



MINUTES OF THE ISO 20022 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Tuesday 22 August 2017

ASX Offices, Bridge Street, Sydney; Webinar

- 1. Welcome, Agenda**
- 2. Minutes from last meeting, open actions**
- 3. CHES Replacement project update by ASX**
- 4. ISO 20022 project update by ASX**
- 5. Update from Business Committee**
- 6. Matters for Consideration (Business and Technical matters)**
 - 6a MyStandards Community - usage guideline feedback**
 - 6b Registration details**
 - 6c CHES EIS 421 – securities transformation**
 - 6d Achieving ISO 20022 compliance**
 - 6e Usage guidelines for review**
- 7. Next meeting**

ATTENDEES

MEMBERS		
Company	Name	Job Title
Australian Payments Network Limited	Paul Creswick	Security Standards Manager
Bank of America Merrill Lynch	Andree Hindmarsh	Head of GMOT Australia
Bank of America Merrill Lynch	Jimmie Alam	
Bell Potter Securities	Dean Surkitt	Managing Director Retail
BNP Paribas Securities	Narelle Rutter	Head of Local Custody & Clearing Operations
BNP Paribas Securities	Wayne Murphy	Project Manager
Boardroom Limited	Tony Robinson	Senior Software Engineer
Boardroom Limited	Michael Mullins	CIO
Broadridge (Australia)	John Greenhow	General Manager, Australia
Broadridge (Australia)	Manoj Mathew	Business Analyst
Broadridge (Australia)	Mabel Chow	Development and Support Manager
CBA Equities	Joel Cox	Technical Business Analyst
CBA Equities	Carolyn Webb	Test Manager
CBA Equities	Ben Lowe	Manager Settlements
Chi-X Australia	Mike Aikins	Head of Solution Development
Chi-X Australia	Suketu Adhvaryu	Senior Solution Architect
Citicorp	Miles O'Connor	Director, Direct Custody & Clearing Securities Markets & Securities Services
Citicorp	Brett Dennis	Head of Operations – Party Clearing
Citicorp	Vlad Medvedev	
Citicorp	Lyll Herron	
Citicorp	Janice O'Brien	Markets & Securities Services Technology
Citicorp	Matthew Warner	
Citicorp	Ashok Kumar Balusa	
Citicorp	Glenn Pahilan	
Computershare	Leanne Bailey	Senior Business Analyst Product & Innovation
Computershare	Laik Tan	
Deutsche Securities	Kevin Novini	
Dion Global Solutions	Craig Gray	Product Manager – Australia and New Zealand
Dion Global Solutions	Nikki Gleisner	Account Manager
GBST	Andrew Murdoch	Product Specialist, GBST Capital Markets
GBST	Sue Schafer	Product Owner
Goldman Sachs	Darrel Schwarz	Technology Vice President
Goldman Sachs	Nichole Alexander	Operations Vice President
HSBC Securities Services	Gregory Wilkin	Head of HSBC Operations
HSBC Securities Services	Salih Kulic	Manager Custody
HSBC Bank Australia Limited	Michael Macintosh	Senior Client Account Manager, Global Liquidity and Cash Management

