Transaction ID. Please confirm	Wayne Murphy	ASX agree with your comment. "SettlementAgentNetPosition" is used when the CSP sends a funds obligation related to Batch with aggregated Total Funds Obligation for the payment provider. In this case, the transaction Id will be generated by the CSP. "SettlementAccountNetPosition" is used when the CSP sends funds obligation message to the payment provider per payment Facility in case of Batch or per bank account in case of BDSI/Corp Action Entitlements. sett_133 will be generated by the CSP to be sent to the Payment provider. This is a funds obligation message. In case of BDSI, the transaction id is the transaction Id generated by the CSP. In case of Corp Action Payments, Transaction Id is the Id of sett_141 (Real time payment Request) initiated by the Participant.
Feb-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	135_001_02_DRAFT1camt_090_001_01	/	1	No issues with the formatting.	Wayne Murphy	Thank you
Feb-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	137_001_02_camt_054_001_08	/	1	No issues with the formatting	Wayne Murphy	Thank you
Feb-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	137_001_02_camt_054_001_08	/	2	In the message flow diagram this message is pictured before the evnt_747 which identified what the refund is for - is it possible the evnt_747 should be received before confirmation of the receipt of funds?	Sue Schafer	On receipt of a positive response from a payment service, the CSP will send the following messages in the following sequence: 1) Sett_142_pain_002 message in response to sett_141_pain_001 message to the Registry (Issuer) to indicate that Payment has been completed. 2) Then then CSP will generate sett_137 message and send it to three parties: The Payer Payment Provider The Receiver Payment Provider The Receiver participant 3) Then mark the status of all the associated elections to Complete and send evnt_747 to the Controlling Participant. Sett_137 message sent to the participant has the following information to help reconciling this message with individual refund messages (evnt_747): Corp Action Event Id Payment Reference Amount
Feb-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	137_001_02_camt_054_001_08	/Notification/Entry/AdditionalEntryInformation	1	Will there be anything populated in this field where notifying of BDSI payment (assuming this message is used for this case also)	Sue Schafer	In case of BDSI, this message will be sent to the Payer and the Payee payment providers. This field is an optional field and should not be used in case of BDSI.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Feb-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	170_001_02_admi_004_001_02	/	1	No issues with the formatting	Wayne Murphy	Thank you
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	018_001_02_acmt_006_001_06	/	1	No issues from BNP Paribas	Wayne Murphy	Thank You
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	018_001_02_acmt_006_001_06	/	2	Please confirm CSP will send an acct_018 to Issuer to acknowledge receipt of a previous acct_018 from Issuer to CSP to accept/reject Bank Account Instructions. The Message flow diagram on slide 30 of the TC 10 Dec 2019 Presentation from 10 Dec TC only shows the acct_018 being sent to Issuer in the event of housekeeping.	Laik Tan	The CSP will send Transaction Acknowledgement Advice comm_809 message (with Status Code "Accepted (ACCP)") back to the Issuer.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	018_001_02_acmt_006_001_06	/	3	How long must a Bank Account Notification be unactioned before ASX cancels it due to Housekeeping?	Laik Tan	The CSP will cancel any pending Bank Account Notification (unactioned) that were submitted more than two business days prior.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	018_001_02_acmt_006_001_06	/StatusReport/ExistingAccountIdentification	1	We note that this element is optional - under what circumstances should this element be used?	Laik Tan	This message is also used in a scenario where an Account Sponsor role requests to nominate a different settlement entropot to become the Nominated Market Settlement Entrepot. Change in nominated settlement entropot is not effected immediately but the CSP sends a acct_018 message to the participant. This message does not use the element.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	018_001_02_acmt_006_001_06	/StatusReport/Status/Rejected/Reason/Code/NotCompliantWithSLA	1	Could this code NSLA be used with Housekeeping rather than STNP or does it have other implications?	Sue Schafer	Thanks for your feedback. We will change the message structure in case of housekeeping. The CSP will send the message with following elements: StatusReport/Status/Rejected/Reason/Proprietary/Identification/ reason code 'HOUS' will be added to the "RejectedBankAccountReason_ASX_1" code list.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	018_001_02_acmt_006_001_06	/StatusReport/Status/Rejected/Reason/Proprietary/Identification	1	RejectedBankAccountReason_ASX_1 does not exist in the ASX Proprietary Code List attached to the ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct collection in the ASX ISO 20022 Technical Committee Community. Please provide the list of valid codes.	Laik Tan	Updated ASX proprietary code list will be published with the messages following the technical committee meeting for participants review.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	018_001_02_acmt_006_001_06	/StatusReport/Status/Status	1	Please advise whether CSP will send an acct_018 to the Issuer to acknowledge a previous acct_018 acceptance/rejection message from Issuer to CSP and if so, what code will be populated in this element?	Laik Tan	The CSP will send Transaction Acknowledgement Advice comm_809 message (with Status Code "Accepted (ACCP)") back to the Issuer.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	012_001_01_acmt.003.001.07	/	1	No issues from BNP Paribas	Wayne Murphy	Thank You
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	012_001_01_acmt.003.001.07	/	2	EIS 534 contains BP62 Origin Transaction Id but this is not present in the acct_012. Can this be added to the message, as it is useful for registries to have in the event we are contacted by Participants about TFN/ABN/Exemption code updates.	Laik Tan	acct_012 message contains 'Transaction Id'. The CSP will use the same Transaction Id as received from the participants while sending the message to the Issuer.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	012_001_01_acmt.003.001.07	/	3	Date of Birth: Note that where a TFN Child Exemption is provided, the ATO requires that a Date of Birth is Supplied. So in the event that Foreign Tax Status Details are not provided, but a Child Exemption is, then the Date of Birth element must be populated.	Laik Tan	Thanks for your feedback. The proposed messages design is inline with existing EIS 533/EIS 534 currently used. The feedback from wider market participants with regard to investor data was not to deviate from the existing process.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	012_001_01_acmt.003.001.07	/ModifiedAccountParties/PrincipalAccountParty/JointOwner/TaxReporting	1	This falls under the Joint Owner node which allows [1..4] holders, so why should 5 different Tax IDs be provided per Joint holder? In the acct_002 this only occurs once per holder object.	Laik Tan	Each of the joint holder can have more than more Tax Identification Numbers. For example the holder can have a Tax File Number (TFN) and additionally also can have Tax Identification numbers assigned by other countries. EIS735, EIS736 message currently supports upto 3 tax identification numbers per holder. We have enhanced it to upto 5. This field can accommodate Australian ABN/TFN and TINs required for FATCA/CRS certification.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	012_001_01_acmt.003.001.07	/ModifiedAccountParties/PrincipalAccountParty/JointOwner/TaxReporting/TaxationCountry	1	For TFN/ABN/Exemption Code detail updates will this only be AU?	Laik Tan	This element can be any ISO country code. It is only one ISO element that (up to 5 occurrences) that holds the Tax information. When country Code is defined Australia 'AU', then the field contains a 'TFN/ABN/Exemption Code' value. When the country code is other than AU, then the field will contain 'Tax Identification Number'.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	012_001_01_acmt.003.001.07	/ModifiedAccountParties/PrincipalAccountParty/PrimaryOwner/Party/IndividualPerson/ModifiedPostalAddress/ModificationScopeIndication/InsertNewDataSet	1	Should INSE of new address be possible in the 012 given this would then link the address to a single security code? Should this only be possible in an account modification acct_003 where the address would be applied to the holder for all securities?	Sue Schafer	acct_003 message is used to update the information held within the CSP. This information is applicable to all the securities. Holder address is optional information and the participant may not provide the information when the account is being created. Whereas acct_012 message is used to convey the foreign tax status of the Investor to an Issuer which include the investor addresses as part of the self certification. The CSP will not store this information. These addresses are not part of the registration details.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	012_001_01_acmt.003.001.07	/ModifiedAccountParties/PrincipalAccountParty/PrimaryOwner/TaxReporting	1	This element falls under the Primary Owner node, so why should a single holder provide up to 5 different Tax IDs? In the acct_002 this only occurs once per holder object?	Laik Tan	Please check response above.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	012_001_01_acmt.003.001.07	/ModifiedAccountParties/PrincipalAccountParty/PrimaryOwner/TaxReporting/TaxationCountry	1	For TFN/ABN/Exemption Code detail updates will this only be AU?	Laik Tan	Please check response above.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	012_001_01_acmt.003.001.07	/ModifiedCashSettlement/CashAccountDetails	1	Why has this changed to [1..1]? Slide 31 of the TC Presentation 10 Dec 2019 states that DRP/Bank Details are not allowed for non mFund Application Order related use cases (e.g. updating TFN/ABN/Exemption Code details).	Laik Tan	Multiplicity is controlled at 'ModifiedCashSettlement'. If 'ModifiedCashSettlement' is used then 'CashAccountDetails' field becomes mandatory.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	012_001_01_acmt.003.001.07	/ModifiedInvestmentAccount/OwnershipType/Proprietary/Identification	1	Why does this element only occur once? Shouldn't an Investor Type be supplied for each TFN/ABN provided? e.g. if 4 holders exist on the account and each provide TFNs/ABNs that are for different Investor Types, how will this work?	Laik Tan	This indicates the type of the investor. The investor type could be 'Single' or 'Joint' or other values listed in the message. There will be only one occurrence of this for a given Account (HIN). In case, the investor type is 'JOINT' then there can be up to four holders. The Tax Identification of each of the joint holders then can be supplied at "/>

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	evnt_742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction/SecuritiesQuantityOrInstructedAmount/InstructedAmount	1	For an SPP where the price is known up-front, will both the Unit Quantity and Instructed amount be provided in messages from CSP to Issuer? If so, the Instructed Amount will not always be Unit Quantity x Offer Price (sometimes this may be rounded down/up to the nearest cent where the offer price includes fractions of a cent).	Laik Tan	On further analysis, we have changed the structure of the message. 'Instructed Amount' and Instructed quantity both will always be mandatory for SPP (PRIO) and Rights Issue(RHTS). Where the price is known upfront, the actual unit quantity can be specified else the unit quantity can be specified as zero '0'. We have removed this rule and new usage guideline has been published for review.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	evnt_742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction/SecuritiesQuantityOrInstructedAmount/InstructedAmount	2	RE: Business Rule Identification: Instructed Amount Rule Description: For share purchase plan (PRIO), the Instructed Amount must stand between AUD Minimum Application and AUD Maximum Application. If the Maximum Application amount is \$15,000 for an SPP, by enforcing this rule, Omnibus accounts will be unable to apply for >\$15,000, even though they may be attempting to apply for multiple beneficial holders, each applying for up to \$15,000 each. This rule needs to be reviewed.	Laik Tan	Thanks for the feedback. We have removed this rule and new usage guideline has been published for review.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	evnt_742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction/SecuritiesQuantityOrInstructedAmount/InstructedAmount	3	We request that the the instructed amount is always provided in messages from CSP to Issuer, to assist in reconciling money paid vs units accepted for a given holder entitlement.	Laik Tan	On further analysis, we have changed the structure of the message. 'Instructed Amount' and Instructed quantity both will always be mandatory for SPP (PRIO) and Rights Issue(RHTS). Where the price is known upfront, the actual unit quantity can be specified else the unit quantity can be specified as zero '0'. For rights election request (RHTS) , the unit quantity must be a number greater then zero.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	evnt_742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction/SecuritiesQuantityOrInstructedAmount/SecuritiesQuantity/InstructedQuantity/Quantity/Unit	1	So for an SPP where the price is known up-front, will this element always be provided? What will be provided where the price is not known before the offer close?	Laik Tan	On further analysis, we have changed the structure of the message. 'Instructed Amount' and Instructed quantity both will always be mandatory for SPP (PRIO) and Rights Issue(RHTS). Where the price is known upfront, the actual unit quantity can be specified else the unit quantity can be specified as zero '0'. For rights election request , the unit quantity must be a number greater then zero.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	evnt_743_001_04_seev_034_001_09	/	1	No issues from BNP Paribas	Wayne Murphy	Thank You
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	evnt_745_001_04_seev_040_001_07	/	1	No issues from BNP Paribas	Wayne Murphy	Thank You
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	evnt_745_001_04_seev_040_001_07	/CorporateActionInstruction/InstructedQuantity	1	Where an amount has been requested for a Share Purchase Plan (PRIO) does the amount need to be an option for a Cancellation request?	Sue Schafer	An entitlement election can only be cancelled in full. The partial cancellation of an entitlement election will not be provided. When cancelling a Share Purchase Plan (PRIO) or a Rights Offer Election (RHTS), the quantity should be specified as 'QALL'. The message does not support dollar amount.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	evnt_746_001_04_seev_041_001_08	/	1	No issues from BNP Paribas	Wayne Murphy	Thank You
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	138_001_01_camt_057_001_06	/	1	No issues from BNP Paribas	Wayne Murphy	Thank You
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	138_001_01_camt_057_001_06	/	2	We understand a single Payment Reference may apply to one or many Entitlements. Can multiple Payment References (i.e. each for partial payment amounts) apply to a single Entitlement? Can multiple Payment References (i.e. each for partial payment amounts) apply to multiple Entitlements?	Laik Tan	On further analysis of other related functionalities, we have descoped sett_138 message. Instead, the CSP will send sett_137_camt_054. multiple Payment References (i.e. each for partial payment amounts) can not be applied to a single Entitlement as the ISO message does not support it. Multiple payment references are not possible within a single payment request which aggregates the elections. However the participant/registry could choose to use the same payment reference on multiple Real time payment instructions. The CSP will not check the uniqueness of the payment reference across request across participants.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	138_001_01_camt_057_001_06	/Notification	1	Is this supposed to be the Transaction Id of the original sett_141 Real Time Payment Request from Participant to CSP?	Laik Tan	On further analysis of other related functionalities, we have descoped sett_138 message. Instead, the CSP will send sett_137_camt_054. sett_137 will not have the transaction ID of sett_141 Real time payment request. The Registry can reconcile the sett_137 message to the election requests using the following fields: 1) Payment reference 2) Corp Action event Id 3) CounterParty Id Additionally, sett_137 message will have the transaction Id of the sett_133 funds obligation message to the receiving payment provider. Registry can reconcile with the payment provider on the funds moved to the bank account.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	138_001_01_camt_057_001_06	/Notification	2	Please ignore comment above	Laik Tan	On further analysis of other related functionalities, we have descoped sett_138 message. Instead, the CSP will send sett_137_camt_054.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	138_001_01_camt_057_001_06	/Notification/Identification	1	Is this supposed to be the Transaction Id of the original sett_141 Real Time Payment Request from Participant to CSP?	Laik Tan	sett_137 message is sent to the receiving party (i.e. Registry in case of corporate action elections). Sett_141 message which is a Real Time payment request submitted by the participant will not be sent to the receiving party hence the reference will not add any value on the sett_137 message.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	138_001_01_camt_057_001_06	/Notification/Item/RemittanceInformation/Unstructured	1	Please confirm CSP will validate Corp Action Event IDs when processing evnt_742 messages from Participants, i.e. there is no chance that a Payment Notification will be sent to an Issuer that contains an invalid Corp Action Event ID?	Laik Tan	On further analysis of other related functionalities, we have descoped sett_138 message. Instead, the CSP will send sett_137_camt_054. The CSP will validate the corp action event Id on the election request and on the sett_137. Sett_137 is an egress message from CSP to the Issuer. The corp action event Id will be validated when it is added to the message.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	141_001_01_pain_001_001_09	/	1	No Issues from BNP Paribas	Wayne Murphy	Thank You
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	142_001_01_pain_002_001_10	/	1	No issues from BNP Paribas	Wayne Murphy	Thank You
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	122_001_02_semt_020_001_05	/	1	I'm struggling with the purpose of this message. When a NBOB or GMTD fails to settle it is notified with the rescheduled using the NSFI/NRSI and then they can be housekept?	Sue Schafer	In order to achieve settlement finality, the NBOB and GMTD will always fully settle. ASX will send sett_119 settlement confirmation messages to the participants and create NSFI and NRIN and send a transaction generation message (sett_130) to the participant.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	122_001_02_semt_020_001_05	/Reference/OtherMessageIdentification	1	This is shown as mandatory, but it only applies to NFIN and NRIN. I would have thought this would be omitted when targeting an allegement. Please clarify.	Craig Gray	'Reference' is a choice element. One of the following child elements can be used: 1) SecuritiesSettlementTransactionAllegementNotificationTransactionIdentification 2) OtherMessageIdentification OtherMessageIdentification <OtherMsgId> MUST BE populated when the message is sent to cancellation a Novated Rescheduled Instruction (NRIN) or Novated Settlement Failure Instruction (NSFI)
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	122_001_02_semt_020_001_05	/Reference/SecuritiesSettlementTransactionAllegementNotificationTransactionIdentification/TransactionIdentification	1	This is shown as mandatory, but surely it only applies to cancelling allegements (as per its location in the message). When cancelling NFIN and NRIN. I would have thought this would be omitted, and Other Message Identification, as below, used instead. Please clarify.	Craig Gray	Please check response above.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	130_001_05_sese_032_001_07	/	1	Looks like this message (130 = sese.032) now has two conflicting uses, and this is potentially confusing. Its use for NFSI and NROB cases is good use of sese.032; it is notifying a newly generated settlement instruction. Its use as defined earlier-on for rescheduling failed BSSI and USSI conflicts with this; in those cases it is simply updating an existing settlement instruction, not creating a new one; this is not the same thing. Having quite different meanings for the same message is confusing. The choice of sese.032 for rescheduling failed BSSI and USSI was always problematic, as per my earlier feedback. So once again, just to be clear, the use of 130 = sese.032 for NFSI and NROB notifications is good, because the model there is to close out the failed instructions, and generate new settlement instructions; perfect. But for BSSI and USSI, where the failed instruction is simply carried forward to the next cycle, then sese.032 remains a bad choice, because you are not actually generating a new settlement instruction. One suggestion I made previously was not to send a message at all for fully-failed BSSI and USSI, to keep the settlement date unchanged, and to change settlement processing so that it attempts to settle all transactions scheduled to settle on the day, or on previous days. Same for part settlement of BSSI and USSI; just send the 119 = sese.025, but no need to change the settlement date; on any day, always settle anything due or overdue. I think this is a good approach, and avoids the problem of using 130 in conflicting ways. Alternatively, make them different messages: one for creating new settlement instructions (new NFSI and NROB), and one for rescheduling failed instructions (BSSI, USSI, failed NROB).	Craig Gray	Thanks for your suggestion. To enable participants to easily identify if this is a rescheduled settlement instruction or a newly generated transaction in case of NSFI and NROB, we have introduced additional values for element 'Reason'. CSP will continue to use reason as "In case any settlement instruction is rescheduled because of insufficient units." In cases where the sett_130 message is used to convey the newly generated NSFI or NBOB instructions, the CSP will use the code as 'SING' (Settlement Instruction Generation).
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	130_001_05_sese_032_001_07	/	2	What will this message now be called? Originally it was "Rescheduled Settlement Instruction", but if we are now creating new settlement instructions with it, that is not a great fit. Might just get away with it for NRIN, but not NSFI.	Craig Gray	This message has been named as 'Settlement Transaction Generation Notification'.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	130_001_05_sese_032_001_07	/	3	Further to comment #1, or as a specific example of potential confusion caused by the dual use of this message. What if NRIN instructions fail settlement? My understanding is, old-style fail processing will apply (EIS 124-like processing). So this means we will get a further 130 message next day, presumably also with Settlement Transaction Condition = 'NRIN', but this time we have to check that the failing transaction is itself an NRIN, so we know that this is not a new transaction, but just a reschedule of the old one. Whereas previous day, we would have had a 130 with Settlement Transaction Condition = 'NRIN', but the failing instruction would have been a GMTD or NBOB, and therefore that message instance was establishing a new settlement instruction. This is too subtle! Now, we can be clever enough to work that out if we have to, but it would be FAR simpler—don't you think?—if there were different messages for updating the settlement date of an existing instruction, versus creating a whole new instruction.	Craig Gray	Thanks for your feedback. We have introduced a new reason code "Settlement Instruction Generation for Failed Units (SING)". This will help Participants to differentiate when a new settlement obligation is created and when an existing settlement obligation is rescheduled.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	130_001_05_sese_032_001_07	/	4	should this be using the same version of the base sese_032_001 message as sett_140? sett_140 is version 09 and this is version 07	Sue Schafer	Agree. Both the messages should use the same ISO base message version. We have corrected the ISO base message version for sett_140. This will be published in the next documentation release.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	140_001_01_sese_032_001_09	/	1	is override basis of movement no longer required for an accrued instruction?	Sue Schafer	Override Basis of Movement is a field submitted by Participants to override the default Basis of Movement. As the accrual is an instruction generated by the platform there is no point at which a participant can provide an override.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_rel6_comm	809_001_02_admi_007_001_01	/MessageIdentification/MessageIdentification	1	Is this Transaction Id that is currently bit position 48 in EIS422 and EIS722? I understand that it has to match Business Message Identification from BAH.	Elvira Imamovic	Correct. This is a unique identifier of the comm_809 message. For simplicity we have kept its same value as BAH.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_rel6_comm	809_001_02_admi_007_001_01	/SupplementaryData/Envelope	1	Is this applicable to Registry/mFund? If it is, what kind of information will be provided here?	Elvira Imamovic	"/MessageIdentification/MessageIdentification" is the transaction id however the CSP is not generating a unique id in this case but using the same unique value populated in the 'Business Message Identification' from BAH. 'Report/related Reference/Reference' is the element which is mapped to BP62 - Origin Transaction Id.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	sett_141_001_01_pain_001_001_09			Assumption is that Registries will be paying refunds directly to the investors on Day 1, as per the current processes. Based on this assumption, Registry will not be sending message sett_141 to CSP. Is this assumption correct?	Elvira Imamovic	This is a new service optional offering. The Registries can continue to process the refunds as per the current process or process them electronically via CHES+. If registries utilise the service a sett_141 message will be used to initiate the RTGS payment
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	evnt_742_001_04_seev_033_001_08			Are all applications within one Corporate Action to be either in Units or Amounts, i.e. there won't be a mix of unit / amount applications within one Corporate Action?	Elvira Imamovic	On further analysis, we have changed the structure of the message. 'Instructed Amount' and instructed quantity both will always be mandatory for SPP (PRIO) and Rights Issue(RHTS). Where the price is known upfront, the actual unit quantity can be specified else the unit quantity can be specified as zero '0'. For rights election request, the unit quantity must be a number greater than zero.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	evnt_742_001_04_seev_033_001_08			What standard approach will be taken for representing the choice of units or amounts? Will the standard approach be evident from the CA STPII announcement data of ASX publication of the event?	Stephen	On further analysis, we have changed the structure of the message. 'Instructed Amount' and instructed quantity both will always be mandatory for SPP (PRIO) and Rights Issue(RHTS).
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	evnt_742_001_04_seev_033_001_08			Are messages evnt_742 and sett_138 linked via Payment Reference ?	Elvira Imamovic	On further analysis of other related functionalities, we have descoped sett_138 message. Instead, the CSP will send sett_137_camt_054. The sett_137 message will be sent to the funds receiving party (registry in case of a elections processing.). Sett_137 message will have two links to the elections (evnt_742) message. 1) Corporate Action Event ID 2) Payment Reference
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	evnt_742_001_04_seev_033_001_08			What is the relationship between messages evnt_742 and sett_138 (presumably via Payment Reference), can they have many to many relationship?	Elvira Imamovic	On further analysis of other related functionalities, we have descoped sett_138 message. Instead, the CSP will send sett_137_camt_054. One sett_137 message can link to one or many evnt_742 election requests depending on how the participant aggregated the real time payment instruction. However, one election request can be associated with only one sett_137 message.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	evnt_742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	<PtyCtctNrrt>		How unique will the Payment Reference be?	Stephen	The CSP will not validate the uniqueness of the payment reference. It is up to the payment initiating participant to add a reference which will enable them to reconcile against the movement of funds. The registry will have to use combination of Payment Ref + Corp Action event Id + Counterparty Identifier to reconcile sett_137 against the individual election requests.
Jan-20	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	evnt_742_001_04_seev_033_001_08	<OthrDocId><DocNb><PrtryNb><Id>		Need more information about Entitlement numbers and how either initial or subsequently generated entitlement information will be passed onto CHES.	Elvira Imamovic	Entitlement number is an optional field on the election message. The participant is responsible for capturing the entitlement number provided to the investor for a long form offer document.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	004_001_04_acmt_014_001_02	/	1	Please advise how the process differs (if at all) for setting up a RTGS Payment Facility for a Rights Issue/SPP vs how one is currently established for a DvP placement? Currently forms are completed to request the creation/update/cancellation facility and sent to ASX Ops. Please also advise whether this message will be sent to the Issuer where the Payment Facility is setup for Corporate Action Entitlement Payments via RTGS (i.e. is an Issuer deemed a 'Payment Manager' in this scenario).	Laik Tan	1. Change in process for a Rights Issue or SPP is that bank account details are required to be provided in a Bank Letter (adopting same process as Austraclear for capturing Bank account details). 2.The Payment Manager will be the Registry appointed as settlement agent for corporate action entitlements processing by the Issuer.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	004_001_04_acmt_014_001_02	/Payment Facility Additional Data/Account_Restriction_Details/CashAccount/Identification/Other/Identification	1	Given there is no regular expression/pattern in the text(1,19) datatype, can a format rule be included here (or in the messaging pages) that explains the structure & validation of cash account i.e. BSB and Account Number e.g. "00-00-00 1234567890".	Darcy Wright	Thank you. The message data type is aligned with the RBA pacs message.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	004_001_04_acmt_014_001_02	/Payment Facility Additional Data/Account_Restriction_Details/CashAccount/Identification/Other/Identification	2	p.s. also useful to include mapping of EIS757 BP201 and BP203 if BSB Number and Account Number separated by space is the structure	Darcy Wright	EIS 757 is part of Investor Details
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	004_001_04_acmt_014_001_02	/Payment Facility Additional Data/Safekeeping_Account	1	1. In case a payfac is account specific and has > 200 accounts, what is the mechanism for advising the remainder? Is this another PayFac add for the same same PayFac Id with same Payment Manager, payfac type and status?	Darcy Wright	Today a paper form is supplied with all the Account (HINs) attached for ASX Operations. The restriction of 200 Account (HINs) is on the creation of the payment facility message. For example if 250 Account (HINs) were provided, the first 200 Account (HINs) would be associated to the Account Specific Payment Facility and then ASX Operations would send an update message to attach the remaining 50 Account (HINs) to the same PayFac ID with the same Payment Manager and Payment Facility Type.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	004_001_04_acmt_014_001_02	/References/ProcessIdentification/Identification	1	Comment (Note) refers to inte_918 (Payment Facilities Request) with mapping to an existing(?) EIS BP62. Will this ASX-internal message id be added to the UML - or should this reference be removed if the inte_918 won't be published in the CHES Replacement catalogue?	Darcy Wright	Thank you. This annotation will be removed
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	004_001_04_acmt_014_001_02	/Report/Account/Status	1	Can you clarify? Annotation refers to active, cancelled and suspended status—sounds like three values—but only enabled and disabled are included in the schema (ENAB, DISAB).	Craig Gray	Thank you. The annotation is incorrect, deleted will be removed from the annotation.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	004_001_04_acmt_014_001_02	/Report/Account/Type/Proprietary	1	Comment refers to PaymentFacilityType_ASX_1 but a codeset(ACCT and NOMN) is defined and the ASX Prop Code List attached to draft_acct doesn't have this tab. Remove comment?	Darcy Wright	Thank you. The comment will be removed.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	evnt_742_001_03_seev_033_001_08	/AdditionalDetails_evt_742/InstructedPercentageRate	1	Not all Issuer DRP/BSP plans allow partial elections using percentage rates. If an Issuer receives an election from CSP with percentage and the plan does not allow this, the Issuer would reject the election. Issuer DRP/BSP plans that allow partial percentage rates are generally restricted to whole percentages (i.e. do not allow fractions of a percent). We are keen to understand why this field allows up to 10 decimals - is this simply the ISO standard, or is there demand from a specific market segment (e.g. Omnibus holdings) to provide percentage to this extent? If the latter, it should be noted that the vast majority of Issuers that offer percentage, also offer units. Given the choice, units would be far more accurate than a percentage rate.	Laik Tan	We agree with you. We had to add the 'percentage' in the supplementary data to cater for those rare occasions (older plans we hear) where you can still instruct a percentage. And yes, the format was picked according to the ISO standard- the datatype was not modified. We do not anticipate the percentage being used. There is a constraint to it as explained in the Usage Guideline. If you use percentage you must also set the Instructed Quantity to zero in the core message.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	evnt_742_001_03_seev_033_001_08	/AdditionalDetails_evt_742/InstructedPercentageRate	2	In the case of an instructed percentage is there a standard approach for rounding where the result is not a number of whole units?	Sue Schafer	This decision will be made by the Registry.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	evnt_742_001_03_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionGeneralInformation/CorporateActionEventIdentification	1	What is ASX approach for reconciling all Issuer DRP/BSPs operating on migration date and assigning Corporate Action IDs to each of them? Registries will need to map these Corporate Action IDs to a specific issuer and plan in their systems, so will require some coordination for not only migration date but going forward, a process will also be required for when new plans are offered.	Laik Tan	It is our understanding that not all DRP plans will be announced through ASX, which is why for DRP/BSP elections we took the approach of using 'NONREF' for the CA event Id as recommended by ISO when the election is not preceded by an announcement (seev.031). also, Dividend Elections can be made at any time and are not related to a specific Dividend.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	evnt_742_001_03_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction/CurrencyOption	1	The version documented in tranche 5 had this field included - has it been excluded now deliberately?	Sue Schafer	It was later decided to remove the flag of 'currency option'; the Foreign Cash election will be handled through the new payment message (that has not been presented to the group yet).
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	evnt_745_001_03_seev_040_001_07	/AdditionalDetails_Evnt745	1	The ASX Proprietary Code List file attached to the ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt collection does not contain CancellationRequestReason_ASX_1. Please provide the list of valid codes (presumably will cover Investor Request, Zero Holding, Ineligible to Participate, Plan Suspended).	Laik Tan	The code list is contained within the schema and not in an internal code list. Please refer to the latest version of the Usage Guideline. And the codes you are referring to are the correct ones.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evt	evnt_745_001_03_seev_040_001_07	/CorporateActionInstruction/InstructedQuantity	1	Business rule states: Where the Event Type is <DVP>the Instructed Quantity must be expressed as a reference of QALL (All Securities). This implies that the Corporate Action\Instruction\Instructed Quantity\Code element must always be populated with QALL and that the Corporate Action\Instruction\Instructed Quantity\Quantity\Unit element must not be used for DRP/BSP election cancellations, irrespective of whether the original election was ALL or partial? Is this correct? If not, is there an expectation that the Issuer validates that the choice of ALL or Units supplied in the cancellation request matches the election on file prior to authorising it? Or do we just ignore it and authorise?	Laik Tan	Your assumptions are correct. if you wish to cancel a DRP election you must use the code word QALL, that is correct. the assumption is- as long as the participant keeps instructing, these are all partial elections that we pass on to the registry. ASX keeps 'adding on' to previously accepted elections. But if the participant wishes to cancel and re-instruct- he has to do it from the start. Send a cancellation request for everything and re-start the election process.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_comm	809_001_02_admi_007_001_01	/Report/RelatedReference/Reference	1	Will this contain the transaction ID from the evnt_742 message DRP/BSP election or the evnt_743 authorisation/rejection?	Laik Tan	The related reference always refers to the message the ASX is acknowledging. As ASX is acknowledging the acceptance or rejection of an election through the evnt_743, the comm_809 will refer to the latter.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_comm	809_001_02_admi_007_001_01	/Report/RequestHandling/StatusCode	1	Please confirm this element will be populated with COMP for the DRP/BSP election use case.	Laik Tan	no- it will be populated with code word "accepted" (ACCP)
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	132_001_01_semt_044_001_01	/Penalty additional Details	1	Quantity and Value are present but the price used to calculate Securities Valuation is not. Slide 31 of Nov1 TC gives formula as Shortfall by the "closing price of the security as reported by the primary listed venue" but this calculation can not be verified if that price is not disclosed. Also I seem to recall this was the closing price on S-2? Perhaps add a business rule annotation? And as this detail is in SuppData extension - could this closing price be added for improved traceability/integrity?	Darcy Wright	1. The price used to calculate the securities valuation will be the closing price of the security 2 days prior to the current business day (S-2). The price is disclosed through other methods such as ReferencePoint.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	132_001_01_semt_044_001_01	/Penalty/PenaltyPerCounterparty/PenaltyDetails/ComputedAmount	1	1. ASX Element Name "Levy Value" appears here and in Aggregated Net Amount tags. Assume they are same value but comment here is missing usage for reversed levy notification message. Is this only used for levy Notification message?	Darcy Wright	the code list is contained within the schema not in right internal code list. Please refer to the latest version of the Usage Guideline. And the codes you are referring to are the correct ones.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	132_001_01_semt_044_001_01	/Penalty/PenaltyPerCounterparty/PenaltyDetails/ComputedAmount	2	2. If levy amount same value in both elements, could the Penalty Per Counterparty/Levy amount instead carry total for the Settlement Batch Id? This would give a way of confirming to total levy for all Security Codes a settlement date - and may even be the same as ASX billing amount that is collected end-of-month?	Darcy Wright	A change request has been submitted to SWIFT to move attributes from the supplementary data into the main body of the message. This change request also requests to add the levy amount into the main body, therefore not to duplicate it in the message. It is for this reason that additional attributes will not be added into the supplementary data.
Nov-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	132_001_01_semt_044_001_01	/Penalty/PenaltyPerCounterparty/PenaltyDetails/Identification/MarketInfrastructureIdentification	1	Confused by Type in New Data Requirement. Does this element have a 4 character code T/C or is it a 1,35 string?	Darcy Wright	The correct type is 1,35. The annotation will be updated.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_02_semt_002_001_10	/BalanceForAccount/AggregateBalance/ShortLongIndicator	1	In terms of this ISO message definition, Short Long Indicator qualifies the Quantity of the Aggregate Balance. It cannot be used for the proposed purpose, to qualify the Unit Quantity in the Net Settlement Movement Attributes in the Supplementary Data. What you need to do is always specify LONG here in the Long Short Indicator (because the balance will never be short), and then have a new field in the Supplementary Data to indicate whether the Unit Quantity is an increase or decrease.	Craig Gray	Agree with the comment. We have added 'Short Long Indicator' in the supplementary data and restricted the field in the message body to always use LONG.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	301_01_02_semt_013_001_04	/AdditionalDetails/Account_Identifier	1	Could you please clarify on why this field is mandatory for ETOC? will ETOC only initiated by Broker clients? will a custodian be expected to populate Clearing account details as well?	Pradeep Pandian	This account identifies the clearing account relating to the Client's HIN to enable ASX Clear to correctly record the collateral against an open position. This account will be used by ASX Clear to record the collateral value against the clients position which otherwise may be subject to cash margin. In case of a custodian this could represent the clearing account linked to the omnibus HIN.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	301_01_02_semt_013_001_04	/IntraPositionDetails/BalanceFrom/QuantityBreakdown/LotNumber/Identification	1	I think lodgement number is being retained going forward to allow removal of collateral lodged under the old paper-based system. Would ASX consider converting all paper-based lodgements to paperless between now and CSP go-live? Lodgement number could then be dispensed with going forward. Are there significant numbers of paper lodgements left? I think, perhaps, not. How feasible to convert the remaining ones?	Craig Gray	The understanding is correct. We have retained this field to allow removal of collateral lodged under the old paper-based system. CSP would accept only paperless lodgements going forward. It is up to the clearing participant to remove and redodge the stock with ASX Clear. This is a manual process between ASX Clear and the member. We will reconsider the number of lodgements with unique references closer to go-live.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	301_01_02_semt_013_001_04	/IntraPositionDetails/BalanceFrom/Type/Code	1	1) when a participant sends collateral creation request, this field should be populated with value = "AVAI" 2) When a participant sends Collateral Removal request, this field should be populated with value = "BLOK" could you confirm this understanding?	Pradeep Pandian	The understanding is correct.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	301_01_02_semt_013_001_04	/IntraPositionDetails/BalanceTo	1	1) when a participant sends collateral placement request, this field should be populated with value = "BLOK" 2) When a participant send Collateral Removal request, this field should be populated with value = "AVAI" could you confirm this understanding?	Pradeep Pandian	The understanding is correct.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	302_01_02_semt_014_001_06	/	1	Dear Team, This messages is missing in the Collateral Creation UML flow in "Technical_Committee_Meeting_23Jul2019_Presentation.pdf". Could you please let us know the revised UML flow please.	Pradeep Pandian	In the collateral creation workflow this message will be used by ASX Clear to authorise or reject the collateral creation request. This message will not be used for communication between the participant and CSP in collateral creation workflow because, as soon as the collateral creation request is received and validated by the CSP, the units are blocked in a sub position and the CSP sends a Pldg_303 message to the participant. Once the Collateral is authorised by ASX Clear, the CSP will send a comm_809 message to the participant indicating that the request is complete.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	302_01_02_semt_014_001_06	/ProcessingStatus/AcknowledgedAccepted/Reason/Code/Proprietary/Identification	1	Could you please clarify on the Sequence of statuses? Is it PEND -> AUTH -> AUCP? Could you clarify on which status to be taken as the final status? Also what statuses are applicable for 1) Collateral creation 2) Collateral removal	Pradeep Pandian	As mentioned earlier, pldg_302 message is not relevant for participants in case of collateral creation. The sequence in case of collateral removal could be: a) PEND -> REJT Or b) PEND -> AUCP -> AUTH In case of Rejection, REJT is the final status. (Please note we used 'REJT' just for representation. In actual, the xml will contain xml element 'Rejected') In case of Acceptance, the participants will get a pldg_303 confirmation message once the request is fully authorised and the units are moved to available subposition.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	302_01_02_semt_014_001_06	/ProcessingStatus/AcknowledgedAccepted/Reason/Code/Proprietary/Identification	2	Also, I believe the Original flow diagram for "Collateral Creation" was missing the "pldg_302_Semt_014" flow from the UML diagram. Therefore, request you to show us the revised UML for Collateral Creation request as well.	Pradeep Pandian	In the collateral creation workflow this message will be used by ASX Clear to Authorise or reject the collateral creation request. This message will not be used for communication between the participant and CSP in collateral creation workflow because, as soon as the collateral creation request is received and validated by the CSP, the units are blocked in a sub position and the CSP sends a Pldg_303 message to the participant. Once the Collateral is authorised by ASX Clear, the CSP will send a comm_809 message to the participant indicating that the request/workflow is complete.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	302_01_02_semt_014_001_06	/TransactionIdentification/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	1	I believe this message type is used between multiple parties 1) CSP to Participant 2) Clearing Participant to CSP 3) CSP to ASX Clear 4) ASX Clear to CSP Therefore, it is important to understand the significance of this field. Will the transaction ID sent by the original requester of pldg_301.semt_013 be retained throughout?	Pradeep Pandian	The understanding is correct. Transaction ID sent by the original requester of pldg_301.semt_013 be retained throughout.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	303_01_02_semt_015_001_07	/	1	This message is equivalent to EIS 028 (amongst others). Is there an equivalent message to EIS 020 in these flows?—there does not seem to be one.	Craig Gray	Comm_809 will be used for this purpose.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	303_01_02_semt_015_001_07	/	2	Re Comment #1 above; my apologies, I have discovered 809 = admi.007 is being used for this purpose.	Craig Gray	Thanks.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	303_01_02_semt_015_001_07	/AdditionalDetails/Participant_Reference	1	From a participant perspective, does this field contain Transaction Id of the Original pldg_301.semt_013 message? why if this field optional?	Pradeep Pandian	This field has been retained from the EIS messages and represents bit position 34. Participants can optionally use this field to populate information for example, this field may be used to hold contract note numbers. CSP will not validate this field.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	303_01_02_semt_015_001_07	/AdditionalDetails/Reason	1	Is this field applicable for pldg_303_semt_015? I have a feeling when collateral removal is rejected, then a participant should never get this message back? Please confirm the understanding?	Pradeep Pandian	As mentioned earlier, when collateral removal is rejected, then a participant will not receive pldg_303 message instead they will receive a pldg_302 message. In case of a collateral removal initiated by ASX Clear, they will initiate a collateral removal request using a pldg_301 message. On receipt of this message from ASX Clear, the CSP will move the units from Blocked to available and send a pldg_303 confirmation message to the participants. CSP will populate this field with the reason to indicate why units have been moved from Blocked to Available (Reason for removal of collateral by ASX Clear for e.g. EXPI: Security Approaching Expiry Date)
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	303_01_02_semt_015_001_07	/AdditionalDetails/Sub_Position_Balance	1	How is this field different from "Settled Quantity"?	Pradeep Pandian	Settled quantity represents the quantity that should be blocked or unblocked as part of that message. Total Cover represent the total number of units of a security that are pledged on a specific account and security holding which is the total after processing of the creation request . If the Subposition Type = 'ETOC', the value in the Total Cover field would be the total options cover after adding/removing the new unit quantity; and if the Subposition Type = 'CMMC', the value in the Total Cover field will be the total cash market margin cover after adding/removing the new unit quantity.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	303_01_02_semt_015_001_07	/AdditionalParameters/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	1	In case of ASX clear initiated collateral Removal, what value will be populated by CSP in the message to the controlling participant? Is it possible for CSP to communicate the reference of the original Collateral creation initiated by the Controlling participant?	Pradeep Pandian	In this case the field will be populated with the transaction Id initiated by ASX Clear. It will not be possible for CSP to populate the 'Collateral creation' request because there may not be one to one mapping between the two. It is possible that the participant sent multiple collateral creation requests to form that collateral position and ASX Clear is removing all of it because the security is no longer eligible for collateral.