MEMBERS		
Company	Name	Job Title
HSBC Bank Australia Limited	Anna Fratini	Senior Product Manager – High Value Payments, Clearing and Financial Institutions,
JP Morgan	Ed Lawson	Settlements Manager
JP Morgan	Danny Ng	Middle and Back office AD Manager
JP Morgan	Scott Oakland	Direct Custody Product Manager Australia
JP Morgan	Daniel Smith	VP, Network Management
JP Morgan	Lesley Henderson	Technology Product team
Link Group	Ian Batterham	Business Applications Architect
Link Market Services	Sue Julian	National Manager, Corporate Actions
Macquarie Group	Paul Bragg	Senior Manager Equities Clearing ANZ
Macquarie Group	Merrilyn Auton	Manager Operations
Morgans Financial	Matt Neubauer	Team Leader, Service Management Team
Morgans Financial	Ed Strike	IT Manager
Morgan Stanley	Kirsty Venters	VP, Prime Brkrng Funding & Fin Tech
Morgan Stanley	Oscar Dela Cruz	
Morgan Stanley	Andrew Fielder	
Morgan Stanley	Gordon Davies	VP/Firmwide Ops
NAB Asset Management	Suresh Chinnappa	Head of Custody Service Operations
National Stock Exchange	Lina Lim	Head of Technology
Nomura Research Institute	John Ryan	Senior Consultant
Securitease	Anton Smith	Director
Securitease	Chris Werry	Business Analyst
Share Investing	Phil Barnes	Senior Manager, Platforms
SWIFT Standards	Nicole Jolliffe	Senior APAC Standards consultant
SWIFT Standards	Mieko Morioka	Senior APAC Standards consultant
SWIFT	Chermaine Lee	SWIFT Project Coordinator
Sydney Stock Exchange	Leo Zhang	Business Analyst
Sydney Stock Exchange	Jason Shen	Market Operations Officer
UBS	Phillip Drury	Phillip Drury, Executive Director, Equities IT
UBS	Duncan Earl	Executive Director, Head of Change, UBS Group Operations
Wealthhub Securities	James Channon	Manager, Capital Markets Trading

ASX Management	
Name	Job Title
Tim Hogben	Chief Operating Officer (Chair of the Technical Committee)
Cliff Richards	Executive General Manager, Equity Post Trade Services
Karen Webb	Manager, Equity Post Trade Services
Rodd Kingham	Senior Manager, Equity Post Trade Services
Russell Eyre	Enterprise Architect
Anne-Marie Fisher-Taylor	Team Lead, Application Development

ASX Management	
Name	Job Title
Darcy Wright	Senior Business Analyst, Equity Post Trade
Priscilla Ferri de Barros	Senior Business Analyst, Equity Post Trade
Gary Hobourn	Senior Economic Analyst, Regulatory and Public Policy
Brendon Luscombe	General Manager, Product Owner, CHESS Replacement Project

APOLOGIES

MEMBERS		
Company	Name	Job Title
Australian Payments Network Limited	Andy White	Chief Operating Officer
Computershare	Paul Walton	Senior Manager, Corporate Actions & New Business Development – Investor Services
Morgan Stanley	Dorothy Wilson	Executive Director Morgan Stanley Wealth Management, ISG Technology

The meeting commenced at 3.00pm.

Agenda item 1: Agenda overview

The Chair welcomed Technical Committee members to the meeting including members attending by webinar.

The Chair outlined the Agenda for this meeting, referring to the presentation slides prepared by ASX. The agenda included an overview of the proposed forward plan of meeting topics, as outlined on slide number 3 of the ASX presentation.

Agenda item 2: Minutes from last meeting, open actions

The Chair noted that there had been no feedback on the minutes from the meeting held on 18 July 2017 and subsequently had been finalised. The minutes have been published on the ASX CHES Replacement web page.

The Chair noted the outstanding actions from the last meeting as outlined on slide number 4 and 5 from the ASX presentation.

Action item 17 was for ASX to provide further information on party identification for issuers. The Chair noted that ASX would take this off-line with registries for further discussion and would provide the outcome to the Technical Committee. **This item remains open.**

Action item 19 remains open and on hold.

Action item 20 was for ASX to provide a proposed plan for the remaining training webinars. The Chair noted that ASX was considering training closer to implementation. The Chair asked members to provide any feedback, or any specific topics for inclusion. **This item remains open.**

Action item 23 was for ASX to provide further report candidates for descoping. The Chair noted that ASX had not identified any further reports at this stage, but would come back to the next meeting with a list of the next candidates. **This item remains open.**

Action item 30 was for ASX to obtain international usage comparisons on the use of UTC time format. Members were also to provide input from international offices where possible.

The ASX Senior Business Analyst referred to slide number 8 of the ASX presentation providing an overview of comparative global implementation of date and time formats. In summary there were various methods used globally for date, and date and time. There had also been mixed feedback from members of the committee.