Oct-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	305_001_01_sese_025_001_07	/TransactionIdentificationDetails/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	1	What will be populated here. Normally in an sese.025 this would contain the transaction id from the participant's sese.023; however, in this case the affected participant has not sent an sese.023. So what will be populated here? Is sese.025 actually the correct message to use?	Craig Gray	This will be the transaction ID created by ASX Clear when they initiate a sese.023 message. We analysed other market practices and discussed with SWIFT on the usage of sese.025 message in this scenario. There is no standard market practice indicating that sese.025 cannot be used in this case. In this case, the sese.025 would be like a "Copy" of the sese.025 sent to the sender of sese.023 message (ASX Clear). Similar approach has been used in other markets like T2S.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	742_001_01_seev_033_001_08	/		No issues with the message formatting	Wayne Murphy	Thank you
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	742_001_01_seev_033_001_08	/		In the Participant initiated model, the evtnt_742_seev_033 is accompanied by an acct_002_acmt_002 when the CSP passes the request to the Offeror. In the Offeror Initiated model will this also be the case when the CSP passes the request to the participant?	Sue Schafer	Yes the assumption is correct. An acct_002 will be sent to the offeror whether the acceptance is initiated by the participant or the offeror
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	742_001_01_seev_033_001_08	/		General comment on takeover/buyback workflows. Using corporate action messages for these flows is understandable; however, for settlement participants a key aspect of takeover/buyback workflow is establishing the sub-position for protecting the holdings impacted by the accepted takeover/buyback offer. This key aspect is not very visible in these messages—can it be made more explicit? Contrast collateral creation, where use of inter-position movement messages makes the sub-positions he helpfully explicit. The only instance here is with bid finalisation, where a 303 (semt.015) suddenly pops up out of the blue when all through the process there has been no explicit mention of a sub-position; something seems not quite right about this. There may be good reason beyond settlements to be using the corporate action messages, but should we be making more explicit use of intra-position movements alongside this? Or can we even switch to intra-position messages for takeovers/buybacks, and get near-common workflow for all sub-position creation?	Craig Gray	As the acceptance of takeover and buybacks must relay some of the corporate Action notification details, it is very difficult to convey all those details in the intra-position movement family of messages. This would result in a lot of supplementary data. Following market feedback, we have also removed the semt.015 from this workflow and replaced it with an seev.034, or status advice on an election, to show that the units that were blocked following a Corporate Action Election, are now released following a cancellation for instance. Following market feedback more text/annotation has been added to the Usage Guidelines to explain exactly what quantity relates to what status. For instance if the status is 'instruction cancelled' the status quantity expresses the total number of units released. Same if the status is 'cancellation request rejected' the status quantity will show the number of units that remain locked.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	742_001_01_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionGeneralInformation/CorporateActionEventIdentification		If this will contain the 9 digit Reference Point Corporate Action id, will the type/code be changed to [0-9][9]?	Laik Tan	ASX has decided to not reduce the length of the field for future proofing. The Corporate Action Id size could change over time.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	742_001_01_seev_033_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction/OptionType		What is the purpose of specifying the Option Type given that Option Number is already specified? Can this field be marked as optional rather than mandatory?	Khanh Ler	It is a mandatory field in all Corporate Action messages. An option is always uniquely identified by the combination of an option number and a code. In the custodians world, where investors use the services of several custodians, they will receive CA notifications from every custodian and the usage of Option numbers will not be consistent. One custodian may announce Option 001 as cash and another will pick option 002 as cash. To make sure that the right choice is captured in the election it is mandatory to instruct using both the option number and the option type.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	743_001_01_seev_034_001_09	/		No issues with the message formatting	Wayne Murphy	Thank you
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	743_001_01_seev_034_001_09	/CorporateActionInstruction/StatusQuantity		Please confirm whether this is intended to reflect the current Sub Balance? For example, if it was a takeover acceptance then this is the Takeover Acceptance Balance	Khanh Ler	Following market feedback more text has been added to the Usage Guidelines to explain exactly what quantity relates to what status. For instance if the status is 'instruction accepted' the status quantity expresses the total number of units locked after received an instruction. Same if the status is 'instruction rejected' the status quantity will show the number of units released.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	743_001_01_seev_034_001_09	/CorporateActionInstruction/StatusQuantity		Also in the case of a rejection where the request may have been for a distinct portion, will this Quantity indicate the number of units that have been rejected (the number on the original request) or the total that remain accepted if units have been previously accepted on the HIN.	Sue Schafer	Please see comment above.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	743_001_01_seev_034_001_09	/InstructionIdentification/Identification		Does this contain Account Owner Document Identification from the initiating 742 = seev.033?	Craig Gray	Yes, This is the 'Transaction Id' from the request message evtnt_742
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	745_001_01_seev_040_001_07	/		No issues with the message formatin	Wayne Murphy	Thank you
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	745_001_01_seev_040_001_07	/		Please confirm that this message, as well as being sent by offeror or participant to request removal of acceptance, is also RECEIVED by the participant if the message is sent by the offeror. This is shown on the UMLs presented at Technical Committee; however, this corresponds to EIS 092, and EIS 092 is not listed in the top-level annotation to this usage. Hence wanting to confirm this additional use.	Craig Gray	Yes this correct. The EIS 092 has now been added to the annotation.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	745_001_01_seev_040_001_07	/CorporateActionInstruction/OptionType/Code		as per comment on evtnt_743, can option type be optional given that Option Number already been specified	Khanh Ler	Please see comment above.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	746_001_01_seev_041_001_08	/		No issues with the message formatting	Wayne Murphy	Thank you
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	746_001_01_seev_041_001_08	/AdditionalInformation		Note this is an optional element. Please provide business rules to explain when it should be used.	Laik Tan	Additional information is present to include the Cancellation Request reason. The only reason code possible is 'Legal Entitlement'
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	746_001_01_seev_041_001_08	/CorporateActionGeneralInformation/OfficialCorporateActionEventIdentification		Is there any intention to use this field? If yes, please provide more details on the scenario and its purpose	Khanh Ler	The Official Corporate Action Event Identification is used in the ISO 20022 notifications sent by ASX (STP project). The project team is aware that not everyone is a subscriber, so this field has subsequently been removed from the evtnt_746 as it may not be relevant for every recipient.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	746_001_01_seev_041_001_08	/CorporateActionGeneralInformation/OfficialCorporateActionEventIdentification		Note that this element is optional. Under what circumstances must this element be populated?	Laik Tan	Please see comment above. It has been removed.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	746_001_01_seev_041_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction		Shouldn't this be [1..1]?	Laik Tan	It was originally kept optional for housekeeping messages. It is now mandatory for every scenario.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	746_001_01_seev_041_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction		Agree - would prefer this was included, particularly to match number of units under Status Quantity	Sue Schafer	The field is now mandatory.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_evtnt	746_001_01_seev_041_001_08	/CorporateActionInstruction/StatusQuantity		Please confirm whether Quantity in this context is intended to represent the Takeover Sub Balance if the status of the advice is Cancellation Complete or Accepted. That is, it is the takeover sub balance after the cancellation is effective.	Khanh Ler	Following market feedback more text has been added to the Usage Guidelines to explain exactly what quantity relates to what status. For instance if the status is 'instruction cancellation accepted' the status quantity expresses the total number of units released. Same if the status is 'cancellation request rejected' the status quantity will show the number of units that remain locked.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_comm	809_001_01_admi_007_001_01	/Report/RequestHandling/StatusCode		Please advise which codes will be used in messages from CSP to Offeror and under what scenarios.	Laik Tan	COMP' will be used in this scenario.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	229_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/		UMLs published to Technical Committee show message 226 (seev.036) being sent to the participant in response to this 229 (with 230 = sese.025 being sent to the offeror). I cannot find the definition of 226.	Craig Gray	This message was already published for the members review and feedback along with holding adjustment messages.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	229_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/DeliveringSettlementParties/Party1/Identification/ProprietaryIdentification/Identification		What is the reason behind including BP20 Delivering PID in this message? It's not present in EIS 431 and the Offeror may not have the correct PID for all accepted CHES sponsored accounts (whether that be because the target doesn't supply the PIDs in the copy of the register, and additionally because ASX no longer provides the CHES Master File which the Offeror could previously use to look up the PIDs for all CHES accounts). What validation will CSP perform against PID vs HIN and could this prevent the transfer of accepted securities to the Offeror HIN?	Laik Tan	We will update the message and make the DeliveringSettlementParties block optional as this message is used for multiple scenarios. In this use case (takeover transfer), the delivering HIN will be populated within QuantityAndAccountDetails>>SafekeepingAccount. The offeror will not need to populate Delivering PID in that case since this will be made
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	229_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SafekeepingAccount/Identification		What is the purpose of BP17 Delivering HIN appearing in this message twice? Quantity And Account Details\Safekeeping Account\Identification and Delivering Settlement Parties\Party 1\Safekeeping Account\Identification	Laik Tan	The same message (hold_229) is being used for both Issuer's agent Transfer (warrants) and takeovers. We renamed the message to "Corporate Action related Transfer" to reflect the transfer that has to happen between 2 Accounts (HINs) as a result of Corporate Action. When the transfer is identified as a 'delivery', the underlying account (Quantity and Account Details/Safekeeping account) represents the HIN from which the securities are taken, and the 'to' account, or receiving HIN, is shown in Receiving Settlement Parties/Party1/Safekeeping account. When the transfer is identified as a 'receive', the underlying account (Quantity and Account Details/Safekeeping account) represents the HIN to which the securities are received and the 'from' account, or delivering HIN, is shown in Delivering Settlement Parties/Party1/Safekeeping account.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	229_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/ReceivingSettlementParties/Party1/SafekeepingAccount/Identification		If the business rule is correct in that this element (BP16 Receiving HIN) is only allowed for messages with Securities Movement Type set to 'DELI' (noting that it will always be set to 'RECE' for a request to transfer accepted securities to the Offeror HIN), then how will the Offeror notify CSP the Receiving HIN to transfer accepted securities to???	Laik Tan	see above rule
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	230_001_02_sese_025_001_07	/		No issues with the message formatting	Wayne Murphy	Thank you
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	230_001_02_sese_025_001_07	/		Top-level annotation here maps this message to EIS 034; however, UML presented to Technical Committee shows a different message (226) being sent to the participant in context of corporate-action related transfer (226). In other words, UMLs map EIS 034 to message 226, not to this message 230.	Craig Gray	The EIS 034 was wrongly mapped in the annotation. We do confirm that the 034 is being replaced by the hold_226 and the annotations will be corrected in the next release of external documentation.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	230_001_02_sese_025_001_07	/		Following on from comment #2, if this message does in fact map to EIS 034, then from ISO perspective this particular use of the message seems incorrect; it is OK to send sese.025 to the offeror, who submitted the related sese.023, but it makes no sense to send an sese.025 to the participant, who has not sent an sese.023 for it to refer back to.	Craig Gray	the EIS 034 is replaced with a Corporate Action Confirmation message, or seev.036 (hold_226), which shows the removal of the units that were locked for a takeover or buyback. The sese.025 is not used in this case.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	230_001_02_sese_025_001_07	/		Further to comment #2, I cannot find a definition of the 226 message.	Craig Gray	This message was already published for the members review and feedback along with holding adjustment messages.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	230_001_02_sese_025_001_07	/HoldingBalance		Which (or will both) of Delivering & Receiving Holding Balances be provided in a message from CSP to Offeror?	Laik Tan	This will be the receiving holding balance as the offeror will be the recipient of the units in this case.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_rel3_sett	123_001_01_semt_020_001_05	/		Team, description of this messages seems confusing. sett_109 is unmatched status advice for sett_105 messages. Therefore, this should be by right a message for sett_118 rather than sett_109. Could you please clarify on the same? do we intend to use sett_123 for both 1. Cancellation of unmatched settlement instruction (sett_105) 2. Cancellation of unmatched cancellation request (sett_107)	Pradeep Pandian	sett_109 (sese.024 iso base message) is a Securities Settlement Transaction Status Advice and is used for three different purposes in CHES Replacement: a) Bilateral Settlement Instruction Unmatched Status Advice b) Bilateral Settlement Instruction Housekeeping Status Advice c) Bilateral Settlement Instruction Status Advice to Counterparty, indicating that the settlement instruction cancellation has been requested. whereas sett_118 (sese.027 ISO base message) is a Securities Transaction Cancellation Request Status Advice and is used to report the status of a sett_107. 1. Cancellation of unmatched settlement instruction (sett_105) >> The participants should use sett_107_sese_020 to request cancellation of an unmatched settlement instruction. 2. Cancellation of unmatched cancellation request (sett_107) >> Participants should send sett_118_sese_020 to request withdrawal of a unmatched cancellation request.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_301_01_01_semt_013_001_04	/		No issues with the message formatting	Wayne Murphy	Thank You
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_301_01_01_semt_013_001_04	/IntraPositionDetails/BalanceTo/QuantityBreakdown/LotNumber/Identification		This is too significant a departure from the intended use of this element—it is part of a structure for breaking down the quantity into lots. You need to find another place for lodgement id.	Craig Gray	We have removed the 'Lodgement Number' field from the collateral creation flow. On further analysis we have found that this field was used earlier during the paper lodgement process however is redundant in the current process. We have however retained this field for collateral removal workflow so that existing lodgements with specific unique lodgement numbers can be removed. As far as the field mapping goes, into the message, we understand the point however we think this is the closest field we can map in the message. The definition of 'Lot Number' is "Identification, for tax purposes, of a lot of identical securities that are bought at a certain date and at a certain price." and the lodgement number is an identification of a group of units (lot) have been pledged together". We could not find any other field in the message which precisely fits our purpose of the lodgement number and the other option will be to go with the supplementary data. Given the above, we think this is the correct mapping. We are going to try and extend the definition of the field by raising a change request to ISO 20022.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_302_01_01_semt_014_001_06	/		is this message also relevant for the EIS020?	Wayne Murphy	This message is not relevant for EIS 020. We have mapped EIS 020 to comm_809 message to convey that the process is complete as the participants were informed about the movement of units into a sub position earlier in workflow using a pldg_303_semt_015 message.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_303_01_01_semt_015_001_07	/		No issues with the message formatting	Wayne Murphy	Thank You
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_303_01_01_semt_015_001_07	/		Please confirm that this message is also sent to a participant in context of takeover/buyback, in the bid finalisation phase. If so, this means it is also the equivalent of EIS 082. However, EIS 082 is not mentioned in the top-level annotation here; hence my wanting to clarify this.	Craig Gray	Please refer to the comments above. We have changed the mapping of this message and pldg_303 will not be used in a Bid Finalisation process. We will be using evtnt_743_seev_034 message instead.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_303_01_01_semt_015_001_07	/		This usage of semt.015 seems incorrect from ISO perspective. Semt.015 is confirmation of the instruction given in the corresponding semt.013, but if the participant has never sent an semt.013 (as is the case in this workflow), how can they possibly receive a confirming semt.015?	Craig Gray	Please refer to the comments above. We have changed the mapping of this message and pldg_303 will not be used in a Bid Finalisation process. We will be using evtnt_743_seev_034 message instead.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_303_01_01_semt_015_001_07	/		Note comment # 3 above refers to use of this message in takeover/buyback workflow; it is not saying that other proposed uses are incorrect.	Craig Gray	Please refer to the comments above. We have changed the mapping of this message and pldg_303 will not be used in a Bid Finalisation process. We will be using evtnt_743_seev_034 message instead.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_303_01_01_semt_015_001_07	/		Following on from comment # 4—nevertheless, proposed receipt of multiple semt.015 in response to a single semt.013 also seems incorrect ISO usage. Could not more have been done with semt.014, to avoid this?	Craig Gray	Thank You
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_303_01_01_semt_015_001_07	/		Please ignore comment # 5; I did not look at this carefully enough before commenting.	Craig Gray	Thank You
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_303_01_01_semt_015_001_07	/AdditionalParameters/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification		Refer comment # 3 at top level. Account Owner Transaction Identifier should always be something recognisable to the account owner. The fact that the content proposed here is not something recognisable to the recipient supports the assertion that semt.015 is not being used correctly.	Craig Gray	Collateral Creation flow, the pldg_303 message is sent in two scenarios: 1) When the participant sends a pldg_301 message to create a collateral, the CSP moves the units to blocked sub position and sends a pldg_303 message. 2) In case ASX Clear rejects the collateral creation request, the CSP will move the units back to available position and send a pldg_303 message. In both these cases the 'Account owner Transaction Id' is mapped to transaction Id from semt.013 request message. Pldg_303 message has been replaced by evtnt_743 message in case of bid finalisation process for takeovers and buybacks.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_303_01_01_semt_015_001_07	/AdditionalParameters/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification		Comment # 1 here refers to use of the message takeover/buyback bid; nevertheless, there is also an issue with use of this element in collateral lodgement. I would expect Account Owner Transaction Id on semt.015 to reflect Transaction Id on the semt.023 that I sent, that this message is a response to.	Craig Gray	Collateral Creation flow, the pldg_303 message is sent in two scenarios: 1) When the participant sends a pldg_301 message to create a collateral, the CSP moves the units to blocked sub position and sends a pldg_303 message. 2) In case ASX Clear rejects the collateral creation request, the CSP will move the units back to available position and send a pldg_303 message. In both these cases the 'Account owner Transaction Id' is mapped to transaction Id from semt.013 request message.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_303_01_01_semt_015_001_07	/AdditionalParameters/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification		Replacing comment # 2. Comment # 1 here refers to use of the message in takeover/buyback bid finalisation; nevertheless, there is also an issue with use of this element in collateral lodgement. I would expect Account Owner Transaction Id on semt.015 to reflect my Transaction Id sent on my semt.013.	Craig Gray	Please refer to the comments above. We have changed the mapping of this message and pldg_303 will not be used in a Bid Finalisation process. We will be using evtnt_743_seev_034 message instead.
Aug-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_pldg	pldg_303_01_01_semt_015_001_07	/IntraPositionDetails/SecuritiesSubBalanceIdentification/Identification		When (if) this message is being used in context of takeover/buyback finalisation (part EIS 082 equivalent), what subposition type will be indicated here? Codes list contains HADM, CMCC, ETOC and AVAI; seems to be nothing about takeovers.	Craig Gray	Please refer to the comments above. We have changed the mapping of this message and pldg_303 will not be used in a Bid Finalisation process. We will be using evtnt_743_seev_034 message instead.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	130_001_03_sese_032_001_07	/	1	This comment assumes we will only receive this message when zero units are settled on the day, and there is also no mark-to-market amount on the day (there is no price movement in the market, or the transaction is not NBOB). If the assumption is wrong, we may need to revise this comment, but if it is right, then the comment stands, and all this message is doing is changing the settlement date of an existing instruction. FIRSTLY, sese.032 is not a good choice, because a settlement instruction is not being generated or created here, as implied by use of sese.023. Rather, an existing instruction is being retained, and carried over to the next day. THEN, a possible solution is simply to send no message, and to depart from existing CHES processing to the minor extent that batch settlement on any day includes transactions due to settle on or before that day—not just transactions due to settle exactly on that day. Adopting this approach, you would also not need to advise a revised settlement date on the 119 message for part settlements. ALTERNATIVELY, if you really think you must retain CHES practice of updating the settlement date, then how about stretching the definition of part settlement to include the case of zero funds and zero units, and always send us a 119; this would allow uniform processing of all cases off a single message type. BUT OVERALL, we prefer the first suggestion of not updating the settlement date, and sending no message. This eliminates unnecessary workflow, and importantly reflects internal processing (where the settlement date of a transaction is retained, even when it fails). It also avoids this proposed, strained use of sese.032.	Craig Gray	sett_130 message is sent from the CSP to the participants in number of scenarios. 1) Sub-register suspended for a security 2) If there a lock on the account 3) Scheduled batch cancellation 4) Failed Settlement - Units Shortfall / Participant Default (FSUS) This message not only confirms the rescheduled settlement date of the settlement instruction but also has additional information such as: 1) 'value of SSP adjustment' for NBOs. 2) Before the settlement instruction is rescheduled because of any of the reasons stated above, it could have part settled over multiple days. This message will give the current snapshot of the settlement instruction with additional details such as 'Remaining units awaiting settlement', 'Remaining cash awaiting settlement'.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	130_001_03_sese_032_001_07	/	2	Quick correction to comment #1; the one mention there of sese.023 was meant to be sese.032—that was a typing error.	Craig Gray	Please refer to the comment above.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	130_001_03_sese_032_001_07	/Linkages/Reference/SecuritiesSettlementTransactionIdentification	1	Please clarify. Is this simply replicating Linkages information from the original settlement instruction that is now being rescheduled by this message, or does this element have a specific, new meaning relevant to this message?	Craig Gray	This field will be populated with the settlement link Id from the original settlement instruction.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	130_001_03_sese_032_001_07	/OtherAmounts/Other/Amount	1	Please clarify relationship between this and Settlement Amount, as per same question raised on 119 message.	Craig Gray	This field on sett_130 will be populated only for NBOB and will hold the standard settlement price adjustment.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	130_001_03_sese_032_001_07	/TransactionIdentificationDetails/ProcessorTransactionIdentification	1	Considering this is a Rescheduled SI, what is the relevance of this field? will this field contain payments transaction ID for the partially settled funds? (in case of Partial settlements)?	Pradeep Pandian	Although this message relates to the rescheduled settlement instruction, in case of NBOB, this could involve the movement of funds. This field will provide the transaction Id of the net funds movement message.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	119_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/OtherAmounts/Other/Amount	1	Please clarify relationship between this SSP (mark-to-market) amount and the Settled Amount. We assume that where SSP amount is present, it is also included in Settled Amount; however please confirm exactly one way or the other.	Craig Gray	This field on sett_119 will be populated only for NBOB and will hold the standard settlement price adjustment. Settled amount field will include this field. Settled amount = Value SSP Adjustment + Value of Units Settled
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	119_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/SettledAmount/Amount	1	Is Settled amount a mandatory field? how about USSI : FOP instructions?	Pradeep Pandian	Settled amount is a mandatory field. For USSI FOP transactions, the CSP will populate this with zero amount.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	119_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/SettlementAttributes/ValueUnitsSettled/Amount	1	I can understand significance of this field in case of Participants settling an instruction on an FOP basis, however in case of Against payments, how is this value different from the Settled Amount? just for clarity purpose...	Pradeep Pandian	For settlement instructions free of payments, Settled amount = Value of Units Settled = 0 For settlement obligations against payments (BSSI, GMTD), Settled amount = Value of Units Settled For settlement obligations against payments (NBOB), Settled amount = Value of Units Settled + Value SSP Adjustment
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	119_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/SettlementAttributes/ValueUnitsSettled/Amount	2	Please clarify the role of this element vis-à-vis Settled Amount and/or Other Amount (SSP/MTM amount).	Craig Gray	For settlement instructions free of payments, Settled amount = Value of Units Settled = 0 For settlement obligations against payments (BSSI, GMTD), Settled amount = Value of Units Settled For settlement obligations against payments (NBOB), Settled amount = Value of Units Settled + Value SSP Adjustment
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	119_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/TradeDetails/SettlementDate/Date/Date	1	Refer comments #1 and #2 at top level of proposed 130 (EIS 124-equivalent) message.	Craig Gray	Please refer to the comment above.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	119_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/TransactionIdentificationDetails/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	1	Please review usage. Whenever we have sent the sese.023 to create the settlement transaction, we want Account Owner Transaction Identification on sese.025 to contain the transaction id that we used on sese.023. This currently applies to all demand transfers, issuer-sponsored transfers/conversions, and BDSI. Please make USSI and BSSI the same. NBOB and GMTD are a different story, because we have no self-generated id for them. Probably Account Owner Transaction Id should be omitted for NBOB and GMTD.	Craig Gray	We have aligned this with sett_130 message. The new rules for populating Account Owner Transaction Identification in the sett_119 should be the next: 1) For USSI, BSSI, BDSI: populated with Transaction Id of the related settlement instruction (sett.105) 2) for NBOB: populated with the transaction id of the related sett_102 netting message. 3) for GMTD: populated with with the transaction id of the sett_101 trade confirmation notification
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	119_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/TransactionIdentificationDetails/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	2	Further to comment #1 above, please also see Account Owner Transaction Identification usage on the 130 message, which is inconsistent with usage on this message, but is (correctly) consistent with usage I have said above for USSI and BSSI.	Craig Gray	Please refer to the comment above.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	119_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/TransactionIdentificationDetails/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	3	Just to clarify comments #1 and #2 (and sorry about #2, which is very unclear), I think it is enough if Account Owner Transaction Identification usage here is changed to be the same as on 130 Rescheduled Settlement Instruction, for all equivalent cases. The exception of course is BDSI, which 130 is not applicable to; what you have here for BDSI is already OK.	Craig Gray	Please refer to the comment above.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	119_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/TransactionIdentificationDetails/ProcessorTransactionIdentification	1	USSI can be Free of Payment, in which case participants will not populate settlement amount. Then what value will be populated by ASX in this field?	Pradeep Pandian	In case of USSI free of Payment settlement instruction, the CSP will calculate the net settlement amount as zero and will send Effected Net Funds Movement Notification (sett_137) message with zero amount. Thus, we will have a processor transaction Id to be populated in this message.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	119_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/TransactionIdentificationDetails/ProcessorTransactionIdentification	2	should this be a Mandatory field? Just trying to understand how it works for USSI - FOP instructions	Pradeep Pandian	Please refer to the comment above.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	134_001_02_camt_052_001_08	/	1	If EIS 186-equivalent functionality is to be combined with any other message, we would prefer it to be combined with the EIS 170-equivalent message; combining it with the EIS 150-equivalent gives us no benefit. The reason is, we use data from the 170- and 186-equivalent messages to replicate the actual debit and credit transactions applied to trust and general accounts by the payment provider. When the EIS 186 was invented, we asked for its content to be added to the EIS 170, so that we could work from a single message to work from (but to no avail). Combining EIS 150- and EIS 186-equivalent messages leaves us still having to work off two messages instead of one; therefore absolutely no benefit to us. On the other hand, if EIS 186- and 170-equivalent messages were combined, we would only need to use that one message, and this would be a benefit.	Craig Gray	1) EIS186 – Message from the CSP to the Participant to notify 'Net Trust Amount Movement'. This message has been mapped to sett_134_camt_052. Entry status code in this message is 'Information'. CSP has calculated this Net Trust Amount but has no confirmation from the payment provider that this has been actually moved. Note: draft messages released for market review has this code as 'BOOKED' which we have changed to 'INFO' in the technical documentation release. 2) EIS170 – Message from the CSP to the Participant to notify 'Effected Net Funds Movement'. Mapped to sett_137_camt_054. Entry status code used is 'BOOKED'. This is the actual funds movement and has received confirmation from the payment provider that the entries have been booked. We analysed this further with the help of SWIFT. Although the entry type options available in both the messages are same, the funds industry best market practice is to use camt.054 message for booked (confirmed) entries AND camt.052 for other unconfirmed entries. As a result we will keep the mapping unchanged.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	134_001_02_camt_052_001_08	/	2	On comment #1; sorry, misunderstood. Thought you were sending one message with both sets of data, whereas it is just a dual-purpose message. Not sure why I thought that. BUT, having made that mistake, is there any change of adding EIS 186-type data to the 170-equivalent message??	Craig Gray	Please refer to the comment above.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_01_sese_025_001_07	/	1	As noted in earlier rounds of consultation, use of sese.025 for this purpose is problematic—we are not dealing with an actual settlement transaction confirmation here, but rather a report on the net securities movement on an account, arising from one or more settlements. Therefore, rather than use sese.025 to report the movement, with balance-reconciliation detail in supplementary data, we think it would be better to use semt.002 to report the balance-reconciliation detail, with the net movement in supplementary data. This would deliver the same data, but would avoid confusing use of the settlement confirmation message for what is not in fact a settlement confirmation. had you considered this approach?	Craig Gray	ASX is doing further analysis on this and also consulting with SWIFT on the correct ISO base message per message scope. We will publish the feedback as soon as possible.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_01_sese_025_001_07	/SettlementParameters/SecuritiesTransactionType	1	Proposed use of this element highlights the poor fit of this message to the required purpose; refer comment #1 at top level.	Craig Gray	ASX is doing further analysis on this and also consulting with SWIFT on the correct ISO base message per message scope. We will publish the feedback as soon as possible.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	136_001_01_sese_025_001_07	/TransactionIdentificationDetails/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	1	Please clarify how this element will be populated. On a true settlement confirmation, this points back to the account-owner's initial instruction. That is not possible here. What will the content be?	Craig Gray	The field AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification is mapped to Transaction Id which is system generated unique transaction id
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	137_001_01_camt_054_001_08	/Notification/Entry	1	Is it possible to have a second element here, containing the trust-movement amount, and have the separate EIS 186-equivalent message done away with? This would let us replicate payment-provider transactions on the general and trust accounts off this one message, instead of having to use two messages for that calculation. This is something we asked for back when the EIS 186 was invented, but to no avail at the time; maybe this time round we can have it?? It would be a small, but very real, improvement.	Craig Gray	Please refer to the comment above.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	137_001_01_camt_054_001_08	/Notification/TransactionsSummary/TotalEntries/NumberOfEntries	1	This element is meant to contain the number of entries in the report, that is, the number of <Ntry> elements following this <TxSummary> element. It cannot be used to hold a count of the number of related transactions, as proposed here. This clearly goes against the definition of the element.	Craig Gray	ASX understands your point of view. We had given a consideration to this when designing the message. However the other alternative we have to report the 'Total Message Count' is to use 'AdditionalNotificationInformation'. The element name 'Additional Notification Information' does not make the usage of this element very obvious whereas 'TotalEntries/NumberOfEntries' at least relates to some extent to the 'total message count' we are referring to, hence this element was preferred over additional information.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	137_001_01_camt_054_001_08	/Notification/TransactionsSummary/TotalEntries/NumberOfEntries	2	Re #1, that is, the number of Entry elements following the Transactions Summary element.	Craig Gray	Please refer to the comment above.
Jul-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	129_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/	1	In the event that the instruction is being un-suspended, what message is expected to be received from CSP?	Khanh Ler	This will be covered in the future requirements.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/	1	We note that BP28 Location of Register is not present in the ISO message. Why?	Laik Tan	Our analysis suggests that this is a redundant field and not used anymore. Is there a specific reason you want ASX to include this field?
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/Additional Details	1	Believe this has to be mandatory on a conditional basis. Please clarify	Pradeep Pandian	This element is mandatory if the supplementary data is used however the supplementary data is optional. For hold.211 message, 'Registration Reference' is optional element and is not used for 'Conversion' requests.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/Additional Details/RegistrationReference	1	This should be optional field? Participants are not required to send this reference for Conversion requests?	Pradeep Pandian	Please refer to the earlier response.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	1	Why is this defined as text(1,15)? Delivering HINs are only 10 digits & SRNs only 12 in EIS and the Registration ID text(15) should be supplied in the Registration Reference element, not this one?	Laik Tan	Within the Transfers & Conversions workflows, there are 3 account identifiers used: 1. Holder Identifier Number (HIN) [10 digits] 2. Securityholder Reference Number (SRN) [12 digits] 3. Registration Identifier (RGID) [15 characters] In order to maintain consistency across all account identifiers used within the transfers & conversions workflow the maximum number of characters has been used within the messaging suite. This is to minimise impact as a result of: - Either HIN or SRN being extended from their existing lengths - Messages being used to support other workflows that have yet to be analysed
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SettlementQuantity/Quantity/Unit	1	Why is Unit Quantity now defined as td = 18, fd = 17? Is this to accommodate mFund securities? i.e. will Equities always be max 11 digits?	Laik Tan	Unit Quantity has been defined as td = 18, fd = 17 to align with the ISO datatype as well as to accommodate all security types. CSP will not restrict the Equities to be max11. We will perform the validation against the data type td = 18, fd = 17.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/ReceivingSettlementParties/Party1/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	1	Why is this defined as text(1,15)? Receiving HINs are only 10 digits & SRNs only 12 in EIS and the Registration ID text(15) should be supplied in the Registration Reference element, not this one?	Laik Tan	Within the Transfers & Conversions workflows, there are 3 account identifiers used: 1. Holder Identifier Number (HIN) [10 digits] 2. Securityholder Reference Number (SRN) [12 digits] 3. Registration Identifier (RGID) [15 characters] In order to maintain consistency across all account identifiers used within the transfers & conversions workflow the maximum number of characters has been used within the messaging suite. This is to minimise impact as a result of: - Either HIN or SRN being extended from their existing lengths - Messages being used to support other workflows that have yet to be analysed
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/TradeDetails/TradeIdentification	1	As a clearing participant, if we are to initiate a Issuer to Participant Transfer in order to settle a market obligation by the broker, then participant can populate Contract Note reference in the Participant reference field? however, unable to understand the use of Underlying reference? Additionally, why can't a participant populate Underlying reference in a Conversion request? Can we understand the rationale behind the same please?	Pradeep Pandian	Underlying reference' can be used by the participant to populate any reference information - for example name/contact of the person who initiated the request etc. CSP will not use this information for processing purposes. This information will also not be sent in the hold_216 confirmation message hence hold_216 message allows only one occurrence of 'TradeIdentification'.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/TradeDetails/TradeTransactionCondition	1	Team, Looking into the Technical documentation released on the 7th of May, this field is shown as "Settlement Transaction Condition" in the screenshot Page 22. Therefore, could you please clarify which is correct?	Pradeep Pandian	Agree. The screenshot captured in the slide does not capture the entire element tree hence it appears as if 'Settlement Transaction Condition' is a child element of 'Trade Details'. 'Trade Transaction Condition' is a child element of 'Trade Details' and will be populated with 'Override Basis of Movement'. TC pack refers to 'Settlement Transaction Condition' which is a child element of 'SettlementParameters'. This will be populated with following values: ITRP ICVP PCVI PTRI
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/	2	The UML flow indicates an Account Notification message will be sent to the Issuer 'If Zero Balance'. Presume this means there is no balance on the participant holding available to convert/transfer. The Account Notification message for the Issuer is therefore unnecessary - why send it?	Laik Tan	This is done in CHES today. It simply shows that the Holding is accurately updated to reflect the conversion / transfer to the Issuer (Registry).
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/Additional Details/RegistrationReference	2	Are participants required to populate HIN when initiating Conversions requests just because this field is mandatory in sese.023? If yes, will CHES ignore if this field contains a HIN Reference?	Pradeep Pandian	Participants are not required to populate 'Registration Reference' field for conversion requests. This field is optional and the optionality is controlled at a supplementary data level. The participants do not need to use supplementary data in case of 'Conversion' requests.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/TradeDetails/TradeTransactionCondition	2	I believe "SettlementTransactionCondition" comes under Settlement Parameters not Trade Details, however, looking at the Technical documentation, it looks bit confusing..	Pradeep Pandian	Please refer to the earlier response.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/Additional Details/RegistrationReference	3	As already communicated, we are philosophically opposed to the principle, seen here and in other messages dealing with issuer-sponsored holdings, of using temporary accounts (temporary HINs) to pass registration details between participants and issuers. We have listened carefully to all the arguments advanced in favour of using temporary accounts, and they invariably beg the question, and are therefore circular, and therefore invalid. For those arguments to hold up, you have to presuppose using temporary accounts; therefore the arguments do not prove the need for temporary accounts. The only argument that bears any weight is the concern over building highly-structured data into Supplementary Data to carry registration details. We concede that that is awkward, but participants having to manage temporary accounts in the regular flow of transaction processing is highly awkward; it does not, in fact, reflect the real business flow. The real business flow is simple. Participants have an account for the client. Participants need to pass those account details to the issuer, so that the issuer can establish a corresponding account. Creating a temporary account/HIN at CHES/CSP, just for purposes of passing the registration details, is an added, unnecessary and meaningless step from point of view of business flow, and is therefore fundamentally wrong. Whilst internally CSP may choose to re-use account structures for this purpose, this implementation choice should not be imposed unnaturally upon the end-to-end business workflow. When natural business workflow is not modelled properly, complexity always arises; this is exactly what we are seeing here. Participants are now faced with having to create and manage these temporary accounts. The more workflows in which this step is embedded the more complex things become, due to the varying shape of individual workflows. Sharing a temporary account across transactions does not necessarily help, and in the end could just make things more complicated. Not to mention, over time huge numbers of these accounts will have to be created and removed—so much overhead for no benefit. It would be far better if registration details can be passed direct in the messages, without having to create and reference a temporary account; however, see another comment by us that suggests an alternative approach altogether.	Craig Gray	We understand your point however we have designed separate messages carrying transfer details and registration details for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ISO compliance: Scope of the ISO base messages used for transfers & conversions does not include attributes to support registration details, and including registration details would deviate from the scope of the message, thus making it non ISO compliant• Re-usability: :-Streamlining the Issuer to Participant and Participant to Issuer workflows to ensure consistent details are provided from the requesting Participant regardless of the flow :- As discussed above, we seek to reuse workflows across different clearing and settlement functions (for example SRN enquiries where registration details must be provided to Issuers to perform matching) We will therefore not be able to consolidate Holder and Transaction details into a single message.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/TradeDetails/TradeTransactionCondition	3	In EIS, Override Basis of Movement occurs 5 times, why only 3 in ISO?	Laik Tan	Registries were consulted and the feedback ASX received was that there will never be more than two corporate actions on a security at the same time. However just to future proof the messages, we have allowed up to three occurrences of BOM.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	211_001_03_sese_023_001_07	/Additional Details/RegistrationReference	4	Following on from comment #3, and I hesitate to ask this, not having fully thought about all the implications, nevertheless, is it worth considering an approach that allows registration details to be created permanently? Participants could then create these details whenever an account is opened on their systems, and reference these permanently-recorded registration details in issuer-sponsored transactions. Ideally, they would also be able to reference these details when creating a HIN for that account, and this could be a significant step forward in unifying registration details. I realise there are some big implications there, and that it may be way too late in the piece to propose a change of this sort, plus there may be regulatory difficulties, but thought I should at least mention it.	Craig Gray	CSP will archive the Registration Identifier when there are no pending transactions. 1) Archiving the identifier when no outstanding transaction, ensures the participant always does a 'pre-check' including registrations details for a given transaction, instead of current CHES post checks. Leads to increased investor protection. If the identifier was never archived, and be reused then in effect, you are no longer performing a pre-check. 2) Also additional concerns/ questions would arise with regards to maintenance of said ID
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	212_001_01_sese_023_001_07	/TradeDetails/TradeTransactionCondition	1	In EIS, Override Basis of Movement occurs 5 times, why only 3 in ISO?	Laik Tan	Registries were consulted and the feedback ASX received was that there will never be more than two corporate actions on a security at the same time. However just to future proof the messages, we have allowed upto three occurrences of BOM.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	212_001_01_sese_023_001_07	/	1	BP62 Origin Transaction ID is mandatory in EIS404 & 408 but not present in this message?	Laik Tan	It is mapped in 'Counterparty Transaction Id', in the same field as the transaction id received from the participant
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	212_001_01_sese_023_001_07	/FinancialInstrumentIdentification/Description	1	Is this APIR code element only applicable for mFund securities?	Laik Tan	yes; the APIR code is only applicable for mFund
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	212_001_01_sese_023_001_07	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	1	Why is this defined as text{1,15}? Delivering HINs are only 10 digits & SRNs only 12 in EIS and the Registration ID text{15} should be supplied in the Registration Reference element, not this one?	Laik Tan	Within the Transfers & Conversions workflows, there are 3 account identifiers used: 1. Holder Identifier Number (HIN) [10 digits] 2. Securityholder Reference Number (SRN) [12 digits] 3. Registration Identifier (RGID) [15 characters] In order to maintain consistency across all account identifiers used within the transfers & conversions workflow the maximum number of characters has been used within the messaging suite. This is to minimise impact as a result of: · Either HIN or SRN being extended from their existing lengths · Messages being used to support other workflows that have yet to be analysed
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	212_001_01_sese_023_001_07	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SettlementQuantity/Quantity/Unit	1	Why is Unit Quantity now defined as td = 18, fd = 17? Is this to accommodate mFund securities? i.e. will Equities always be max 11 digits?	Laik Tan	Unit Quantity has been defined as td = 18, fd = 17 to align with the ISO datatype as well as to accommodate all security types. CSP will not restrict the Equities to be max11. ASX will perform the validation against the data type td = 18, fd = 17.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	212_001_01_sese_023_001_07	/ReceivingSettlementParties/Party1/Identification	1	Annotation states this element is not present in EIS. Isn't this the equivalent of EIS BP19 Receiving PID?	Laik Tan	Agreed. Changed annotation to reflect BP19
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	212_001_01_sese_023_001_07	/ReceivingSettlementParties/Party1/SafekeepingAccount	1	Shouldn't this be [1..1]? EIS BP16 Receiving HIN is mandatory?	Laik Tan	Agree. Schema has been changed to reflect the field as mandatory
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	212_001_01_sese_023_001_07	/ReceivingSettlementParties/Party1/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	1	Why is this defined as text{1,15}? Receiving HINs are only 10 digits in EIS and the Registration ID text{15} should be supplied in the Registration Reference element, not this one?	Laik Tan	Kindly refer to the response provided for hold_211 message.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	213_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/	1	The presentation for the 7 May Technical Committee Meeting slide 14 states that this usage guideline applies to EIS016 and EIS076 use cases, yet the usage guideline itself states that it also applies to EIS426 use case. The Issuer to Participant Conversion & Transfer UML flows indicate this message is only sent to Issuers in response to a Conversion/Transfer rejected by the Issuer. Which is right?	Laik Tan	the EIS 426 Rejection message has been mapped to the hold_213 status message. When the Issuer to Participant Transfer/conversion is effected, the CSP does not send an acknowledgement or a status but instead a confirmation to both Registry and participant
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	213_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/ProcessingStatus/Cancelled/Reason/Code/Proprietary/Identification	1	HOUS - "ASX initiated housekeeping", could you please advice us on how long ASX would wait before it cancels the transfer/conversion request as part of their house keeping process? Transfer / conversion could span across multiple days?	Pradeep Pandian	CSP will cancel all pending Issuer Sponsored to Participant Transfers and Conversions that were requested on a date that is 6 days or more before the current business date.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	213_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/ProcessingStatus/Rejected/Reason/Code/Proprietary/Identification	1	Team, couldn't find MovementRejectedReason_ASK_1 in the latest proprietary code list that I downloaded from the Technical documentation site, could you please advice me whether it is "MovementReason_ASK_1" that we need to refer?	Pradeep Pandian	Technical documentation related to 'Transfers and Conversions' has not been released yet. In the meantime, you will be able to check the code list which was attached to MyStandards Collection 'ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold'.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	213_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/TransactionIdentification/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	1	Please explain on what basis this element and the Account Servicer Transaction Identification element will be populated in a message from CSP to Issuer? Will the Account Servicer Transaction Identification always contain BP62 Origin Transaction Id so the Issuer can identify the Conversion/Transfer rejection that this message is acknowledging?	Laik Tan	Correct. When used to acknowledge a rejection received by the Issuer, the CSP will send back BP62 to not only to identify the rejection, but also to identify the original transfer/conversion request. It ties all the messages together
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/	1	We note that BP28 Location of Register is not present in the ISO message. Why?	Laik Tan	Our analysis suggests that this is a redundant field and not used anymore. Is there a specific reason you want us to include this field?
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/	1	BP62 Origin Transaction ID is mandatory in EIS404 & 408 but not present in this message?	Laik Tan	It is mapped in 'Counterparty Transaction Id', in the same field as the transaction id received from the participant
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/	1	No comments.	Laik Tan	
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/	1	The presentation for the 7 May Technical Committee Meeting slide 14 states that this usage guideline applies to EIS016 and EIS076 use cases, yet the usage guideline itself states that it also applies to EIS426 use case. The Issuer to Participant Conversion & Transfer UML flows indicate this message is only sent to Issuers in response to a Conversion/Transfer rejected by the Issuer. Which is right?	Laik Tan	ASX believes you are referring to hold_213 message. The usage guideline is correct. This message is used in 3 scenarios: 1) An update from the CSP to the sender participant acknowledging the Transfer/conversion request. (EIS016) 2) An update from the CSP to the sender participant informing that the Transfer/Conversion request has been rejected by the Issuer (EIS076) 3) An acknowledgement from CSP to the Issuer that the Transfer/Conversion rejection has been received and processed at CSP (EIS426) Note: hold_213 message does not cover the acknowledgement to the Issuer in case of Authorisation response (EIS426 Authorisation response)
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/Additional Details	1	Believe this has to be mandatory on a conditional basis. Please clarify	Pradeep Pandian	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/Additional Details /RegistrationReference	1	This should be optional field? Participants are not required to send this reference for Conversion requests?	Pradeep Pandian	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/FinancialInstrumentIdentification/Description	1	Is this APIR code element only applicable for mFund securities?	Laik Tan	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/ProcessingStatus/Cancelled/Reason/Code/Proprietary/Identification	1	HOU5 - "ASX initiated housekeeping", could you please advise us on how long ASX would wait before it cancels the transfer/conversion request as part of their house keeping process? Transfer / conversion could span across multiple days?	Pradeep Pandian	CSP will cancel all pending Issuer Sponsored to Participant Transfers and Conversions that were requested on a date that is 6 days or more before the current business date.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/ProcessingStatus/Rejected/Reason/Code/Proprietary/Identification	1	Team, couldn't find MovementRejectedReason_ASX_1 in the latest proprietary code list that I downloaded from the Technical documentation site, could you please advise me whether it is "MovementReason_ASX_1" that we need to refer?	Pradeep Pandian	Technical documentation related to 'Transfers and Conversions' has not been released yet. In the meantime, you will be able to check the code list which was attached to MyStandards Collection 'ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold'.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	1	Why is this defined as text{1,15}? Delivering HINs are only 10 digits & SRNs only 12 in EIS and the Registration ID text{15} should be supplied in the Registration Reference element, not this one?	Laik Tan	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, his could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards.. However for clarification, kindly refer to the response provided for hold_211 message.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	1	Why is this defined as text{1,15}? Delivering HINs are only 10 digits & SRNs only 12 in EIS and the Registration ID text{15} should be supplied in the Registration Reference element, not this one?	Laik Tan	This element does not apply to hold_214 message,his could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards.. However for clarification, kindly refer to the response provided for hold_211 message.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SettlementQuantity/Quantity/Unit	1	Why is Unit Quantity now defined as td = 18, fd = 17? Is this to accommodate mFund securities? i.e. will Equities always be max 11 digits?	Laik Tan	This field could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards, however just to clarify: Unit Quantity has been defined as td = 18, fd = 17 to align with the ISO datatype as well as to accommodate all security types. CSP will not restrict the Equities to be max11. We will perform the validation against the data type td = 18, fd = 17.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SettlementQuantity/Quantity/Unit	1	Why is Unit Quantity now defined as td = 18, fd = 17? Is this to accommodate mFund securities? i.e. will Equities always be max 11 digits?	Laik Tan	This field could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards, however just to clarify: Unit Quantity has been defined as td = 18, fd = 17 to align with the ISO datatype as well as to accommodate all security types. CSP will not restrict the Equities to be max11. We will perform the validation against the data type td = 18, fd = 17.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/ReceivingSettlementParties/Party1/Identification	1	Annotation states this element is not present in EIS. Isn't this the equivalent of EIS BP19 Receiving PID?	Laik Tan	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/ReceivingSettlementParties/Party1/SafekeepingAccount	1	Shouldn't this be [1..1]? EIS BP16 Receiving HIN is mandatory?	Laik Tan	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/ReceivingSettlementParties/Party1/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	1	Why is this defined as text{1,15}? Receiving HINs are only 10 digits & SRNs only 12 in EIS and the Registration ID text{15} should be supplied in the Registration Reference element, not this one?	Laik Tan	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards. However for clarification, kindly refer to the response provided for hold_211 message.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/ReceivingSettlementParties/Party1/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	1	Why is this defined as text{1,15}? Receiving HINs are only 10 digits in EIS and the Registration ID text{15} should be supplied in the Registration Reference element, not this one?	Laik Tan	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards. However for clarification, kindly refer to the response provided for hold_211 message.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/TradeDetails/TradeIdentification	1	As a clearing participant, if we are to initiate a Issuer to Participant Transfer in order to settle a market obligation by the broker, then participant can populate Contract Note reference in the Participant reference field? however, unable to understand the use of Underlying reference? Additionally, why can't a participant populate Underlying reference in a Conversion request? Can we understand the rationale behind the same please?	Pradeep Pandian	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/TradeDetails/TradeTransactionCondition	1	In EIS, Override Basis of Movement occurs 5 times, why only 3 in ISO?	Laik Tan	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/TradeDetails/TradeTransactionCondition	1	Team, Looking into the Technical documentation released on the 7th of May, this field is shown as "Settlement Transaction Condition" in the screenshot Page 22. Therefore, could you please clarify which is correct?	Pradeep Pandian	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/TransactionIdentification/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	1	Please explain on what basis this element and the Account Servicer Transaction Identification element will be populated in a message from CSP to Issuer? Will the Account Servicer Transaction Identification always contain BP62 Origin Transaction Id so the Issuer can identify the Conversion/Transfer rejection that this message is acknowledging?	Laik Tan	Correct. When used to acknowledge a rejection received by the Issuer, the CSP will send back BP62 to not only to identify the rejection, but also to identify the original transfer/conversion request. It ties all the messages together
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/	2	The UML flow indicates an Account Notification message will be sent to the Issuer 'If Zero Balance'. Presume this means there is no balance on the participant holding available to convert/transfer. The Account Notification message for the Issuer is therefore unnecessary - why send it?	Laik Tan	This is done in CHES today. It simply shows that the Holding is accurately updated to reflect the conversion / transfer to the Issuer (Registry). Note: CSP will not send the complete registration details in this message, it will have the minimum information (HIN, Reason indicating that this is a ZERO balance notification and Security Id)
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/Additional Details /RegistrationReference	2	Are participants required to populate HIN when initiating Conversions requests just because this field is mandatory in sese.023? if yes, will CHES ignore if this field contains a HIN Reference?	Pradeep Pandian	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/TradeDetails/TradeTransactionCondition	2	I believe "SettlementTransactionCondition" comes under Settlement Parameters not Trade Details, however, looking at the Technical documentation, it looks bit confusing.	Pradeep Pandian	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/Additional Details /RegistrationReference	3	As already communicated, we are philosophically opposed to the principle, seen here and in other messages dealing with issuer-sponsored holdings, of using temporary accounts (temporary HINs) to pass registration details between participants and issuers. We have listened carefully to all the arguments advanced in favour of using temporary accounts, and they invariably beg the question, and are therefore circular, and therefore invalid. For those arguments to hold up, you have to presuppose using temporary accounts; therefore the arguments do not prove the need for temporary accounts. The only argument that bears any weight is the concern over building highly-structured data into Supplementary Data to carry registration details. We concede that that is awkward, but participants having to manage temporary accounts in the regular flow of transaction processing is highly awkward; it does not, in fact, reflect the real business flow. The real business flow is simple. Participants have an account for the client. Participants need to pass those account details to the issuer, so that the issuer can establish a corresponding account. Creating a temporary account/HIN at CHES/CSP, just for purposes of passing the registration details, is an added, unnecessary and meaningless step from point of view of business flow, and is therefore fundamentally wrong. Whilst internally CSP may choose to re-use account structures for this purpose, this implementation choice should not be imposed unnaturally upon the end-to-end business workflow. When natural business workflow is not modelled properly, complexity always arises; this is exactly what we are seeing here. Participants are now faced with having to create and manage these temporary accounts. The more workflows in which this step is embedded the more complex things become, due to the varying shape of individual workflows. Sharing a temporary account across transactions does not necessarily help, and in the end could just make things more complicated. Not to mention, over time huge numbers of these accounts will have to be created and removed—so much overhead for no benefit. It would be far better if registration details can be passed direct in the messages, without having to create and reference a temporary account; however, see another comment by us that suggests an alternative approach altogether.	Craig Gray	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/TradeDetails/TradeTransactionCondition	3	In EIS, Override Basis of Movement occurs 5 times, why only 3 in ISO?	Laik Tan	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	214_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/Additional Details /RegistrationReference	4	Following on from comment #3, and I hesitate to ask this, not having fully thought about all the implications, nevertheless, is it worth considering an approach that allows registration details to be created permanently? Participants could then create these details whenever an account is opened on their systems, and reference these permanently-recorded registration details in issuer-sponsored transactions. Ideally, they would also be able to reference these details when creating a HIN for that account, and this could be a significant step forward in unifying registration details. I realise there are some big implications there, and that it may be way too late in the piece to propose a change of this sort, plus there may be regulatory difficulties, but thought I should at least mention it.	Craig Gray	This element does not apply to hold_214 message, this could be a misalignment of the comment / message in MyStandards

ASX CHESSE Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHESSE Replacement response
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	215_001_02_semt_020_001_05	/	1	Proposed use in respect of change of controlling workflows seems incorrect. In those workflows as proposed, this message (semt.020) is sent to the relinquishing participant when the requesting participant cancels a request before the relinquishing participant responds. However, the relinquishing participant has never received a message that semt.020 can validly target. Refer overall comments on the 220 message for a suggest alternative use of messages that would make this use of semt.020 valid.	Craig Gray	hold.215_semt.020 is only sent if the relinquishing participant has been notified through a hold_220
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/	1	No issues with this	Wayne Murphy	
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/AdditionalDetails/RegistrationReference	1	According to the Tech document released on the 7th of May, (page 21), its mentioned that this field will always contain either HIN reference (for conversions) or Registration ID in case of Transfers. Therefore, should the multiplicity be 1..1? will this field always contain a value?	Pradeep Pandian	Registration Reference' for hold_216 message is an optional field and will not be populated when this message is used to send Conversion confirmation to the Participant. Please refer to the slide 21 of the Technical Committee presentation.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/FinancialInstrumentIdentification	1	No issues	Wayne Murphy	
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	1	this field should contain value of the Delivering HIN or SRN, however, can't understand how this can contain Registration ID? Registration ID should be not be sent using this field? Please Comment section under Annotation.	Pradeep Pandian	This field will not be used to send the 'Registration Identifier'. We will update the usage guideline and remove the 'Registration Identifier' reference.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SettledQuantity/Quantity/Unit	1	Why is Unit Quantity now defined as td = 18, fd = 17? Is this to accommodate Mfund securities? i.e. will Equities always be max 11 digits?	Laik Tan	Unit Quantity has been defined as td = 18, fd = 17 to align with the ISO datatype as well as to accommodate all security types. CSP will not restrict the Equities to be max11. We will perform the validation against the data type td = 18, fd = 17.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/ReceivingSettlementParties/Party1/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	1	Just to confirm , this field could again contain either a Receiving SRN or HIN , however, after reasing "ASX Element definition" gives a feeling that this will only be an SRN, Could you please clarify us?	Pradeep Pandian	Agree. This field will be populated with either a HIN or SRN. We will update the 'ASX Element Definition' to indicate this.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/SupplementaryData	1	No issues	Wayne Murphy	
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/TradeDetails	1	No issues with this section	Wayne Murphy	
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/TradeDetails/TradeIdentification	1	Quick question, if participant has the option to populate both Participant and Underlying reference in a transfer request, why is this field only referring to "Participant reference" alone? What if participant only populated "UNDERLYING" reference in their transfer request hold_211?	Pradeep Pandian	Underlying reference' can be used by the participant to populate any reference information for e.g. name/contact of the person who initiated the request etc. CSP will not use this information for processing purposes. This information will also not be sent in the hold_216 confirmation message hence hold_216 message allows only one occurrence of 'TradeIdentification'.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/TradeDetails/TradeTransactionCondition/Proprietary/Identification	1	I believe the correct reference to the appropriate Proprietary code list is "OverrideBasisOfMovementCode_ASX_1?"	Pradeep Pandian	The list name 'BasisOfMovementCode_ASX_1' is correct. The codes for 'Override Basis of Movement' and 'Basis of Movement' are the same hence we have created just one data type and the external code list. However depending upon the message, different ASX Element name is used. For example hold.211 uses 'Override Basis of Movement' and hold.216 uses 'Basis of Movement'
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/TransactionIdentificationDetails	1	No issues with this section	Wayne Murphy	
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/TransactionIdentificationDetails/ProcessorTransactionIdentification	1	"Wrong Annotation? EIS BP34 is Participant Reference not Registry Reference? If this is supposed to be Registry Reference, why would there be one for a message from CSP to Registry? If this is supposed to be Participant reference, the annotation for Trade Details\Trade Identification states that this must not be supplied in this message when sent from ASX to registry, in which case this element should be [0..1]."	Laik Tan	We believe this is correct. BP 34 is also registry reference and since in this message it is mapped under 'Processor Id' it is clearly the registry reference, not the participant reference. Participant reference will always be 'trade identification' This is an optional field - if we have it it will be populated with what we have received from the registry; if not provided simply not present
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/TradeDetails/TradeTransactionCondition/Proprietary/Identification	2	In EIS, Override Basis of Movement occurs 5 times, why only 3 in ISO?	Laik Tan	Registries were consulted and the feedback ASX received was that there will never be more than two corporate actions on a security at the same time. However just to future proof the messages, we have allowed upto three occurrences of BOM.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/	2	The UML flow indicates an Account Notification message will be sent to the Issuer 'If Zero Balance'. Presume this means there is no balance on the participant holding available to convert/transfer. The Account Notification message for the Issuer is therefore unnecessary - why send it?	Laik Tan	This is done in CHESSE today. It simply shows that the Holding is accurately updated to reflect the conversion / transfer to the Issuer (Registry).