Referring to slide number 9 of the ASX presentation the Analyst outlined 3 key areas where there may be impact.

1. Logical date fields (based on BP12) – remains logical date but formatting change to ISO format (from yyyymmdd to yyyy-mm-dd)

2. Timestamp fields (based on BP21) - the ASX recommended that where there was a time stamp to use UTC, with zulu format (except for Trade Execution time reported by AMO)
3. Trade Execution Time (in EIS164) – Trade Date and Trade Execution Time consolidated to single ISO field in YYYY-MM-DDThh:mm:ss using local time (TBC –see below)

The ASX Senior Business Analyst did note an error on slide number 9 where “//YYMMDD” reference should be “//YYYYMMDD”.

The EIS 164 message was a special case, where there was an upstream dependency, so trade date could stay in local time. A member questioned this exceptional case, with the Analyst explaining this information was received from an upstream AMO rather than CHESSE derived data. The member asked why CHESSE couldn't convert the date, and that the participants would then have to do the conversion if CHESSE did not. The Analyst suggested using local time would help reconcile between AMO and CHESSE records. Another member asked if an AMO could provide in UTC format and was it worth asking AMOs if this was feasible, or for CHESSE to make the change before dissemination. A member asked if there was any impact on corporate action event timetable. The Analyst confirmed that wasn't the case as corporate action events included a business date rather than a processing date and time. The Chair confirmed that ASX was trying to come to an agreement on this point. A member suggested that they would be seeking consistency across messages for one format to be used, and while noting conversions were possible, consistency was preferred. That member confirmed their preference for UTC. Another member suggested this agreement had already been reached at the last meeting. The Chair sought any further objections from the committee and none were forthcoming, therefore the Chair confirmed that ASX would move ahead with use of UTC (**Action item 30 closed**), noting the further analysis required on the EIS 164 and upstream considerations. (**Matters Arising 1, Action item 38**)

Action item 31 was for members to provide further comments via MyStandards, regarding the sample consolidated (EIS 138) and rationalised (EIS 138 and 134). The Chair noted that no comments had been received to date via MyStandards. The Chair asked a general question of the committee whether ASX approach to seeking feedback/member review was effective or what else could be done. The Chair sought commitment from the group that they at least acknowledge they had reviewed, even if no specific comments. The ASX Senior Business Analyst confirmed the simplification samples were available in a different collection (called ASX_AU_EPT_Sample_Message_Review). **This item was closed.**

Action item 32 was for ASX to contact the users of the EIS 121 to confirm agreement with the recommendation to remove usage of the EIS 121. The Chair noted that HSBC had confirmed to ASX their agreement to remove EIS 121 and the recommended approach. The Chair thanked HSBC for their consideration and confirmed the recommendation would be adopted. **This item was closed.**

Action item 35 was for ASX and SWIFT to publish all final draft usage guidelines in MyStandards and highlight to members those usage guidelines that need committee member review. The Manager Equity Post Trade Services confirmed with reference to slide number 6 of the ASX presentation that to date the usage guidelines shared were all for committee review. Once ASX began to publish additional guidelines that did not necessarily need review there were a few options available to highlight that to the members – including documenting the review requirements in the description section of the collection in MyStandards, for members to refer to the date on the version label for each usage guideline, and that ASX would provide confirmation by email. **This item has been actioned and closed.**

Action item 36 was for ASX and SWIFT to provide members with details of feature in MyStandards to affirm a comment. The Manager Equity Post Trade Services confirmed with reference to slide number 7 of the ASX presentation that a member that agreed with a comment previously made by another member could leave a simple comment referencing the agreement, as demonstrated. **This item has been actioned and closed.**

The Chair again asked for feedback on the process being taken by ASX and whether a different approach should be considered. The Chair would consider how to elicit feedback from members – whether that was by survey or bilateral discussions. **(Matters Arising 2, Action item 39)**