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	2	Registration ID is mentioned under comment under "ASX Element Definition"	Pradeep Pandian	Please refer to the earlier response.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/ReceivingSettlementParties/Party1/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	2	ASX Element Definition says : Unique identifier of a holding on an issuer controlled sub-registry allocated by the issuer or its registry	Pradeep Pandian	Please refer to the earlier response.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/	3	How will Registry know if this is a 426 vs a 416/418?	Laik Tan	The 426 in case of a rejection has been mapped in a sese.024. If the transfer/conversion was successfully effected, the registry receives a confirmation only (hold.216_sese.025)
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	216_001_03_sese_025_001_07	/QuantityAndAccountDetails/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	3	Why is this defined as text[1,15] if it's either SRN or HIN? The Reg ID (15 chars) should be in the Registration Reference element?	Laik Tan	Kindly refer to the response provided for hold_211 message.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	217_001_01_semt_025_001_01	/	1	Shouldn't BP21 Processing Timestamp be mapped to the Creation Date element in the BAH?	Laik Tan	Yes it can be mapped to Creation Date in the BAH. Added to the Usage Guideline
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	217_001_01_semt_025_001_01	/Additional Details/Registration_Reference	1	"For an SRN Enquiry will this contain the Reg ID? For a balance Enquiry will this contain the SRN?"	Laik Tan	When the sender of the message is inquiring about an SRN Registration ID needs to be present in order to locate the registration details. When the sender of the message fills in the SRN it means that he is inquiring about the balance on the account.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	217_001_01_semt_025_001_01	/SearchCriteria/SafekeepingAccount/Account/Identification	1	Could you kindly advice us what occasions a participant will be required to populate HIN while sending an SRN / Balance Enquiry? I believe this field will be carrying Registration ID in case of SRN/Balance enquiry?	Pradeep Pandian	The Safekeeping Account is the SecurityHolder Reference Number (SRN) and this element is optional. if <SfkpgAcct> is present then the message is a SRN Balance request; if <SfkpgAcct> is not present then the message is a SRN Enquiry. This field will not be populated with HIN or Registration Identifier.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	217_001_01_semt_025_001_01	/SupplementaryData/Envelope	1	Could you advice us on what value to be populated by participants while sending an SRN / Balance enquiry?	Pradeep Pandian	This field will be populated with either a HIN or Registration Identifier, the latter providing all registration details to identify the SRN
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	217_001_01_semt_025_001_01	/	2	Shouldn't BP49 Target Transaction Id be mapped to Related Msg ID in the BAH?	Laik Tan	hold_217 is the request so it does not contain a Target Transaction Id.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	219_001_01_semt_040_001_01	/Balances/BalanceForAccount	1	Please confirm this element (and its child elements) should only be provided if the originating request was a balance enquiry.	Laik Tan	Correct Statement. An annotation has been added to the Usage Guideline.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	219_001_01_semt_040_001_01	/Balances/BalanceForAccount/BalanceDate	1	Annotation states 'Mandatory ISO 20022 Element not present in EIS' - isn't this equivalent of BP87 Holding Balance Timestamp?	Laik Tan	Correct Statement. An annotation has been added to the Usage Guideline.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	219_001_01_semt_040_001_01	/ReportGeneralDetails/QueryReference	1	this should be the Message Identification of the hold_217 request sent by the participant to CHESSE?	Pradeep Pandian	This is correct and it is. In the ISO 20022 Messages with no 'transaction Identification' field, Message Identification has been used for that purpose. It is the case here with the semt.017 and semt.019. The Transaction Id has been mapped to Message Identification in the Request and to Query Reference in the response.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	219_001_01_semt_040_001_01	/ReportGeneralDetails/QueryReference	2	Agree that the description of this in the annotation is confusing. Will this reference the requesting 217 = semt.025?	Craig Gray	There are 2 explanations in the annotation depending on who is sending the message. It ultimately is the origin Transaction Id as sent by the Requestor.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	220_001_01_sese.023.001.07	/	1	SESE.023 is a settlement instruction , wondering if we should be using a different ISO format. No issues with the formatting of the message though.	Wayne Murphy	The message caters for a portfolio move and is the message recommended by SMPG as well.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	220_001_01_sese.023.001.07	/SettlementTypeAndAdditionalParameters/SecuritiesMovementType	1	As there are two parties to this transaction, and the initiating party is sending this message, and will be receiving securities from the other party, why is this a DELI transaction? Should it not be a RECE transaction?	Craig Gray	We have it as a convention - and ISO has it as well - that in single sided transactions, we always choose a delivery. The anomaly here is that the change of controlling participant is initiated by the new participant, not the current one. The settlement chain though clearly indicates who is delivering and who is receiving.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	220_001_01_sese.023.001.07	/	2	This is a relevant comment/question on the overall flow, seen from ISO perspective, and particularly focusing on "Participant 2" workflow as depicted in the UML diagram--there is a lack of congruence between how settlement transaction messages are used by "Participant 2" and "Participant 1" here, and in fact "Participant 2" usage here differs from all other participant-to-participant workflows defined in this project so far. Can the "Participant 2" workflow be altered to be more consistent with "Participant 1" and with all other participant-to-participant workflows defined so far, in terms of ISO message use? Could we have something like: "Participant 1" sends settlement instruction (sese.023), "Participant 2" receives settlement allocation (sese.028), "Participant 2" rejects by sending counterparty response (sese.040), or "Participant 2" accepts by sending matching settlement instruction (sese.023); status advices (sese.024) flow as appropriate, always from CSP to participant. Is there a reason why this cannot be done? The logical workflow is no different, but it makes for more consistent use of ISO messages. In fact, given that the relationship between CSP and participants is that of account servicer to account owner, is it even ISO-compliant for CSP to be sending a settlement instruction to "Participant 2", or "Participant 2" to be sending a status advice to CSP?	Craig Gray	Thank you for your comment. ASX tried to adhere to the market practice document ("book transfer") as published on smpg.info. We are not alleging a matching transaction here, but rather are looking for authorisation from the current controlling participant to allow the portfolio move. So in this particular scenario the CSP has authority from the new controlling participant to elicit permission, and as the sese.023 can be used to initiate a portfolio transfer, the CSP is only relaying the information. Participant 2 then has the possibility to reject using a status message.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	220_001_01_sese.023.001.07	/SettlementTypeAndAdditionalParameters/SecuritiesMovementType	2	In respect of comment 1, this confusion or inconsistency arises on account this exact message also being sent direct to the counterparty. Refer to our overall comments for suggested alternative use of messages that would also alleviate this anomaly.	Craig Gray	Please refer to the earlier response.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	220_001_01_sese.023.001.07	/	3	Following on from comment 3, and again looking at overall flow from ISO perspective. You have proposed using semt.020 to notify "Participant 2" of a cancelled request; however, in the workflow as drawn here, none of the valid targets of semt.020 has previously been received by "Participant 2" so this use seems invalid. Valid targets include allegation notification (sese.028) and portfolio transfer notification (sese.037). Yes, this is a portfolio transfer operation, but you are not using sese.037; therefore, it is still not valid to use semt.020 here. On the other hand, if the flow I suggested in comment 2 were adopted (sending sese.028 to "Participant 2" instead of sese.023), then semt.020 would not only be valid but would be the absolutely correct message to use here.	Craig Gray	The semt.020 message is used to inform of the cancellation of any securities message previously sent. In this scenario, the CSP has sent sese.023 message to the controlling participant and the semt.020 would only be sent following a sese.023.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	220_001_01_sese.023.001.07	/	4	I also note Wayne's comment questioning use of sese.023 as the initiating participant's request mechanism, and observe that use of this message is somewhat fudged--always a concern. However, I do not have a better suggestion.	Craig Gray	This is an ISO 20022 shortcoming. The standard allows for a portfolio move but mandates quantity for instance. We should be able to just move all units in a single message.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	221_001_01_sese.024.001.08	/ProcessingStatus	1	Clarification needed on population of Processing Status. Am I right? When used as initial response to 220, sent back to request initiator, we will get PrcgSts.AckAcptd.NoSpfdRsn = NORE. When we are the other party, and are sending this message, then we need to set PrcgSts.AckAcptd.Rsn.Cd.Prtry.Id = AUTD. Is that correct? This is a bit confusing! Please refer our overall comments on the 220 message where we propose different message usage that will avoid this confusion.	Craig Gray	Your assumptions are correct regarding the use of the message.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	221_001_01_sese.024.001.08	/ProcessingStatus	2	Comment 1 covers only two uses of this message. Am I right? We also have (3) rejection response sent, and also (4) same received by initiating party-- both will have PrcgSts.Rjctd.Rsn.Cd.Prtry.Id = rejection reason? And also (5) immediate response back to accepting/rejecting party--not clear what will be in the message in this case. Yes, this is very confusing. Please seriously consider the alternative flow suggested in our overall comments on 220 message, but also clarify proposed message content in all these different cases.	Craig Gray	<p>Status 1 (from CSP to Part 1) Acknowledged/Accepted with NORE (No reason) is used to indicate - that the Request to change the Controlling Participant has been accepted by the CSP and will be sent to the current controlling participant;</p> <p>Status 2 (from Part 2 to CSP) Acknowledged/Accepted/Proprietary/AUTH (authorised) is used to indicate - that the Request to change the Controlling Participant has been authorized by the 'old' controlling participant.</p> <p>Status 3 (from Part 2 to CSP then relayed to Part.1) Rejected/ReasonCode/Proprietary is used to indicate - that the request has been rejected by the current controlling participant and the reason for rejection, then passed back to Part 1)</p> <p>Status 4 (from CSP to Part1) Cancelled/ReasonCode/Proprietary is used to indicate - that the request has been cancelled by the new controlling participant and the reason for cancellation</p>
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	222_001_01_sese.025.001.07	/	1	In reference to flow described in UML document, receipt of sese.025 by "Participant 1" is fine but seems anomalous when received by "Participant 2" who has never sent an sese.023 in the first place. Refer alternative flow suggested in overall comments on 220 message, which would resolve this anomaly.	Craig Gray	Granted that Participant 2 has received and not sent a Request from the CSP in the form of a sese.023; but if the transfer was authorised by him, he also needs to know when the transfer has been completed. The right message is the confirmation
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	223_001_01_sese.020.001.05	/	1	No issues with the formatting	Wayne Murphy	
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	226_001_01_seev_036_001_10	/CorporateActionGeneralInformation/CorporateActionEventIdentification	1	How and when will the market be notified of this Corporate Action Event ID? Will this be via Reference Point?	Laik Tan	If the registry is a subscriber to ReferencePoint, this will be notified via ReferencePoint.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	226_001_01_seev_036_001_10	/AccountDetails/Balance/ConfirmedBalance/Balance/QuantityChoice/Quantity/Unit	1	If the 'From' balance means the 'pre-adjustment' balance, the registry will not have the accurate intra-day position, so question the worth of this element. Could this be changed instead to a fixed value?	Laik Tan	This element is a mandatory element in the message. CSP will not perform any business validations on this element and will not be used during processing. The data type of this element is 'Decimal Number' hence we can put a fixed value like 'NONREF' in the element. The fixed value has to be a number and putting a number for e.g. '0' will be misleading.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	226_001_01_seev_036_001_10	/CorporateActionConfirmationDetails/SecuritiesMovementDetails/DateDetails/PostingDate/Date	1	Can the posting date be back/forward dated? If so, would this date be the date printed on CHES holding statements for the transaction?	Laik Tan	This element is a mandatory element in the message. CSP will not perform any business validations on this element and will not be used during processing. When the CSP sends this message to the participant confirming the Holding Adjustment, this field will be populated with the current business date.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	226_001_01_seev_036_001_10	/CorporateActionConfirmationDetails/SecuritiesMovementDetails/PostingQuantity/Quantity/Unit	1	As per our comments on Conversions/Transfers/SRN Enquiries, has the unit definition been expanded from 11 to 18 digits to cater for mFund securities? Will equities still be max 11 digits?	Laik Tan	Unit Quantity has been defined as td = 18, fd = 17 to align with the ISO datatype as well as to accommodate all security types. CSP will not restrict the Equities to be max11. We will perform the validation against the data type td = 18, fd = 17.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	226_001_01_seev_036_001_10	/CorporateActionGeneralInformation/Event/Code	1	The majority of the EIS BP33 Reason codes don't have an equivalent code in this element definition. Please provide a table that cross-references each EIS code to an ISO code, or explain why there is no equivalent ISO code.	Laik Tan	The Reason codes have been moved from the ISO code list in the message to ASX proprietary code list. We have tried to map the existing reason codes to the ISO codes as much as possible. Please refer to ASX proprietary Code list 'HoldingAdjustmentReason_ASX_1'.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	226_001_01_seev_036_001_10	/CorporateActionGeneralInformation/FinancialInstrumentIdentification/Description	1	Please confirm APIR codes are only applicable for mFund securities?	Laik Tan	Correct. The APIR code is only applicable for mFund.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	226_001_01_seev_036_001_10	/CorporateActionGeneralInformation/Event/Code	2	Why are the Holding Adjustment Reason Codes maintained within the Usage Guideline, when the same element in the hold_228 has the codes managed through the external code list HoldingAdjustmentReason_ASX_1? Furthermore, the codes WDLW, WRLW & WUXW listed in the HoldingAdjustmentReason_ASX_1 external code list are NOT listed as valid codes in this UG. Why the discrepancy???	Laik Tan	The Reason codes have been moved from the ISO code list in the message to ASX proprietary code list. We have tried to map the existing reason codes to the ISO codes as much as possible. Please refer to ASX proprietary Code list 'HoldingAdjustmentReason_ASX_1'. The ASX proprietary code list includes warrants related codes.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	227_001_01_admi.007.001.01	/	1	No comments	Laik Tan	
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	228_001_01_semt.002.001.10	/BalanceForAccount/BalanceBreakdown/SubBalanceAdditionalDetails	1	Please confirm for a Takeover Acceptance, this element will be populated with the 6 character Takeover code allocated by ASX to uniquely identify a takeover or equal access buyback.	Laik Tan	This will be the six character takeover acceptance code as assigned today by ASX. There is no intention to change it. Takeover functionality is still under analysis however the message supports upto max 35 char.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	228_001_01_semt.002.001.10	/BalanceForAccount	1	Shouldn't this be [1..1]? The child elements are mapped to mandatory EIS fields?	Laik Tan	Agree, this should be mandatory. We have made this change in the schema.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	228_001_01_semt.002.001.10	/BalanceForAccount/BalanceBreakdown	1	Shouldn't this be [1..1]? The child elements are mapped to mandatory EIS fields?	Laik Tan	Agree, this should be mandatory. We have made this change in the schema.