Action item 37 was for ASX and SWIFT to provide comparisons to other market implementations of transaction ids. The ASX Senior Business Analyst briefly described the difference between event id and message id and that this would be a topic for discussion at the October meeting. **This item remains open.**

The Chair noted that a member had emailed ASX with a suggestion that a sub-group of the committee discuss the use of bespoke/unregistered messages, and use of supplementary data. The member questioned the usage or relevance of such ISO-based messages for CHES Replacement. The Chair noted this request had not been formalised and would be considered in the context of the role of the Technical Committee. The member noted that until ASX confirmed the published usage guidelines were final and not draft, it may be premature to review the guidelines. The Chair acknowledged that the analysis currently being undertaken was subject to change through the business requirement gathering process but was not irrelevant and would form an important foundation in finalising the messaging protocol.

Agenda item 3: CHES Replacement project update by ASX

The Chair invited the Executive General Manager, Equity Post Trade Services to provide an update on the CHES Replacement project. The Executive General Manager noted that the business requirement gathering working groups were progressing well, having completed 5 workshops related to corporate actions, with good discussion on improvements, problems and opportunities. 8 high level business requirements had been formed to date by the corporate actions group. The requirements were published and available on the ASX website as part of the Business Committee papers.

There had also been one meeting related to transfers and conversions with 3 draft business requirements. The next working group would commence in early September focused on settlement enhancements, with invitations and pre reading to be distributed soon. All draft requirements were published on the ASX CHES Replacement website.

The Executive General Manager referred to the 3 key aspects of the project including the technology investigation, business requirements and ISO 20022 work. The technology build (DLT) was tracking to plan based on a subset of current and enhanced CHES functionality. The delivery of software to date had been high quality with quick remedy of defects. The DLT build was also focused on non-functional aspects over the next 3 to 4 months. ASX also confirmed it would be seeking a third party security review, with outcomes to be shared with the Business Committee initially. The day 1 scope for implementation would be announced end of March 2018 with feedback on the priorities agreed by the working groups, shared with Business Committee and with additional public consultation expected on this scope. The information shared end of March would also include a plan to complete the build, integration and so on, but couldn't say how long that would be. ASX appreciates feedback from stakeholders regarding the impact on their own budgets and resources.

A member asked if the security review would be shared with stakeholders. The Executive General Manager confirmed that high level points would be shared, recognising that the review would contain sensitive information regarding security. The Chair noted that ASX had released its annual results last week, with well-received financials, but the focus of press interest continues to be on this project and the outcome of the DLT work.

Agenda item 4: ISO 20022 project update by ASX

The Chair invited the Manager, Equity Post Trade Services to provide an update on the ASX ISO 20022 stream of work. The Manager referred to slide number 11 of the ASX presentation, noting that there hadn't been a lot of mapping work in the last month as the ASX and SWIFT teams had come together for 7 days of onsite workshops in late July, early August to review progress and plan the work ahead. The workshop discussions were focused on various points noted on the slide, which were the subject of further agenda items at this meeting, and also any key items to bring to the Technical Committee as noted in the forward work plan. The Manager also noted that ASX would provide to members at the next meeting the list of messages in scope for mapping during this second half of the year. **(Matters Arising 3, Action item 40)**

Agenda item 5: Update from Business Committee

The Chair noted that in addition to the working group overview provided to the recent Business Committee by the Executive General Manager Equity Post Trade Services, that ASX had also provided an update on the Corporate Actions STP project and progress to completing Phase 2 covering the remaining corporate action events, with the aim to achieving associated benefits. ASX had not committed to a timeframe but indicated a potential 18 to 24 month duration depending on planning and resourcing. The Business Committee was also provided with an update on the activities of the Technical Committee. A member asked if the Corporate Actions STP project would be separate to CHES Replacement and what were the relative delivery timelines. The Chair noted that STP was expected to be delivered prior to CHES Replacement.

The Chair noted that a recommendation had been raised by the Business Committee to include AMO representatives in the CHES Replacement working group meetings going forward and that this had been approved by the ASX Clearing and Settlement Boards.

Agenda item 6: Matters for Consideration

a) Published usage guideline feedback

The ASX Senior Business Analyst noted that comments had been received from 4 members of the committee representing vendor, registry and participant members. No comments had been received on the sample message collection.

Referring to slide number 15 of the ASX presentation, the Analyst provided feedback on 3 common themes, noting a more detailed agenda item for this meeting on the theme of Registration Details. The Analyst provided clarity on the identification of parties in messages and the difference between receiving and delivering in respect to units, vs. the party sending and receiving the request.

With regard to securities movement type, reasonable feedback had been provided regarding the usage of RECE instead of DELI in EIS 015, noting this was not consistent with the prescribed EIS 101 equivalent usage. The field was mandatory in ISO 20022, but not part of the local data requirements so ASX was ambivalent whether it be RECE or DELI provided the usage was agreed and ideally consistent.

The Analyst provided an explanation of the Business Service values, noting this was a string of text in the BAH available to identify a service or different scenarios. ASX was yet to define its usage, but noted it would not be a list of codes but values in the string. Usage would be clear to the sender and receiver what the purpose of the message was.

b) Registration details

The ASX Senior Business Analyst provided an outline of how a holder's registration details could be captured in equivalent ISO 20022 messages, noting that ASX had proposed separating Name and Address Line elements, including a mandatory country element. Referring to slide number 16 of the ASX presentation it was noted that the ISO standard provided even more standardisation into separate street name, town name etc. fields if that was desirable. The size of these fields could also be increased to a maximum of 350 characters per name and address elements, noting the current limitations with the CHES EIS field size of 180 characters for all elements of the registration details. A future requirement had been identified by ASX to potentially include 4 joint names. Further separation of the registration details picked upon themes from the CHES Replacement transfers and conversions working group where increased validation and removing current limitation are draft requirements.

A member sought clarification with regard to the 350 characters, and ASX confirmed it was 350 for each of name and address, 700 in total. A member from a share registry noted a few points for consideration. Firstly, the current field size permitted in CHES messaging was approaching the maximum limit of a printed mailing window, and if increased would pose an issue for mailing houses. The member noted that while further structure was of interest, questioned what was the problem being resolved. This would create costs from redevelopment, cleansing and so on. The member who attended the transfers and conversions working group didn't see separation and further validation as necessarily the solution to reconciliation issues related to the content of those fields. Further, the member wasn't aware of the requirement for additional names, and that issuers had limitations on names in their constitutions. The member also asked about other holder information like bank account, TFN, email elements and that these would be useful at the point of registration.

The Analyst noted that the adoption of ISO necessitated some new mandatory fields, at least separating name and address line. The Analyst further noted that ASX had not yet constrained the field size to something less than 350 characters but that could be done. The member noted that further discussion was needed. Another member asked if there had been any consideration given to separating mailing address from registration details. The Analyst confirmed this hadn't been considered in the mapping from EIS fields but could be considered as a potential requirement.

The member representing a registry also noted that only half of accounts have an email address so that limited a move to electronic notifications to holders. Another member asked if the use of registration details including email could be rationalised across the message set and products, noting some differences for mFund where some information was mandatory without related regulatory requirements and coverage.

A member asked if there was any investigation in the DLT solution to use more electronic methods in place of paper. The Chair noted that a move to remove paper was a clear requirement from the CHES Replacement working groups.

The Chair noted that the next step should be a broader than registration details engagement with registries and mailing houses on a bilateral basis to understand the ramifications, reporting back to the next meeting. **(Matters Arising 4, Action item 41)**

c) CHES EIS 421 – securities transformation

The ASX Senior Business Analyst provided an overview of a recommendation by ASX to withdraw the EIS 421 functionality (on/off holding balance adjustment), and instead utilize 2 x the EIS 425 – one to reduce, one to increase holdings associated with a corporate action, as outlined on slide number 17 of the ASX presentation. This was because the transformation method (2 x securities in the same message) was not ISO compliant. A member representing a registry noted that this could double message volumes, particularly on mornings of a corporate action (e.g. for Medibank this could be 200,000 instead of 100,000 messages). The member also noted that based on current fee regime the issuer fees could double. The member provided statistics to the committee, noting that for their organisation approximately 60% EIS 421 used at completion of DvP and 40% EIS 425 used for retail transactions.