Jun-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	228_001_01_semt.002.001.10	/BalanceForAccount/BalanceBreakdown/SubBalanceType/Proprietary/Identification	1	What are the valid Subposition Type Codes? Haven't seen an external code list published for SubpositionType_ASX_1?	Laik Tan	ASX proprietary code list has been published as an attachment now.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/	1	Annotation should include note that this also covers the EIS220 and EIS512 messages.	Laik Tan	EIS 220 has been descoped, authorisation is not required by ASX Ops for Registration Details.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/AccountParties/OtherParty	1	Shouldn't this be [1..1]?	Laik Tan	Other Parties is not populated in all scenarios where registration details are provided. In some scenarios (such as zero holding balance notification to Registry), acct.002 message will have minimum information i.e. will not have elements inside 'Other Party', hence this has been designed as optional.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/AccountParties/OtherParty/OtherPartyDetails/PrimaryCommunicationAddress/Email	1	Why is this defined as text[1,256] when FS and previous account message UG's define it as text[1,318]? Also, EIS512 has an Email Cancellation element - how do we know to delete an email address in this message?	Laik Tan	The data type of element 'Email' in ISO base message acct.001/002/003 is Max256Text. The ISO base messages used in earlier approach (reda.018) had a length of 318 hence the change. As mentioned in the TC, the Functional Specifications and Technical documentation has not been updated. This will be updated in the later release of Technical documentation. The Usage guidelines were released for early review and feedback from the participants following the Technical Committee meeting. acct_002 message will provide the latest snapshot of the information on the account. For acct_003 message, if the CSP receives the account modification request with modification action Delete and email address mentioned the CSP will delete the email address associated with the account/holder.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/AccountParties/PrincipalAccountParty/PrimaryOwner/AdditionalInformation/AdditionalInformation	1	HolderAccountUpdateReason_ASX_1 code list does not exist in the published CDE2 ASX proprietary code list?	Laik Tan	As mentioned in the Technical Committee, the Functional Specifications and Technical documentation has not yet been updated. This will be updated in the later release of Technical documentation. The Usage guidelines were released for early review and feedback from the participants following the Technical Committee meeting. ASX proprietary code list will be attached to the collection when ASX publishes next set of message UGs for review.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/AccountParties/PrincipalAccountParty/PrimaryOwner/AdditionalInformation/Status/Proprietary/Identification	1	HolderAccountUpdateReason_ASX_1 code list does not exist in the published CDE2 ASX proprietary code list?	Laik Tan	As mentioned in the Technical Committee, the Functional Specifications and Technical documentation has not yet been updated. This will be updated in the later release of Technical documentation. The Usage guidelines were released for early review and feedback from the participants following the Technical Committee meeting. ASX proprietary code list will be attached to the collection when ASX publishes next set of message UGs for review.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/AccountParties/PrincipalAccountParty/PrimaryOwner/AdditionalInformation/Status/Proprietary/Identification	2	Sorry, the previous comment on this element relates to the HolderAccountStatus_ASX_1 code list.	Laik Tan	As mentioned in the Technical Committee, the Functional Specifications and Technical documentation has not yet been updated. This will be updated in the later release of Technical documentation. The Usage guidelines were released for early review and feedback from the participants following the Technical Committee meeting. ASX proprietary code list will be attached to the collection when ASX publishes next set of message UGs for review.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/AccountParties/PrincipalAccountParty/PrimaryOwner/Party/IndividualPerson/NamePrefix/Proprietary/Identification	1	What value should be provided if the Individual is not deceased?	Laik Tan	'Name Prefix' is an optional element and will not be used if the Individual is not deceased.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/AccountParties/PrincipalAccountParty/PrimaryOwner/Party/IndividualPerson/PostalAddress	1	Why is this mandatory when the Postal Address element for Company type Holders is optional? This is unnecessary if the Holder address is not provided?	Laik Tan	'Postal Address' is mandatory for 'Individual Person' in ISO base message acct.002. When the Holder address is not provided, 'Country code' is the only field that will be provided (as this is mandatory in ISO base message). This will be populated with dummy value 'ZZ'
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/AccountParties/PrincipalAccountParty/PrimaryOwner/Party/IndividualPerson/PostalAddress/Country	1	Why is this mandatory? This is unnecessary if the Holder address is not provided?	Laik Tan	'Postal Address' is mandatory for 'Individual Person' in ISO base message acct.002. When the Holder address is not provided, 'Country code' is the only field that will be provided (as this is mandatory in ISO base message). This will be populated with dummy value 'ZZ'
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/AccountParties/PrincipalAccountParty/PrimaryOwner/Party/Organisation/PostalAddress/Country	1	Why is this mandatory? This is unnecessary if the Holder address is not provided? Also missing the annotation about 'ZZ' if address is not supplied.	Laik Tan	If the holder address for 'Organisation' is not provided, the entire 'Postal Address' block can be excluded as this is optional in the message. Hence country code 'ZZ' is not required here.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/ConfirmationDetails/ConfirmationType/Proprietary/Identification	1	NotificationReason_ASX_1 code list does not exist in the published CDE2 ASX proprietary code list?	Laik Tan	As mentioned in the Technical Committee, the Functional Specifications and Technical documentation has not yet been updated. This will be updated in the later release of Technical documentation. The Usage guidelines were released for early review and feedback from the participants following the Technical Committee meeting. ASX proprietary code list will be attached to the collection when ASX publishes next set of message UGs for review.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/Extension	1	Please confirm the Mailing Addressee Line will always be populated when this message is sent to Registry.	Laik Tan	'Mailing Addressee Line' will not always be provided. For example, when an account holding has decreased to a zero holding position, CSP will send minimum information to the issuer including Notification Reason, Security Code, Account Identification.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/InvestmentAccount/AccountStatus/Enabled/Reason/Code/Proprietary/Identification	1	HolderAccountUpdateReason_ASX_1 code list does not exist in the published CDE2 ASX proprietary code list?	Laik Tan	As mentioned in the Technical Committee, the Functional Specifications and Technical documentation has not yet been updated. This will be updated in the later release of Technical documentation. The Usage guidelines were released for early review and feedback from the participants following the Technical Committee meeting. ASX proprietary code list will be attached to the collection when ASX publishes next set of message UGs for review.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/InvestmentAccount/AccountStatus/Other/Reason/Identification	1	HolderAccountUpdateReason_ASX_1 code list does not exist in the published CDE2 ASX proprietary code list?	Laik Tan	As mentioned in the Technical Committee, the Functional Specifications and Technical documentation has not yet been updated. This will be updated in the later release of Technical documentation. The Usage guidelines were released for early review and feedback from the participants following the Technical Committee meeting. ASX proprietary code list will be attached to the collection when ASX publishes next set of message UGs for review.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/InvestmentAccount/AccountStatus/Other/Status/Identification	1	HolderAccountStatus_ASX_1 code list does not exist in the published CDE2 ASX proprietary code list?	Laik Tan	As mentioned in the Technical Committee, the Functional Specifications and Technical documentation has not yet been updated. This will be updated in the later release of Technical documentation. The Usage guidelines were released for early review and feedback from the participants following the Technical Committee meeting. ASX proprietary code list will be attached to the collection when ASX publishes next set of message UGs for review.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/InvestmentAccount/Designation	1	Missing annotation to change type/code to text{1,80}.	Laik Tan	ISO base message acmt.002 has designation as Max35Text. We have changed the designation to Max35Text as a result type change is not applicable here. Functional specifications will be updated.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_002_001_05_acmt.002.001.07	/RelatedReference/Reference	1	Annotation says this is equivalent of EIS BP 48 Transaction ID. Shouldn't this be BP 62 Origin Transaction ID?	Laik Tan	Agree. This will be updated in the next version.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_003_001_04_acmt.003.001.07	/	1	Why doesn't the Account Modification Request have Taxation Country & Taxation Identification Number elements like the Account Creation Request does?	Laik Tan	Taxation Country & Taxation Identification Number fields can be populated only when the participant wishes to create a 'Registration Identifier' type of account. 'Registration Identifier' accounts are temporary in nature to facilitate other functions such as 'Transfer and Conversions'. Modification of data associated with these accounts will not be allowed.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_003_001_04_acmt.003.001.07	/	2	Wrong annotation - This is equivalent of EIS203, not EIS202.	Laik Tan	Agree. This will be updated in the next version.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_003_001_04_acmt.003.001.07	/ModifiedAccountParties/OtherParty/OtherPartyDetails/PrimaryCommunicationAddress/Email	1	Why is this defined as text{1,256} when FS defines it as text{1,318}. Also, EIS203 has an Email Cancellation element - how do we tell CSP to delete an email address in this message?	Laik Tan	The data type of element 'Email' in ISO base message acct.001/002/003 is Max256Text. The ISO base messages used in earlier approach (reda.014) had a length of 318 hence the change. As mentioned in the Technical Committee, the Functional Specifications and Technical documentation has not yet been updated. This will be updated in the later release of Technical documentation. The Usage guidelines were released for early review and feedback from the participants following the Technical Committee meeting. Delete email address can be specified using 'Modification Scope Indication' as 'Delete Data Set' and populating email address under OtherParty/OtherPartyDetails/PrimaryCommunicationAddress/Email. Note: Where an Account Sponsor role requires to update or remove an attribute for an account (i.e. Address, Communication Preferences, Email, Mobile Number, Residency Indicator), the account name is a mandatory element. The Account Sponsor role is to populate 'NONREF' into the account name XML tag (OtherPartyDetails/Party/Organisation/Name).
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_003_001_04_acmt.003.001.07	/ModifiedInvestmentAccount/AccountStatusUpdateInstruction/UpdateInstruction/Proprietary/Identification	1	Is there a version of the proprietary code list available that contains the allowable values of HolderAccountStatus_ASX_1? A similar comment applies to some other fields in this set of messages.	Craig Gray	As mentioned in the Technical Committee, the Functional Specifications and Technical documentation has not yet been updated. This will be updated in the later release of Technical documentation. The Usage guidelines were released for early review and feedback from the participants following the Technical Committee meeting. ASX proprietary code list will be attached to the collection when ASX publishes next set of message UGs for review.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_003_001_04_acmt.003.001.07	/ModifiedInvestmentAccount/AccountStatusUpdateInstruction/UpdateInstruction/Proprietary/Identification	2	HolderAccountStatus_ASX_1 Code list does not exist in published CDE2 ASX Proprietary Code List?	Laik Tan	As mentioned in the Technical Committee, the Functional Specifications and Technical documentation has not yet been updated. This will be updated in the later release of Technical documentation. The Usage guidelines were released for early review and feedback from the participants following the Technical Committee meeting. ASX proprietary code list will be attached to the collection when ASX publishes next set of message UGs for review.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_003_001_04_acmt.003.001.07	/ModifiedInvestmentAccount/Designation	1	Missing annotation to change type/code to text{1,80}. What if an Account Designation was actually REMOVE? How would you differentiate between modifying as REMOVE or deleting?	Laik Tan	ISO base message acmt.003 has designation as Max35Text. We have changed the designation to Max35Text as a result type change is not applicable here. Functional Specification will be updated. Based on our analysis, the account designation of "REMOVE" doesn't exist. The purpose of the designation is to provide additional information about the account, for example " Domestic Trading Account".
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_001_001_06_acmt.001.001.07	/	1	This comment applies to acct_001, acct_002 & acct_003 UG's. They seem a bit complicated having different element nodes for Single vs Joint Holders and further more, Company vs Individual? Could this be simplified to have a single element node but have attributes to define if the holder is company/individual etc.?	Laik Tan	Fully understand the point you are making however the ISO base message requires the data to be populated in the structured way. Secondly, some elements inside the base message are specific to the type of holder we are referring to. For example 'LegalEntityIdentifier' and 'RegistrationDate' are present only under 'Organisation' 'BirthDate' is present only under 'IndividualPerson'. Populating the data in a structured way makes all 3 messages identical and easier from implementation perspective.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_001_001_06_acmt.001.001.07	/AccountParties/OtherParty/OtherPartyDetails/Party/Organisation/Name	1	Previously, ASX advised that CSP will be responsible for creating the Account Name by concatenating all holder names with [space] [plus] [space]. Has this changed? If this is still the case, then this element should be removed.	Laik Tan	This is still the case for all account types except 'Registration Identifier'. In case of 'Registration Identifier', participants must supply 'Account Name' hence this element is optional in the message.
May-19	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_acct	acct_001_001_06_acmt.001.001.07	/AccountParties/OtherParty/OtherPartyDetails/PrimaryCommunicationAddress/Email	1	Why is this defined as text{1,256} when FS and previous account messages define it as text{1,318}	Laik Tan	The data type of element 'Email' in ISO base message acct.001/002/003 is Max256Text. The ISO base messages used in earlier approach had a length of 318 hence the change. As mentioned in the TC, the Functional Specifications and Technical documentation has not yet been updated. This will be updated in the later release of Technical documentation. The Usage guidelines were released for early review and feedback from the participants following the Technical Committee meeting.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	105_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/Linkages	1	Our understanding is that the objective here is to link incoming and outgoing scheduled bilateral transactions; however, there is nothing in these guidelines that clearly expresses this very specific reason for linking the transactions. The purpose needs to be more explicit, or the ability to use Linkages for other purposes in the future may be compromised. More work needs to be done on this. Perhaps use before/after Processing Position, with the other transaction directly referenced via Reference / Securities Settlement Transaction Identification.	Craig Gray	Thank you for raising this. The usage of the linkage will be described in the New Settlement Procedure Guideline not in the usage guideline. ASX was intending to add Processing Position- Code: With. However, "with" element has a mandatory LinkageRule* that does not reflect the ASX model. Processing Position is option then ASX remove this element. * linkageRule: If Code WITH is used, then the one or more instruction which are linked become bound and must be executed together. Even if one single transactions/instructions/notifications cannot be executed, then all the other transactions/instructions/notifications must also be kept pending. Therefore, the use of code WITH must be limited to combine up to 2 or 3 transactions/instructions/notifications.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	105_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/Linkages/ProcessingPosition	1	This element should be reinstated, even if with restricted values, so that there is some explicit indication in the message of why the transactions are being linked. Refer comment on Linkages element. This also needs to be addressed in 106_001_02_sese_024_001_08.	Craig Gray	Please, refer response above.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	105_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/Linkages/Reference/SecuritiesSettlementTransactionIdentification	1	ASX annotation describes this as "common for each linked message," which sounds like we are linking a set of messages via a common identifier supplied here. If that is the case, then I think you should be using Pool Identification, not Securities Settlement Transaction Identification. Pool Identification is defined by ISO as a "collective reference identifying a set of messages," which sounds like what we are talking about here. On the other hand, Securities Settlement Transaction Identification is defined by ISO as an "unambiguous identification of a securities settlement transaction as known by the account owner," in other words, the identifier of a specific settlement transaction, and that does not sound like what we are talking about here. This also needs to be addressed in 106_001_02_sese_024_001_08. However, refer suggestion in comment on Linkages element. If that were adopted, then using Securities Settlement Transaction Identification would be correct.	Craig Gray	Thank you for raising this. ASX agrees that Pool Identification would be a better mapping. However, this element is inconsistent in the ISO 20022 messages. The request message (sese.023) has Pool Identification, but the response sese.024 or sese.025 does not. The Securities Settlement Transaction Identification was the only element found across all messages.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	105_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/SettlementParameters/HoldIndicator	1	In the event that holding had been successfully locked in the Delivering HIN, can you please confirm whether an unsolicited message will be sent to the Controlling Participant to notify the new Blocked and Available balances?	Khanh Ler	ASX will consider to inform the balances in the report.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	105_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/SettlementParameters/HoldIndicator	2	This indicator is normally used to place the settlement transaction itself on hold. Using it instead to influence locking of the securities that are the subject of that transaction is quite confusing if not invalid. Refer also comment # 1 here, and the comments at 106_001_02_sese_024_001_08 / Processing Status / Proprietary / Proprietary Status, and variously on 115_001_01_semt_013_001_04 and 116_001_01_semt_015_001_06, which suggest some further thought needs to be given to this locking mechanism.	Craig Gray	Agreed- The mapping was changed from: Holder Indicator to: Settlement Transaction Condition.

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	105_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/SettlementParameters/SettlementTransactionCondition/Proprietary/identification	1	<p>Notwithstanding the response from ASX to our comment on introducing Settlement Transaction Conditions UDTR, UDRP and BDTR on 201_001_02_sese_023_001_07, we are still not convinced of the need for these, and equally the need for USSI and BSSI here, especially when all these codes are peculiar to ASX. If it is to control workflow, to invoke unilateral versus bilateral processing (reference ASX response on 201_001_02_sese_023_001_07), then surely this can be decided just by checking whether the delivering and receiving parties are the same or different.</p> <p>We are very happy to see EIS101, EIS105 and EIS107 being consolidated into one message, and also EIS001, EIS003 and EIS005 being consolidated, but adding these transaction conditions undoes a lot of that good work, by effectively splitting most of them back out again into separate cases. And you could have taken this further, and consolidated them all.</p> <p>There is an important principle here. You mention invoking the correct workflow in your reply to our comment on 201_001_02_sese_023_001_07, but it looks like what you are talking about is ASX's internal workflow (whether counterparty matching is required or not, whether an allegation workflow needs to be invoked or not). We are not sure that the participant should have to care about that, or should have to supply ASX-invented message codes or condition codes that hint at internal workflow differences, or maybe are just there in an attempt to preserve the structure of CHES. For the participant, all settlement instructions arguably have the exact-same ISO workflow, and potentially can be processed uniformly. There is no difference whether they are unilateral or bilateral, or demand or scheduled: (1) the participant sends the instruction, (2) ASX sends one or more status updates if needed (unmatched, matched, scheduled, etc.), and finally (3) ASX sends the confirmation; it is very simple.</p> <p>Please also refer to our emails of 11 and 22 October.</p>	Craig Gray	Thank you for raising this. ASX had meetings with other Vendors and Participants related to Settlement Transaction Condition Codes. It was raised that Settlement Transaction Condition is a key element to build their system, also mitigate the chance of error (double control).
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	105_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/SettlementTypeAndAdditionalParameters/CommonIdentification	1	Please review our comment made on 201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 / Settlement Type And Additional Parameters / Common Identification, which is equally applicable here. We are not convinced this necessarily implies mandatory matching at Supplementary Reference level (refer ASX's response to our comment). Quoting the counterparty's Safekeeping Account would be optional, so it would only be used for matching if supplied. We still think this suggestion is worth considering.	Craig Gray	Thanks Craig. In its current form, the Supplementary Reference field is free form and it appears that some participants could be populating this field with what appears to be a HIN or a Contract Number or any other value. ASX does not mandate the use of only the HIN so that is why "Safekeeping Account" was not the ISO element selected for mapping. It can be acknowledged that broader agreement maybe required so ASX will discuss internally and determine the necessary action.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	105_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/TradeDetails/InvestorCapacity	1	<p>Notwithstanding ASX response to equivalent comment made on 201_001_02_sese_023_001_07, we still think that the foreign-guaranteed condition is better implemented as a Trade Transaction Condition, rather than as Investor Capacity. It should not matter that Trade Transaction Conditions are also being used for Basis of Movement (reference ASX response to our comment on 201_001_02_sese_023_001_07); we could simply add the code for foreign guaranteed along with the others (the standard ISO Trade Transaction Condition codes cover other sorts of conditions than Basis of Movement, so surely we can follow that precedent).</p> <p>The arguments we made in our comment on 201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 still stand; in summary: (1) the foreign-guaranteed condition fundamentally has nothing to do with Investor Capacity (if SWIFT recommended this, I can only guess they did not understand what foreign-guaranteed does), and (2) Trade Transaction Conditions have the benefit of flowing straight through to allegations without having to be diverted via Supplementary Data.</p> <p>But the strongest argument is that, in practice, basis of movement and foreign-guaranteed are used in the same way, to control delivery of the correct stock; to ensure, for example, that an investor who purchased cum-dividend stock gets cum-dividend stock, or one who purchased foreign-guaranteed stock gets foreign-guaranteed stock. They therefore belong together quite naturally, and are functionally equivalent.</p> <p>This change would also have to be reflected in 110_001_01_sese_028_001_06 / Trade Details / Trade Transaction Condition, and 110_001_01_sese_028_001_06 / Supplementary Data / Trade Additional Details / Investor Capacity could be removed.</p>	Craig Gray	Thank you for your input. We did consider your suggestion however 'Trade Transaction Condition' is an optional element with exact 4 char length. We have mapped 'Override Basis of Movement' to this element. 'Guaranteed Foreign Indicator' is also an optional indicator. If we have to map 'Guaranteed Foreign Indicator' to 'Trade Transaction Condition', we will have to add some kind of a qualifier to distinguish between 'Override Basis of Movement' and 'Guaranteed Foreign Indicator'. Adding a qualifier here will not be possible because exact 4 char length of the ISO element. In absence of a qualifier, we can't even enforce the order in which the elements need to be populated because both the elements are optional in nature. Hence we believe the current mapping fits the purpose and should stay as it is.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	105_001_02_sese_023_001_07	/TradeDetails/TradeDate	1	If Trade Date is populated on a "unilateral" transaction, will the transaction be rejected, or will Trade Date just be ignored? Is there a strong reason for disallowing Trade Date on unilateral messages (stronger than the simple fact that EIS105 and EIS107 did not contain Trade Date)? We fully support consolidating messages, but to maximise the benefit of that you need to unify the processing as much as possible.	Craig Gray	The Transaction will be rejected.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	106_001_02_sese_024_001_08	/	1	The UML diagrams should label this message consistently, perhaps "Status Advice – Settlement Scheduled" or something like that. Labelling the bilateral case "Confirmation – Bilateral Settlement Instruction" is particularly confusing because it makes it sound at first like it is a settlement confirmation.	Craig Gray	Thank you. All the umls will be revisited and published in the December release.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	106_001_02_sese_024_001_08	/MatchingStatus	1	Because the participant may previously have received a.sese.024 with "Unmatched" Matching Status (109_001_01_sese_024_001_08), it would make sense for this subsequent sese.024 to explicitly show "Matched" Matching Status in addition to "Pending" Settlement Status (at very least in the case of a bilateral instruction).	Craig Gray	Thank you for raising this. Same message is used in Unilateral and Bilateral Instruction to maximise the benefit of consolidation, when the instruction is matched, the status will be Scheduled in both scenario.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	106_001_02_sese_024_001_08	/ProcessingStatus/Proprietary/ProprietaryStatus	1	Not clear what is the point of reporting "Not Locked" status here, unless there are to be subsequent status updates that report a changed status. There is no evidence of subsequent updates in what we have been presented so far, unless I have missed it (please let me know).	Craig Gray	The Participant will be able to lock securities in 2 phases: 1. Applying a 'Securities Lock' on the holding within the Delivering HIN when a Settlement Lock is requested in the existing settlement instruction message sett.105. 2. Allow 'SecuritiesLock' on the holding within the Delivering HIN via a separate holding lock message request (hold.215) after a settlement instruction has been received where the original instruction did not have a lock associated to it. For securities lock during Settlement Instruction (sett.105), It allow for the choice of applying a 'securities lock' within the Delivering HIN upon request/matching for the Bilateral Settlement Instruction. In case of Unmatched Settlement Instruction, If the units are not available, ASX will reject the transaction (comm.808). In case of Matched Settlement Instruction, If the units are not available, ASX will not reject the transaction, sett.106 (Settlement Instruction Response) will be sent with the Processing Status> Proprietary Status> Lock or No Lock and Settlement Status> Scheduled.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	106_001_02_sese_024_001_08	/ProcessingStatus/Proprietary/ProprietaryStatus	2	Following on from the previous comment, having thought a bit more about it, the Processing Status of the settlement transaction is not the right place to keep track of the lock status of the securities that are to be delivered via that transaction, if that is what you are trying to do here. A bit more thought is called for, I think.	Craig Gray	Please, refer response Proprietary Satus # 1 Processing Status was mapped in a Proprietary Code.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	107_001_02_sese_020_001_05	/	1	No issues with or questions about this message.	Craig Gray	Noted
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	107_001_02_sese_020_001_05	/	2	Could please explain the comment "The message may also be used to: - re-send a message previously sent."?	Suresh Chinnappa	Could you please clarify the questions.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	107_001_02_sese_020_001_05	/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	1	No issues with or questions about this message.	Craig Gray	Noted
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	107_001_02_sese_020_001_05	/SafekeepingAccount/Identification	2	IGNORE COMMENT #1. It was posted in the wrong place.	Craig Gray	Noted
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	115_001_01_semt_013_001_04	/	1	We have made several comments on this message and on 116_001_01_semt_015_001_06, but admit we may not fully understand the intended use.	Craig Gray	Please, refer response sett.106 /ProcessingStatus/Proprietary/ProprietaryStatus #1
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	115_001_01_semt_013_001_04	/	2	We notice there seems to be no use of semt.014 Intra Position Movement Status Advice in this workflow. Will there be no requirement for this, perhaps in rejection handling?	Craig Gray	The rejection will be with comm.808 (Rejected Transaction)
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	115_001_01_semt_013_001_04	/IntraPositionDetails/SettlementDate	1	Proposed use is incorrect under ISO. This is the date on which the intra-position movement is to take place. If you are trying to lock securities for settlement, you want that to happen now, not on the settlement date of the settlement transaction. Perhaps use a proprietary date code to indicate immediate settlement is required.	Craig Gray	Agreed- Changed for New Data Requirement (Request date)
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	115_001_01_semt_013_001_04	/Linkages	1	Linkages could be reinstated to facilitate linking the Intra Position Movement Instruction to the corresponding settlement instruction. A proprietary Processing Position code might be needed to make the reason for linking explicit.	Craig Gray	Agreed. Added linkage to map Target Transaction id.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	115_001_01_semt_013_001_04	/TransactionIdentification	1	Proposed use is incorrect under ISO. This should be a new transaction identification, identifying this Intra Position Movement Instruction. It is not meant to be a reference to a settlement transaction. Another way of identifying the settlement transaction should be found, possibly via Linkages.	Craig Gray	Agree. Mapping changed.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	116_001_01_semt_015_001_06	/	1	<p>A few comments from an Issuer/Registry perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will issuers have visibility of these locks (both administrative and settlement)? - Settlement locks could be in place for 2 days (from trade through to settlement) and the volume could be far greater than the current use of subpositions – until we have examined the impact on the issuer's ability to apply corporate actions to locked holdings we cannot be satisfied with the design and process flow of this message. - Administrative locks could be in place for an extended period (this is the case in current CHES?) 	Laik Tan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administrative locks will be notified to the Issuer/registry via the hold_205 and currently the Settlement Locks will not be notified to the Issuer/Registry. 2. ASX would be appreciative of your impact analysis as this will assist us to understand why you may need to know about such locks (e.g. settlement and/or collateral) in the future even though sub-position information is not made available to you in current CHES. 3. Agree