Another member noted that for a custodian they would like to see this usage expanded, where full confirmation of the movements would fit with business requirements drafted by the CHES Replacement working group.

The Analyst noted that there was a natural tension between the ISO best practice and implementation decisions between a single message with supplementary data or 2 related messages.

A member agreed that we should aspire to best practice, but we also knew that ISO didn't necessarily cater for the registry processes present in Australia so it was going to be a stretch.

Another member asked if the ASX recommendation would always provide both messages and how would a user know the transaction was complete. The Analyst confirmed that appropriate ack, nacks and linkages would be part of the process.

The Chair asked if it would be worthwhile to further consult with registries on this matter. The Analyst noted that it would be useful to understand registry statistics and motivations. The Chair confirmed that ASX would engage offline with share registries to further discuss the current process and recommendation. **(Matters Arising 5, Action item 42)**

d) Achieving ISO 20022 compliance

The ASX Senior Business Analyst provided an overview of ASX's process with SWIFT for ensuring the best practice adoption of ISO 20022, given there was no formal certification process, as outlined on page number 18 of the ASX presentation. CHES EIS mapping to ISO 20022 was a good fit most of the time, and if not this would be flagged as an issue by the ASX team and with the committee. The Analyst emphasised that actions such as removing optional non-mandatory elements in a message, or referencing proprietary code lists was permitted, as was the use of supplementary data if the purpose of the data and

process was in line with the intended usage of that message. Two uses were made in relation to supplementary data – as an interim measure while seeking a formal change request to the message, or to extend the base message for a local market practice that wouldn't be a candidate for a change request.

Referring to slide numbers 19 and 20, the Analyst provided statistics relevant to the first 130 CHESSEIS messages mapped to ISO in relation to the complete fit to the base messages (67%), and the use of supplementary elements, where 19% of the mapped messages only required 1 additional supplementary data element. The Analyst spoke of her comparative experience in adopting ISO 20022 in Brazil where the mapping was more problematic with a higher use of supplementary data. The Australian CHESSEIS messages were well structured and well suited to ISO 20022 mapping. The Chair suggested the overview was worthwhile to provide a market context and that supplementary data was supported in the message set. It was noted that the number of new message candidates was low and would continue to be re-tested with the guidance of the SWIFT consultants. ASX proposed to include a discussion on the new message set and design process at the next meeting, noting that by registering these messages we would be contributing to the international standard with positive outcomes.

The ASX provided 2 examples on slide numbers 21 and 22 of message design considerations that challenged the best practice model. In some cases the ISO 20022 standard could imply the splitting of an EIS message into 2 separate messages to achieve a business transaction. For example, an EIS 022 Effected Holding Adjustment contains both quantity and balance – the equivalent ISO 20022 message does not. The choice for the committee was whether to keep 1:1 mapping to EIS including all data and therefore use supplementary data (extending the purpose of the ISO message, and therefore wouldn't be a change request that the Securities Evaluation Group would approve), or to follow ISO best practice and provide the quantity and balance in two separate messages. The ASX recommendation was to maintain the 1:1 mapping with CHESSEIS, allowing for implementation considerations and lower complexity.

The second example provided an overview of a case where CHESSEIS messages provide notification of both previous and revised information in the sample message (e.g. EIS 128 and EIS 192). The equivalent ISO 20022 message only provided for revised values. The ASX recommendation was again to maintain 1:1 mapping with EIS and use supplementary data, again extending the purpose of the message. To apply best practice we would need to trim the message and rely upon look ups to related messages to achieve reconciliation.

The Chair noted that ASX was not necessarily seeking approval at this meeting and would allow members time to consider the options and provide feedback. There was a clear trade off vs. 1:1 mapping vs best practice adoption.

A representative from SWIFT noted that other market infrastructures like DTCC and SGX did use supplementary data and that it was not unusual in implementations. Noting that implementation should be conscious of not going against the intention of the message, but to use a pragmatic approach. Global standards do allow for global interoperability though.

A member noted that the balance information was very useful for reconciliation. The Chair agreed that we didn't want to lose the benefits associated with this information and that perhaps Australia was ahead of the global curve in some areas. We should recognise that our market does have unique and attractive features. Another member agreed that not every market is the same, and we should respect the Australian market is different and carry forward the good functionality.

e) Usage guidelines for review

The Chair asked members to consider the information on slide number 23 in their own time. The ASX Senior Business Analyst has earlier noted New Usage Guidelines were being published for Conversion, Part Settlement and some demand Transfer events – 10 in all.

Agenda item 7: Next meeting

The Chair summarised the key action items from the meeting and noted that draft minutes from the meeting would be circulated to members for review.

The Chair confirmed that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday 10 October in Sydney, and otherwise by webinar. Details would be provided to members.

The Chair noted the planned agenda for the 10 October meeting as outlined on slide number 30 of the ASX presentation, including a list of the usage guidelines to be published by ASX for review by committee members (per Agenda item 6e).

The Chair also proposed that the meeting scheduled in November be held in Melbourne.

The Chair thanked members for their input, and for participating in the meeting. The meeting closed at 5.05pm.

Signed as a correct record of the meeting.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'A. Smith', written over a horizontal line.

Technical Committee Chair

A handwritten date in blue ink, '22 SEPTEMBER 2017', written over a horizontal line.

Date

ACTION ITEMS

No.	Meeting Date	Open Action Items	Owner	Due Date
17	14 March 2017	Provide further information on party identification for issuers – UIC or BIC and proposed process.	ASX	10 October 2017
19	2 May 2017	Provide sample of demonstration of comparison between ISO 20022 and ISO 15022 messages.	Scott Oakland, JPM	On hold
20	2 May 2017	Provide details of a proposed plan including potential topics for the remaining training webinars for feedback, standard training provided by SWIFT, and including identification of business vs. technical topics.	ASX	On hold
23	2 May 2017	Further review of the ASX CHES demand reporting summary and responses to questions contained in that summary. ASX to continue review of reports and provide further candidates for descope at meetings.	Members / ASX	10 October 2017
37	18 July 2017	Provide comparisons to other market implementations of transaction ids.	ASX, SWIFT	22 August 2017
38	22 Aug 2017	Review consistency of the application of UTC date, date and time, zulu format, and add item to upstream/downstream considerations log re the use of UTC for Trade Date confirmations from AMOs (with flow on impact to EIS 164 equivalent).	ASX	10 October 2017
39	22 Aug 2017	Chair to contact members seeking feedback on the approach of the Technical Committee, any suggestions to improve the process.	ASX	10 October 2017
40	22 Aug 2017	Provide list of CHES EIS messages in scope for detailed mapping during 2 nd half of 2017, including identification of descoped messages.	ASX	10 October 2017
41	22 Aug 2017	Conduct bilateral discussions with share registries and mailing houses regarding structuring of registration details and associated static data.	ASX	10 October 2017
42	22 Aug 2017	Conduct bilateral discussions with share registries regarding current holding balance	ASX	10 October 2017

No.	Meeting Date	Open Action Items	Owner	Due Date
		changes associated with corporate actions and proposed withdrawal of EIS 421.		