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	116_001_01_semt_015_001_06	/AdditionalParameters/AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	1	Proposed use is incorrect under ISO. This should be the identification of the Intra Position Movement Transaction, not of the related settlement transaction.	Craig Gray	Agree. Mapping changed.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	108_001_02_sese_027_001_05	/	1	Comment here covers this message, 118_001_01_sese_027_001_05 and 112_001_01_sese_027_001_05; it also has implications for 210_001_01_sese_027_001_05. Some proposed uses of sese.027 are questionable from the point of view of ISO workflow. There is no issue when sese.027 is being sent back to the participant that sent the actual cancellation request; that is exactly what the message is for. This includes where "Pending Cancellation" status is sent back to a requesting participant, where a status indicating withdrawal is sent back, or where successful "Cancelled" status is sent back, and in the case of a bilateral instruction the last one will be sent to both parties, and in both cases will reference the relevant party's own cancellation request. Those uses are fine; it is the other uses that are questionable. Most questionable is sending it to the counterparty on cancellation of an unmatched bilateral instruction. This does not make sense. Not only has the counterparty not sent a cancellation request (so shouldn't be receiving a status update on a cancellation request), but the counterparty does not even have a settlement instruction to cancel! The counterparty only has an allegation. In this case you should instead be sending semt.020 (Securities Message Cancellation Advice), to cancel the allegation notification (as per MDR). Having to incorporate sese.027 into allegation workflow is too much of a departure. Semt.020 would be appropriate both when the originating participant cancels the unmatched instruction, and when ASX cancels it as part of housekeeping. Also questionable is sending it to the originating party when an unmatched bilateral instruction is cancelled by ASX housekeeping. Again, sese.027 is a status update on a cancellation request, but the originator has not sent a cancellation request. Sending a sese.024 with "Cancelled" Processing Status would make more sense. Even more so, sese.027 should not be sent to the counterparty as a kind of "cancellation allegation" for matched bilateral instructions (refer 118_001_01_sese_027_001_05), again simply because this message is a status update on a cancellation request, and the counterparty has not sent a cancellation request yet. It would make more sense to send a sese.024 to the counterparty, with "Cancellation Requested" Processing Status, as this exactly reflects what has happened. Equally, if an unmatched cancellation request is withdrawn, the originator of the request correctly should receive a sese.027 referencing that request (112_001_01_sese_027_001_05), but the counterparty should simply receive a further status update on their settlement instruction (sese.024), reverting from the "Cancellation Requested" status previously advised. Consistent principles should be followed for bilateral demand transfers, to the extent that they apply, with equivalent use of semt.020, sese.024 and sese.027. We made some comment on this in the previous cycle, but not as comprehensively as here; please give precedence to this comment over any comment we left on 210_001_01_sese_027_001_05.	Craig Gray	Thank you, really valuable feedback! The flow was reviewed with SWIFT: Cancellation Request 1. P1 sends to ASX sese.020 (SecuritiesTransactionCancellationRequest). This message is across ISO Business Area. 2. ASX sends to P1 sese.027 (Cancellation Status Advice) to P1 3. ASX sends to P2 semt.020 (SecuritiesMessageCancellationAdvice) Housekeeping 1. ASX send to P1 sese.024 (SecuritiesSettlementTransactionStatusAdvice) 2. ASX sends to P2 semt.020 (SecuritiesMessageCancellationAdvice) The flows for each scenario (unmatched, matched and withdrawal) will be published in the December Release.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	108_001_02_sese_027_001_05	/	2	I would like to discuss this at the TC meeting to appreciate what Craig has requested.	Suresh Chinnappa	Please, refer response 108_001_02_sese_027_001_05/ #1
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	108_001_02_sese_027_001_05	/CancellationRequestReference	1	Would prefer this to reference the originating sese.020, rather than being an ASX-generated reference. If the suggestions noted in our comments at 108_001_02_sese_027_001_05 (root level) were taken up, then this would become possible.	Craig Gray	Target Transaction Id from sese.020 is mapped as Account Owner Transaction Identification. Cancellation Request Reference created by ASX will be used in case of withdrawal.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	109_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/	1	No issues with or questions about this message.	Craig Gray	Noted
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	109_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/	2	No issues with this message.	Wayne Murphy	Noted
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	109_001_01_sese_024_001_08	/	3	No issues	Suresh Chinnappa	Noted
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	110_001_01_sese_028_001_06	/	1	No issues with or questions about this actual message. However, we did make a comment on the very similar 208_001_01_sese_028_001_06 about use of sese.029, and that comment is applicable here, too. ASX appears to have misunderstood our comment. We were not saying there was anything wrong with using sese.028 (reference ASX reply to our comment); sese.028 is obviously the correct message. We were just flagging what looks like an incomplete implementation of ISO allegation workflow. If you send us a sese.028, then we would expect a follow-up sese.029 (allegation removal) once we sent a matching settlement instruction. We just wanted absolutely to confirm that this workflow is deliberately incomplete.	Craig Gray	Thank you for clarification The Participant will received sese.025 instead of sese.029. ASX will not generate another message.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	110_001_01_sese_028_001_06	/	2	I refer to Craig's comment. I understand the request but is there a benefit in sending allegation closure message when the trade is being matched? Can we discuss at the next committee meeting please?	Suresh Chinnappa	Please, refer response 110_001_01_sese_028_001_06/ #1
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	111_001_01_sese_020_001_05	/	1	Not comfortable with sese.020 being used to withdraw a cancellation request, as that is simply not its purpose. What to use instead, though, is a bit of a conundrum, but sese.020 is simply not right. Perhaps we can manage without it. Does the participant really need the ability to withdraw a cancellation request? Should we just rely on ASX housekeeping? How often do cancellation withdrawals happen in CHES at the moment?	Craig Gray	Matched Cancellation Request P1 1. P1 sends to ASX sese.020 (SecuritiesTransactionCancellationRequest). This message is across ISO Business Area. Transaction Id OtherTransactionIdentification (Cancellation Request Reference) 2. ASX sends to P1 sese.027 (Cancellation Status Advice) to P1 3. ASX sends to P2 sese.024 (SecuritiesSettlementTransactionStatusAdvice)- Changed Withdraw- The withdrawal flow was reviewed and changed. The sese.020 can be used to withdraw. 1. P1 sends to ASX sese.020 (SecuritiesTransactionCancellationRequest). Transaction Id mapped as OtherTransactionIdentification (Cancellation Request Reference) 2. ASX sends to P1 sese.027 (Cancellation Status Advice) to P1 3. ASX sends to P2 semt.020 (SecuritiesMessageCancellationAdvice) - Changed Housekeeping 1. ASX send to P1 sese.024 (SecuritiesSettlementTransactionStatusAdvice) - Changed 2. ASX sends to P2 semt.020 (SecuritiesMessageCancellationAdvice)- Changed Comment 2- Noted. ASX will investigate.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	111_001_01_sese_020_001_05	/	2	I would like to discuss this. My understanding is message type 020 is used to cancel a trade. The CHES scenario is to cancel a cancellation request.	Suresh Chinnappa	There is not an explicit message in ISO 20022 to cancel a cancellation request. ASX will do further investigation with SWIFT.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	112_001_02_sese_027_001_05	/	1	Refer general comment on 111_001_01_sese_020_001_05. There will still, however, be a need for this message to cater for housekeeping operations.	Craig Gray	Noted ASX will do further investigation with SWIFT.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	112_001_02_sese_027_001_05	/	2	Also refer comment on 108_001_02_sese_027_001_05 (root level).	Craig Gray	Noted
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	112_001_02_sese_027_001_05	/CancellationRequestReference	1	"Cancelled" Processing Status should not be used here, as this is also the status used on a successful cancellation request (refer 108_001_02_sese_027_001_05); its use here to indicate that the cancellation request will now not proceed is highly confusing. Far better to return a Processing Status of "Denied", which means "instruction/request will not be executed." That is precisely what has happened here: the cancellation request has been withdrawn by the originator, or by ASX housekeeping, and so will not be executed.	Craig Gray	Agreed. Mapping changed to Denied.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	112_001_02_sese_027_001_05	/CancellationRequestReference	2	PLEASE IGNORE COMMENT #1. This was accidentally posted in the wrong place.	Craig Gray	Noted
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	112_001_02_sese_027_001_05	/ProcessingStatus	1	"Cancelled" Processing Status should not be used here, as this is also the status used on a successful cancellation request (refer 108_001_02_sese_027_001_05); its use here to indicate that the cancellation request will now not proceed is highly confusing. Far better to return a Processing Status of "Denied", which means "instruction/request will not be executed." That is precisely what has happened here: the cancellation request has been withdrawn by the originator, or by ASX housekeeping, and so will not be executed.	Craig Gray	Agreed. Mapping changed to Denied.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	112_001_02_sese_027_001_05	/ProcessingStatus	2	I think we need to look at the whole cancellation process and how best the ISO 20022 message can be used effectively.	Suresh Chinnappa	Thank you for raising this. ASX is investigating with SWIFT the solution and the impact.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	112_001_02_sese_027_001_05	/ProcessingStatus/Denied	1	Refer general comment on 111_001_01_sese_020_001_05. There will still, however, be a need for this message to cater for housekeeping operations.	Craig Gray	Noted
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	112_001_02_sese_027_001_05	/ProcessingStatus/Denied	2	PLEASE IGNORE COMMENT #1. this was accidentally posted in the wrong place.	Craig Gray	Noted
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	113_001_01_sese_030_001_07	/	1	I don't see any reference to EIS 121- Change Settlement Instruction Request workflow. Can you please confirm that the intention is to remove the EIS 121 workflow and only support EIS 125 (i.e. Maintain Settlement Instruction) workflow.	Khanh Ler	EIS 121 was descope according to TC Meeting of 6 June 2017.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	113_001_01_sese_030_001_07	/	2	From what I understand MT 125 is to allow a participant to change certain values which do not have recourse to the counter party. We will need to review the E2E process for the modification/maintain message processes to determine best message practise.	Suresh Chinnappa	In the TC Meeting of 6 June 2017, ASX proposed to follow the ISO Standard. It was agreed by the TC Members to descope EIS121 and keep EIS125 as some Participants uses to update information not related to the Counterparty.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	113_001_01_sese_030_001_07	/RequestDetails/Linkage	1	Not clear how Linkage is intended to be used here.	Craig Gray	Noted
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	113_001_01_sese_030_001_07	/RequestDetails/Linkage	2	Please ignore Comment #1. We do understand this.	Craig Gray	Noted

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	113_001_01_sese_030_001_07	/RequestDetails/Linkages	1	Refer comment on 105_001_02_sese_023_001_07 / Linkages. Any change made there would need to be reflected here.	Craig Gray	Noted
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	114_001_01_sese_031_001_07	/	1	Refer to my comments in regards to sese_030_001	Suresh Chinnappa	Please, refer response 110_001_01_sese_028_001_06/ #1
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	114_001_01_sese_031_001_07	/RequestReference	1	This should point back to the requesting sese.030. It looks like we are putting a reference to the settlement instruction itself in here; that is not correct. We do have the settlement instruction correctly linked via Request Details / Reference / Account Owner Transaction Identification, which is perfect.	Craig Gray	The request message sett.113 has Account Owner Transaction Id as Target Transaction Id. In sett.104 related reference is mandatory then it was mapped both Related Reference and Account Owner Transaction Id as Target Transaction Id (duplicated). The uml will be updated to reflected this.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	118_001_01_sese_027_001_05	/	1	Refer comment on 108_001_02_sese_027_001_05 (root level).	Craig Gray	Duplicated comment
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	118_001_01_sese_027_001_05	/CancellationRequestReference	1	Would prefer this to reference the originating sese.020, rather than being an ASX-generated reference. If the suggestions noted in our comment at 108_001_02_sese_027_001_05 (root level) were taken up, then this would become possible.	Craig Gray	Duplicated comment
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	118_001_01_sese_027_001_05	/ProcessingStatus/Cancelled	1	Refer comment on 108_001_02_sese_027_001_05 (root level).	Craig Gray	Duplicated comment
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	118_001_01_sese_027_001_05	/ProcessingStatus/Cancelled	2	IGNORE COMMENT #1. It was posted in the wrong place.	Craig Gray	Duplicated comment
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_comm	807_001_01_admi_002_001_01	/	1	This message is identical to 808_001_01_admi_002_001_01, apart from a subtle difference in use of Related Reference / Reference. Given this is the only difference, it would be better to consolidate the two into one (they are already the same ISO message, anyway). In CHES, EIS540 had starkly different content from EIS518, so it had to be a different message; there is no similar justification for defining two messages here.	Craig Gray	ASX will keep segregated to facilitate the identification of whether it is a schema error or business error.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_comm	807_001_01_admi_002_001_01	/Reason/RejectingPartyReason	1	Please advise when the External Code List will be updated with the new 4 character numeric codes and associated descriptions for this message.	Laik Tan	The Code list will be published in the December and subsequent technical documentation releases.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_comm	808_001_01_admi_002_001_01	/	1	This message is identical to 807_001_01_admi_002_001_01, apart from a subtle difference in use of Related Reference / Reference. Given this is the only difference, it would be better to consolidate the two into one (they are already the same ISO message, anyway). In CHES, EIS540 had starkly different content from EIS518, so it had to be a different message; there is no similar justification for defining two messages here.	Craig Gray	ASX will keep segregated to facilitate the identification of whether it is a schema error or business error.
Nov-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_comm	808_001_01_admi_002_001_01	/Reason/RejectingPartyReason	1	Please advise when the External Code List will be updated with the New Error 4 character numeric codes and associated descriptions for this message.	Laik Tan	The Code list will be published in the December and subsequent technical documentation releases.
Nov-18					<p>1) The unit quantity for a unilateral and bilateral demand transfer (001 or 005) will be locked in the Delivering HIN such that it cannot be used for any other purpose other than this request, until such a time as the Bilateral demand transfer is effected or cancelled". So it is unclear as to when the securities will be locked?</p> <p>When exactly will CHES lock the holdings on securities? will it be locked even when it is unmatched or rejected? LOCR - lock upon request, will CHES lock the holdings immediately when a participant sends request or even when the instruction is unmatched? Kindly help us understand the locking mechanism a little better. Additionally, I understand that participant can use sent.013 message to unlock securities as well.</p>	Pradeep Pandian	<p>For Demand Transfer, the securities will be locked immediately when a participant sends request. If there are no units available when the Participant sends the request message (hold.201), the message will be rejected (comm.808).</p> <p>The Participant will be able to lock securities in 2 phases: 1. Applying a 'Securities Lock' on the holding within the Delivering HIN when a Settlement Lock is requested in the existing settlement instruction message sett.105. 2. Allow 'SecuritiesLock' on the holding within the Delivering HIN via a separate holding lock message request (hold.215) after a settlement instruction has been received where the original instruction did not have a lock associated to it. For securities lock during Settlement Instruction (sett.105), it allow for the choice of applying a 'securities lock' within the Delivering HIN upon request/matching for the Bilateral Settlement Instruction. In case of Unmatched Settlement Instruction, if the units is not available, ASX will reject the transaction (comm.808). In case of Matched Settlement Instruction, if the units is not available, ASX will not reject the transaction, sett.106 (Settlement Instruction Response) will be sent with the Processing Status> Proprietary Status> Lock or No Lock and Settlement Status> Scheduled.</p>
Nov-18					<p>2) Settlement Condition - Require your Confirmation</p> <p>Per my understanding, stated below are the conditions to be used,</p> <p>001 -> hold_201 - UDTR 003 -> hold_201 - UDRP 005 -> hold_201 - BDTR</p> <p>101 -> sett_105 - BSSI 107 -> sett_105 - BSSI (We do not used 107) 105 -> sett_105 - USSI</p>		<p>Correct. Only 107 is wrong. 001 -> hold_201 - UDTR 003 -> hold_201 - UDRP 005 -> hold_201 - BDTR</p> <p>101 -> sett_105 - BSSI 107 -> sett_105 -USSI not BSSI 105 -> sett_105 - USSI</p>
Nov-18					Do participants have the option to reject an alignment request(102 or 012) - sese.028?		If the Participant does not agree with the allegement request, the matched instruction is not sent.
Nov-18					4) Page 17 in "ISO_20022_Technical_Committee_Meeting_22May2018_Presentation.pdf", It says "Netted messages will contain Target Transaction Id that will relate to the original sett_101 (EIS164)". IF Netting comprises of multiple buys and sells on a given stock for a settlement date, how will CHES communicate Transaction IDs of all the underlying EIS 164 (Trade notifications)? (any sample illustration will help us understand, just our view)		ASX published umls with Transaction Id in MyStandard ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett Collection.
Nov-18					Could you please advise on the equivalent ISO base Message names for the below CHES messages?		These messages were not published in to-be yet. You can find the as-is mapping in MyStandard ASX_AU_CHS_sett Collection
Nov-18					<p>121 Change Settlement Instruction Request 122 Unmatched Change Settlement Instruction Request 130 Requested Settlement Instruction Change 124 Rescheduled Settlement Instruction 118 Cancelled Change Settlement Instruction Request 162 Suspended Settlement Instruction 123 Change SI cancellation request 128 Adjusted Settlement instruction 024 Seems this has been de-scoped - will this be comm_807? or comm_808?</p>		
Nov-18					6) Page 36 on "ISO_20022_Technical_Committee_Meeting_9Oct2018_Presentation.pdf", unable to understand sese.025 and what sett_201 & sett_202 means? when/where do we use sett_201 & sett_202?		<p>Each Business Message is named according to the following naming convention: <Institution_Country_Service>.<Collection_Business Message ID>.<Major_Minor>.<ISO 20022 base message> Because ISO 20022 requires an identifier to prefix all Business collections, the ASX's identifier is "ASX_AU_CHS".</p> <p>For example, ASX_AU_CHS_hold_201_001_01_sese_023_001_07 Institution Country System= ASX_AU_CHS Collection= hold (Holding Movement) Business Message ID= 201 Major= 001 Minor= 01 ISO 20022 base message= sese_023_001_07</p> <p>Institution Country System= A default system parameter and should be ASX_AU_CHS Collection= The Collection that the Business Message belongs to. Example: Settlement= sett Holding Movement= hold Account Management= acct Common= comm Business Message ID=The Business message's unique ID number Major= The Business message's unique ID number Minor= The Business message's minor change number ISO 20022 base message= The ISO 20022 base message ID</p>

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Nov-18					<p>"Intra Position Movement Instruction V04" - semt.013 - When I look at Balance From, Annotation says</p> <p>Lock :</p> <p>From Available or Blocked Available - Unlocked Blocked - Locked</p>		<p>From: is a choice between Available or Blocked To: is a choice between Available or Blocked</p> <p>scenario 1: From: Available To: Blocked result: Lock securities</p> <p>scenario 2: From: Blocked To: Available result: Unlock Securities</p>
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 /	/		Understand from the nature of the guideline (transfer) why the trade date is not required but does it really make sense to "restrict" it, ie that means it causes problems with STP if ASX receive it. Would they not be better to "ignore" it if instructed?	Ashok Kumar	Trade Date is not an attribute on the current EIS Demand Transfer related messages, therefore ASX took the approach to capture required data that needed validation rather than ignore the data in the message. ASX would like to seek further information to understand 1) the STP problem that results if Trade Date is not included within the ISO message from a participants perspective; 2) is this STP issue experienced today with the current EIS related messages; 3) is the STP issue encountered only because of Trade Date not present.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 /	/	1	Do we have the opportunity to override the default CUM/EX indicator? E.g. what was considered as a ex transaction needs to be treated as a special cum transaction. Should the ASX consider making the supplementary reference mandatory in order to remove the risk of mismatching?	Suresh Chinnappa	Yes, the override basis of movement value can be optionally provided in business message element Trade Transaction Condition <TradTxCond>. The allowable "codes" are not included in the message schema, however ASX will make available an External Code List which provides a list of allowable "codes" for mentioned element. The main purpose for externalising these "codes" is to avoid message impacts and development as a result of having to introduce a new version of the message because of a change to the "code" set values.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 /	/	2	Is there a Tran basis of movement of M, O or L not required?	Suresh Chinnappa	Yes, The Transaction basis is provided in business message element SecuritiesTransactionType <SctiesTxTp>. The allowable "codes" are not included in the message schema, however ASX will make available an External Code List which provides a list of allowable "codes" for mentioned element. The main purpose for externalising these "codes" is to avoid message impacts and development as a result of having to introduce a new version of the message because of a change to the "code" set values.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 /	/	3	will Free of payment transactions be able to settle via Settlement batch? and how will this work? in some cases you have Free of payment Lending transactions settling via settlement batch using 101 chess message. how can you instruct free of payment 105 (with no cash)	Wayne Murphy	The existing CHES EIS 101 and 105 messages will be replaced by another set of messages sett.105 (Settlement Instruction Request) not hold.201. For Demand Transfer Requests the element Payment <Pmt> must equal FREE as these transfers are demand and free of payment (i.e. Units to be settled within the system between two accounts, but the payment may be settled outside of the settlement for example). For Settlement Instruction Requests that are scheduled (i.e. not demand) to be settled the element Payment <Pmt> must be "FREE" where Settlement Amount is not provided, otherwise element Payment <Pmt> must be "APMT" where Settlement Amount is provided and is greater than 0.00
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 /	DeliveringSettlementParties	1	Please consider using Party 2 in Delivering Settlement Parties and Receiving Settlement Parties (as appropriate) to identify the sponsoring participant, and Party 1 to identify the settlement participant (like in market-side settlement instructions, where Party 2 identifies the clearing participant, and party 1 the settlement participant). Then you would not need to introduce the proprietary Settlement Transaction Conditions UDTR, UDRP and BDTR; if delivering and receiving Party 1 are different, it is clearly bilateral; if the same, then clearly unilateral; if delivering Party 1 and Party 2 are different, or receiving Party 1 and Party 2 are different, then it is related-party; if all the same, then not. This also makes the sponsoring participant explicit, which it does not seem to be here.	Craig Gray	Thank you for this suggestion. For the mentioned Settlement Transaction Codes, ASX agrees you could use Party 1 and Party 2, however if new workflows were to be introduced in the future it is unclear if the suggestion will cater for all new workflows, therefore ASX intends to use Settlement Transaction Condition which will explicitly outline the business workflow that is to be invoked.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 /	DeliveringSettlementParties / Party1 / SafekeepingAccount	1	This may need to be retained. Refer comment under Settlement Type and Additional Parameters / Common Identification.	Craig Gray	Thank you. ASX should not enforce mandatory matching at the Supplementary Reference level, however it will be within the Participants control to mandate or not mandate.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 /	/ ReceivingSettlementParties	1	Refer comment under Delivering Settlement Parties.	Craig Gray	Refer to sett.201/ DeliveringSettlementParties
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 /	SettlementParameters / SettlementTransactionCondition / Proprietary / Identification	1	Introducing and requiring proprietary Settlement Transaction Conditions UDTR, UDRP and BDTR (codes that are peculiar to ASX) may be unnecessary. Refer comment under Delivering Settlement parties.	Craig Gray	Settlement Transaction Condition is used to explicitly outline the business workflow that is being invoked.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 /	/ SettlementTypeAndAdditionalParameters / CommonIdentification	1	This is being used to provide equivalent functionality to Supplementary Reference in EIS005, including the "secondary matching" capability. However, by broad industry convention, and especially when used with secondary matching, Supplementary Reference normally carries a HIN; this would be better implemented via Safekeeping Account of the relevant Delivering or Receiving Settlement Party. Then there would be no need to introduce the foreign (to ISO) concept of secondary matching; and after all, secondary matching was really a workaround for the longstanding limitation in EIS005 of not being able to quote and match on the counterparty HIN. Let's remove that limitation, rather than cement the secondary matching workaround. Nevertheless, there will need to be broad agreement on this change, in case there is anyone relying on something that is not a HIN or account identifier for secondary matching.	Craig Gray	Refer to sett.201/ DeliveringSettlementParties / Party1 / SafekeepingAccount
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 /	/ TradeDetails / InvestorCapacity / Proprietary / Identification	1	Trade Details / Investor Capacity / Proprietary / Identification Foreign-guaranteed condition should be implemented as a Trade Transaction Condition, not as the Investor Capacity. First, because foreign-guaranteed really is not an investor capacity (look at what the three standard ISO codes mean). Then importantly, because Trade Transaction Conditions are included on allegement messages (sese.028), but Investor Capacity is not; using Trade Transaction Conditions avoids having to add Investor Capacity as Supplementary Data on sese.028. There is an obvious reason why Investor Capacity is not on the allegement: if it truly is the investor capacity, then it is of no interest to the counterparty. So, Trade Transaction Conditions is a far better place to annotate the foreign-guaranteed condition.	Craig Gray	Noted. Trade Transaction Condition is already mapped as Basis of Movement and only allows 4 characters codes, then qualifier could not be added to differentiate between Basis of Movement and Guarantee Foreign Indicator. Even business rules cannot be included as both elements are optional. In this scenario, investor capacity was the recommendation by SWIFT.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 /	/ TradeDetails / SettlementInstructionProcessingAdditionalDetails	1	Introducing SMAT (a code that is peculiar to ASX) may be unnecessary. Refer comment under Settlement Type and Additional Parameters / Common Identification.	Craig Gray	Refer to sett.201/ DeliveringSettlementParties / Party1 / SafekeepingAccount
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	201_001_02_sese_023_001_07 /	/		Settlement Parties. ASX have indicated that both the Receiving and Delivering Party 1's are mandatory (plus PSETs). Is that always the case for both receives and delivers for this type of transfer (no problem if it is, just want to check)?	Ashok Kumar	It is to simplify the flow, as the same message will be used for Unilateral and Bilateral Demand Transfer. The convention will be for Unilateral populate with the same value and Bilateral always different values.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	202_001_02_sese_025_001_07 /	/	1	From a CA perspective should the message also confirm how the transaction has been settled i.e. CUM or EX?	Suresh Chinnappa	Basis of Movement is mapped to element TradeTransactionCondition <TradTxCond>
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	202_001_02_sese_025_001_07 /	/	2	Please clarify use of this message in the "Unilateral Demand Transfer (Related Participants)" case, since the descriptive refers to both EIS004 and EIS010, but with this now clearly designated a unilateral transfer (correctly, because only one actual settlement participant is involved), there should only be one confirmation message. (Dual confirmation of EIS003 via EIS004 and EIS010 is a vestige of CHES 1.0, where EIS003 effected settlement between participants, and the confirming messages went to separate settlement participants. But current use involves only one settlement participant, the other participant having only sponsoring capacity and requiring the settlement participant to manage its holdings.)	Craig Gray	Agree that the confirmation message in current CHES for the mentioned EIS003 was sent to the Settlement Participant and the Sponsoring Participant to advise that the settlement of units was effected. ASX intends to still send a confirmation message to both the Settlement Participant and Sponsoring Participant as it is still important to advise both parties of their new balance post the settlement of units. The initiator of the workflow is the delivering party and this can either be the Settlement Participant or Sponsoring Participant so two parties are involved in the workflow even though it's not a bilateral demand transfer.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	202_001_02_sese_025_001_07 /	/	1	Agree with Craig's and Suresh's comments	Wayne Murphy	
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	202_001_02_sese_025_001_07 /	TradeDetails / SettlementInstructionProcessingAdditionalDetails / Secondary_Matching_Flag	1	Per my previous comment. Would it be more effective if we make this element compulsory?		Refer to sett.201/ DeliveringSettlementParties / Party1 / SafekeepingAccount
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	207_001_01_sese_024_001_08 /	/	1	The status may be a processing, pending processing, internal matching, matching and/or settlement status". Grammar is not right?	Suresh Chinnappa	The purpose of this message is to notify a Participant that a Bilateral Demand Transfer previously submitted to ASX has been processed but cannot currently be matched against a corresponding instruction submitted by the counterparty. The status is mapped as MatchingStatus>Unmatched>No Match (CMIS). CMIS code definition in ISO20022 is "A matching instruction from your counterparty could not be found".

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	207_001_01_sese_024_001_08 /	/ MatchingStatus	1	Would this have a status of Unmatched?		The purpose of this message is to notify a Participant that a Bilateral Demand Transfer previously submitted to ASX has been processed but cannot currently be matched against a corresponding instruction submitted by the counterparty. The status is mapped as MatchingStatus>Unmatched>No Match (CMIS). CMIS code definition in ISO20022 is "A matching instruction from your counterparty could not be found".
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	208_001_01_sese_028_001_06 /	/	1	Please clarify workflow. There is no mention anywhere of allegation removal advice (sese.029); this should be sent to the participant once the participant's settlement instruction has been received and matched. I think sese.029 is an optional part of the ISO workflow only because the participant receiving the allegation may not send a matching settlement instruction.	Craig Gray	sese.028 is correctly mapped as the scope of this message is: An account servicer ("ASX") sends a SecuritiesSettlementTransactionAllegationNotification to an account owner to advise the account owner that a counterparty has alleged an instruction against the account owner's account at the account servicer and that the account servicer could not find the corresponding instruction of the account owner. The account servicer/owner relationship may be: - a central securities depository or another settlement market infrastructure acting on behalf of their participants - an agent (sub-custodian) acting on behalf of their global custodian customer, or - a custodian acting on behalf of an investment management institution or a broker/dealer.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	208_001_01_sese_028_001_06 /	/	2	agree with Craig's comments	Wayne Murphy	Refer to sett.208/ #1 response
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	208_001_01_sese_028_001_06 /	/ DeliveringSettlementParties	1	Refer comment on "hold.201".	Craig Gray	Refer response on hold.201.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	208_001_01_sese_028_001_06 /	/ DeliveringSettlementParties / Party1 / SafekeepingAccount	1	Refer comment on "hold.201".	Craig Gray	Refer response on hold.201.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	208_001_01_sese_028_001_06 /	/ ReceivingSettlementParties	1	Refer comment on "hold.201" under Delivering Settlement Parties.	Craig Gray	Refer response on hold.201.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	208_001_01_sese_028_001_06 /	SettlementParameters / SettlementTransactionCondition / Proprietary / Identification	1	Refer comment on "hold.201".	Craig Gray	Refer response on hold.201.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	208_001_01_sese_028_001_06 /	/ SettlementTypeAndAdditionalParameters / CommonIdentification	1	Refer comment on "hold.201".	Craig Gray	Refer response on hold.201.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	208_001_01_sese_028_001_06 /	/ TradeDetails / InvestorCapacity / Proprietary / Identification	1	Refer comment on "hold.201" under Trade Details / Investor Capacity. If the foreign-guaranteed condition is implemented as a Trade Transaction Condition, you will not need to insert Investor Capacity as supplementary data here. Investor Capacity should not be relevant to the counterparty, so no surprise it is not included on sese.028, and this just underlines that Investor Capacity is not the right place to put the foreign-guaranteed condition.	Craig Gray	Refer response on hold.201.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	208_001_01_sese_028_001_06 /	/ TradeDetails / SettlementInstructionProcessingAdditionalDetails	1	Introducing SMAT (a code that is peculiar to ASX, and in this case added as supplementary data) may be unnecessary. Refer comments on "hold.201" under Settlement Type and Additional Parameters / Common Identification, and Trade Details / Settlement Instruction Processing Additional Details.	Craig Gray	Refer response on hold.201.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	208_001_01_sese_028_001_06 /	TradeDetails / AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	1	This should contain something understandable to the recipient (which the counterparty's transaction identification certainly is not). Refer ISO description: "Identification of an account owner transaction that could potentially match with the allegation notified." This is not mandatory (despite what it says in the annotation attached to this element), so maybe just omit it.	Craig Gray	Agree Account Owner Transaction Id will be removed
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	209_001_01_sese_020_001_07 /	/ AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	1	This is being used incorrectly. Looks like a new transaction identifier is expected here (by analogy with EIS Transaction Id, which is mentioned in the annotation). This element should contain the transaction identifier that I sent on the original settlement instruction (sese.023), not a new transaction identifier (quite clear from examples in the MDR).	Craig Gray	Agree Target Transaction Id will be mapped as AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification / SecuritiesSettlementTransactionIdentification
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	209_001_01_sese_020_001_07 /	AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification / SecuritiesSettlementTransactionIdentification	1	This needs to be retained, to allow Account Owner Transaction Identification to be used correctly, to identify the settlement transaction being cancelled.		Agree Target Transaction Id will be mapped as AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification / SecuritiesSettlementTransactionIdentification
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	209_001_01_sese_020_001_07 /	AccountServicerTransactionIdentification	1	This should not have to be made mandatory. If Account Owner Transaction Identification is used correctly, carrying the transaction identification of my original settlement transaction instruction (refer comment on Account Owner Transaction Identification), then that is all that's needed to identify the transaction to be cancelled. It is OK to let Account Servicer Transaction Identification be used, but it should not be mandatory.	Suresh Chinnappa	Agree Account Service will be removed
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	210_001_01_sese_027_001_05 /	/	1	In regards to house keeping what will the duration be for a demand transfer cancellation?	Suresh Chinnappa	Noted. Still in investigation.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	210_001_01_sese_027_001_05 /	/	1	Please clarify workflow. This is annotated analogous to EIS048, but EIS048 has very specific workflow in CHES that does not map naturally to ISO. Perhaps something like this makes more sense under ISO: 1. Sese.027 used only in response to explicit cancellation requests from the originator of the settlement instruction (sese.020, "hold_209"). 2. Sese.024 used to notify unsolicited cancellations (from housekeeping); sese.027 makes no sense in this context because there is no account-owner cancellation request (sese.020) to reference back to. 3. Sese.027 or sese.024 sent only to the originator of the settlement instruction, not also to the counterparty; it makes no sense to send messages about cancelling settlement instructions to the counterparty when the counterparty has not yet instructed settlement. 4. Perhaps sese.029 (allegation removal advice) sent to the counterparty for either cancellation scenario, to clear the allegation	Craig Gray	Noted. ASX will investigate the impact, effort versus benefit. This model would increase a lot of complexity specially because Scheduled Settlement Instruction which has cancel match and unmatched instruction should follow the same approach. The message sese.027 can be used to inform housekeeping as the Transaction Id is correctly mapped now and ASX will generate a Cancelling Transaction Id in the sett.210. In the cancel request, the Participant provides the Target Transaction Id to be cancelled which is informed to the Counterparty in the allegation message. The response in a Cancelling status advice and ISO20022 allows status advice to be shared. This mapping was SWIFT recommendation and approved by ASX.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	210_001_01_sese_027_001_05 /	/ TransactionIdentification / AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification	1	Refer comment on "hold_209".	Craig Gray	Refer response on hold.209.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	210_001_01_sese_027_001_05 /	/ TransactionIdentification / AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification / SecuritiesSettlementTransactionIdentification	1	Refer comment on "hold_209".	Craig Gray	Refer response on hold.209.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_hold	210_001_01_sese_027_001_05 /	/ TransactionIdentification / AccountOwnerTransactionIdentification / SecuritiesSettlementTransactionIdentification	1	Refer comment on "hold_209".	Craig Gray	Refer response on hold.209.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	101_001_01_secl_001_001_03 /	/ NotifiedTradeLegDetails / OverrideBasisOfMovement	1	Will this cover all CA codes?	Suresh Chinnappa	Yes.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	104_001_02_secl_002_001_03 /	/	1	No issues with this usage. Much better mapping than version 01 of "sett_104" was.	Craig Gray	Thank you.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	104_001_02_secl_002_001_03 /	/	2	No issues with this version. better mapping to the SECL message	Wayne Murphy	Thank you.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03 /	/	4	The EIS MT 134 stipulates broker related; is this the case in the new environment?	Suresh Chinnappa	Could you please clarify the questions.
Oct-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03 /	/	5	No issues with the formatting on the ISO, Suresh has raised a good point on broker related.	Wayne Murphy	Refer response on sett.102 #4
Jul-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	101_001_01_secl_001_001_03	/	1	We should depart from CHES practice and make this purely a trade notification, without any implications of being a settlement instruction. As such, it should simply notify the designated clearing participant that ASX has accepted the trade in its capacity as central counterparty, without implying anything yet about settlement. Actual, final settlement obligations (netted or not) should then be notified separately, and explicitly (via expanded use of secl.010). Reasons for this suggested change of philosophy include: (1) It eliminates current inefficient processing that requires us to establish settlement obligations for each and every notified trade, only to cancel the majority when netting is notified. Far better to notify settlement obligations just once, in their final form. (2) It avoids exacerbating the above issue when the new give-up function is used (assuming give-up will happen after the initial trade notification). (3) It makes it feasible for participants to choose not to process trade notifications in the context of settlement; if settlement obligations for unnetted trades are not notified explicitly, then processing trade notifications cannot become optional. (4) It better models separation of ASX's role as a central counterparty (and potentially not the only CCP) from its role as provider of the settlement service. (5) It is more in line with CCP practice in other markets, from what I can see. (6) It fits the ISO model better. Once you remove any connotation of settlement from the trade notification, it becomes straightforward that the proper message for notifying cancelled trades is secl.002 (a clearing message), and not sese.027 (a settlement message). I have been suggesting this approach from the outset. This is my final fling at trying to get the point across! Obviously, in the final analysis, we can accommodate whatever you come up with.	Craig Dion Global	Thank you for raising this. Inline with the committee presentation, there will be a review of the current trade registration process incorporating these comments. Updates are progressing internally and will be communicated accordingly.
Jul-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	101_001_01_secl_001_001_03	/	2	No issues for the 164 message type.	Wayne Murphy BNP Paribas	Noted
Jul-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	101_001_01_secl_001_001_03	/ ClearingMember/BIC	1	Confirm BIC is intentionally excluded here. BIC has been retained for counterparty clearing member on this message, and of course in settlement obligation notification.	Craig Dion Global	corrected
Jul-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	101_001_01_secl_001_001_03	/ ClearingMember/BIC	2	BIC has also been retained for non clearing member.	Craig Dion Global	corrected
Jul-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	104_001_01_sese_027_001_05	/	1	Refer comment #1 on "sett_101" (secl.001). If the revised philosophy put forward there were adopted, the natural ISO message to use here would be secl.002, not sese.027. However, if "sett_101" remains a de facto settlement obligation, then my point becomes moot.	Craig Dion Global	Remapping completed as a result of enhancement to trade registration

ASX CHES Replacement Project

Comments received to: 09-April-2021

Tracked Technical Committee comments on published Usage Guidelines in MyStandards, and ASX project responses

Date of ASX response	Collection Name	Guideline Name	Context	ID	Comment	User	CHES Replacement response
Jul-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	104_001_01_sese_027_001_05	/	2	I agree with Craig' s point on this, 116 Chess message cancellation represents a number of Chess messages, 101, 105, 107 etc. This ISO message is represented correctly. However for 164 chess message,or any other SECL message correct ISO should be secl.002	Wayne Murphy BNP Paribas	Noted. The remapping of trade cancellation now uses base message secl.002. This means other cancellation message types will possibly use other base messages per business area.
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_comm	801_001_01_head_001_001_01	/BusinessService	1	Unless I have misunderstood, we seem to be using business service to define a brand new message numbering scheme that is neither CHES nor ISO, and which will be peculiar to ASX. To me, this is an odd thing to do. I would be interested to hear what others think.	Craig, Dion Global	Correct. Business Service value contains new message numbering scheme, not related to EIS message id, read with ISO base message to identify the xml schema
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/	1	I might be running ahead here, but just curious what will happen with trades that need to settle un-netted. Will we get a settlement obligation report for these, or will we just have to assume settlement of them based off the original trade notification and the fact it was not referenced in a net obligation report (like current CHES)? I am trying to think-through separation of clearing and settlement functions, and wondering should trade notification be kept separate from settlement obligation notification always, in which case you would also need an explicit settlement obligation notification for trades settling un-netted, and not just for netted ones. Or maybe that is the intion, or something similar, Can we have a quick chat if that doesn't make sense, because it seems important to me.	Craig, Dion Global	Eligible notified market trades also represent scheduled gross settlement obligations. If not netted, these trades need no further instruction to settle "un-netted". Both non-netted obligations and a 'bulk' settlement obligation report could be provided without further instructions. The proposed messaging given separation of Clearing and Settlement roles does not require new message events. This approach is reflected in the sett.102 Netted Obligation Report message flows, and is extended for the sett.101 Notified Trade for the June TC meeting. This sees both Settlement Participant and Clearing Participant (if different) receiving a copy of the messages (with the potential to opt-out if not required). ASX will review your comments in further detail.
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/	2	Following on from my previous comment, can we at least leave this usage open for on-going comment until we have seen the usage of all other clearing messages, such as trade notification and cancellation, and are clear on the end-to-end workflow from initial trade notification right through to CCP sending settlement instruction to the CSD. A view on how this flow is impacted by the proposed give-up/take-up function is also needed before we can absolutely rule off this segment.	Craig, Dion Global	Agreed for ongoing sett.102 reviewed to allow review of clearing messaging i.e. sett.101
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/ReportDetails/SettlementObligationDetails	1	Multiple occurrence of settlement obligation details has been retained. Please confirm whether or not in practice we will receive messages with multiple settlement obligation details.	Craig, Dion Global	Noted this comment is withdrawn below
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/ReportDetails/SettlementObligationDetails	2	Re comment #1, sorry, I missed the "Multiplicity Restriction" flagged at the top.	Craig, Dion Global	Noted
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/ReportDetails/SettlementObligationDetails/AdditionalSettlementObligationDetails/References/TradeLegNotificationIdentification	1	References element has been removed; however, assuming trade notification is to be via secl.001, then could not References be retained and this element used to provide the link between the settlement obligation report and trade notification, rather than providing referencing via supplementary data.	Craig, Dion Global	Yes for assumption that secl.001 is the base ISO message for trade notification. While References/TradeLegIdentification is repeating - component does not support other data (Trade Execution Id and Trade Date) included per netted trade.
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/ReportDetails/SettlementObligationDetails/Payment	1	Refer comments #1/#2 on ReportDetails / SettlementObligationDetails / SettlementAmount / CreditDebitIndicator.	Craig, Dion Global	Refer to ASX Response on comments #1 on ReportDetails / SettlementObligationDetails / SettlementAmount / CreditDebitIndicator
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/ReportDetails/SettlementObligationDetails/SettlementAmount/CreditDebitIndicator	1	Not really a bid deal this one, but not credit debit indicator has been retained as optional, why not just omit if settlement amount is zero? Why arbitrarily pick credit for a zero amount? In fact, if settlement amount is zero, then should this in fact be a free of payment settlement instruction, rather than an against payment one? Is there a standard practice anywhere?	Craig, Dion Global	Credit Debit Indicator made mandatory for predictability and by ISO convention zero value is a CRDT. Only 'Against Payment Settlement' as this value does not determine security movement behaviour or the framework for fail events.
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/ReportDetails/SettlementObligationDetails/SettlementAmount/CreditDebitIndicator	2	Sorry about comment 1, should say, "Not really a big deal this one, but note ..."	Craig, Dion Global	Noted
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/ReportParameters/ReportIdentification	1	This is defined as "unique identification of the report" but has been mapped to CHES Origin Transaction Id which, for EIS134 that I think we are primarily trying map here, is non-unique (Identifying the netting process).	Craig, Dion Global	The CHES as-is has a common Origin Tx Id for all messaging from the Netting process, but the Tx Id is shared for the EIS134 and EIS138s. In combining these two EIS messages into the sett.102, the Tx Id value becomes unique. For to-be the BizMsgIdr will be unique and will replace the EIS Tx Id.
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/SettlementParties	1	This is defined as providing "details about the receiving parties involved in the settlement chain" but is being used here for the delivering parties. Not necessarily questioning this; just flagging that this message is a little confusing, what with this and also having settlement parties present within the settlement obligation details. Would like it doubly confirmed that our usage here is correct.	Craig, Dion Global	Agreed the presence of Settlement Parties blocks in the base message is confusing. The Mandatory block is used for Receiving Settlement Parties and optional block made mandatory for the Delivering Settlement Parties detail. This local practice is consistent with the SMPG guidance. Alternatives of duplication of Receiving Settlement Parties in both occurrences or using dummy values for the mandatory block is not recommended.
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/SupplementaryData/NettedTradeDetails/TotalMessageCount	1	Annotation appears wrong (trade date). If this is in fact a message count (meaning what? the number of trades represented?), then it really isn't needed - not so much as to warrant adding a supplementary data item for it.	Craig, Dion Global	Thank you. Agree annotation from Trade Date has been used instead of mapping for BP57 from EIS134
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/SupplementaryData/TradeLegDetails	1	Built-in referencing between settlement obligation and underlying trade legs seems to be available via ReportDetails/SettlementObligationDetails/AdditionalSettlementObligationDetails/References/TradeLegNotificationIdentification. If correct, then better to use that than put a new element in supplementary data.	Craig, Dion Global	Please refer to ASX Response to similar comment #1 on /ReportDetails/SettlementObligationDetails/AdditionalSettlementObligationDetails/References/TradeLegNotificationIdentification
Jun-18	ASX_AU_CHS_draft_sett	102_001_01_secl_010_001_03	/SupplementaryData/TradeLegDetails	2	Following on from comment #1, whilst I see content proposed here is more than just the trade leg identification, that extra data should be able to be got from trade notification if needed; hence just the built-in link should be adequate.	Craig, Dion Global	Correct this data is potentially derivable from the sett.101- however we look to avoid lookups - especially should those messages be subject to opt-out preference. We will continue to consult on this as part of the clearing message review.
Jun-18		102_001_01_secl_010_001_03		By email	For the exchange side settlement messages (individual and netted), ideally we would like the option to just receive one scheduled bulk settlement message per stock/BOM per settlement day regardless of if they were netted or not. This is similar to some other markets. This message would come out 5-1 after that days settlement cycle had completed and would include any fails from the previous settlement cycles as well as any accruals due to settle on the next settlement day.	Darrel, Goldman Sachs	Any 5-1 'bulk settlement movement' calculation would be projected as bilateral trades could be matched and scheduled on 5. If used together with an opt-out for related messages, this would be additional reporting as no further instruction is required to schedule market trades. The opt-out requirement for 5-day messages would also need confirmation. This might be achieved using a node-based enquiry, demand report request, or adding a "projected calculation" notification event.
Jun-18		102_001_01_secl_010_001_03		By email	Likewise for these we would like to see just one bulk settlement message per day (i.e.. a bulk of all settled exchange trades). Internally the node will still have the individual/netted messages to enable isolation of counterparty etc. but they are just noise for our internal systems and not needed (note: we still include any isolated trade in the bulk as well).	Darrel, Goldman Sachs	Any "bulk settlement movement" notification could be used with an opt-out of settlement notifications. Such a facility will be considered as part of the to-be design for messaging preferences.
Jun-18		102_001_01_secl_010_001_03		By email	Our exchange trade reconciliation is carried out in the trading/booking systems and all that is past down to our clearing system is a single bulked exchange trade for each stock/BOM/Settlement date. This is following the normal pattern we use in other markets which allows us significantly better scalability in our global clearing and other downstream systems. We would still like to be able to do a report request to get the individual trades if we need them (we have only used the individual trades twice since we did the migration onto the our global clearing systems in March 2014, the last time was the recent ALC incident where we needed trades for a few stocks).	Darrel, Goldman Sachs	Agree a method of ad-hoc collection of required events would be needed to support opt-out preferences.