No.	Meeting Date	Closed Action Items	Owner	Closed Date
1	13 December 2016	Amend the Charter to reflect that the Chair “will” (instead of “may”) forward copies of the minutes to the Business Committee for endorsement. ASX to publish and distribute final Charter.	ASX	13 December 2016
2	13 December 2016	Provide members with information on how to access SWIFT MyStandards.	ASX	14 March 2017
3	13 December 2016	Provide members with an overview of ISO 20022 training options.	ASX/SWIFT	7 February 2017
4	7 February 2017	Provide members with list of current scope of messages for detailed mapping during first half 2017.	ASX	14 March 2017
5	7 February 2017	Schedule training webinar for the attendance by members and seek and review feedback after the initial webinar.	ASX / SWIFT	14 March 2017
6	7 February 2017	Add link to relevant ISO 20022 information websites to the CHES Replacement web page.	ASX	14 March 2017
7	7 February 2017	Provide more details on access to online education available at swift.com.	SWIFT	14 March 2017
8	7 February 2017	Provide members with the current list of Market Identification Codes (MICs)	ASX	14 March 2017
9	7 February 2017	Provide members with more information on the use of BIC vs. UIC as the party identification code.	ASX / SWIFT	14 March 2017
10	7 February 2017	Market Operators to advise the preferred MIC to be presented in trade related messages as the “Place of Trade”.	ASX, Chi-X, NSX, SSX	6 June 2017
11	7 February 2017	ASX to conduct analysis on whether the identification of a financial instrument is a fixed value or true value of the proprietary code issuer.	ASX	14 March 2017

No.	Meeting Date	Closed Action Items	Owner	Closed Date
12	7 February 2017	Provide list of proposed code (i.e. condition or BOM) in ISO 20022 format (4 character) mapped against CHES codes.	ASX	14 March 2017
13	7 February 2017	Add a general CHES Replacement update to the standing agenda for meetings.	ASX	14 March 2017
14	7 February 2017	Check the next Technical Committee meeting date planned for March and advise members of any change.	ASX	14 March 2017
15	14 March 2017	Schedule future agenda item to discuss transition arrangements, including any changed values (e.g. party identifiers).	ASX	2 May 2017
16	14 March 2017	Create register of matters that may impact upstream, downstream systems or processes, including codes, identifiers and ISO 15022.	ASX	2 May 2017
18	14 March 2017	ASX to draft procedures for change requests to usage guidelines and code lists.	ASX	2 May 2017
21	2 May 2017	Provide a list of standard training topics to share. Noted this action item is combined with action item 20.	SWIFT	6 June 2017
22	2 May 2017	Provide members with a copy of the presentation material from the trial training webinar held on 27 April 2017.	ASX	6 June 2017
24	2 May 2017	Resolve issue with Comments function on MyStandards and advise members when fixed.	ASX/SWIFT	6 June 2017
25	2 May 2017	Provide samples of the proposed consolidation and rationalisation scenarios for EIS 138 and EIS 134.	ASX	6 June 2017
26	2 May 2017	Provide proposal to broaden the engagement and method to seek feedback on key concepts such as consolidation/rationalisation.	ASX	6 June 2017
27	6 June 2017	Publish list of comments received on MyStandards with ASX responses regularly, around the time of each meeting.	ASX	18 July 2017
28	6 June 2017	Re-publish ISO 20022 equivalent of EIS 138 with corrected default value INFO for issuer of financial instrument code.	ASX	18 July 2017
29	6 June 2017	Review EIS 102 mapped equivalent message with Scott Oakland, JPM – optional inclusion of HIN.	ASX	18 July 2017
33	6 June 2017	Provide a presentation of CHES EIS mapping to ISO 20022, and typical ISO 20022 flows to assist committee discussion of key topics (e.g.	ASX	18 July 2017

No.	Meeting Date	Closed Action Items	Owner	Closed Date
		rationalisation, consolidation, descope of certain processes like allegement modify). ASX would also seek input from key members about the best process going forward.		
34	6 June 2017	Add the overview of transaction ids to the July meeting agenda.	ASX	18 July 2017
31	6 June 2017	Sample consolidated (EIS 138) and rationalised (EIS 138 and 134) messages published in the MyStandards community – in a separate collection “Sample Message Review”. Members to review and provide further comments via MyStandards, email.	Members	22 August 2017
32	6 June 2017	For Cancel/Correct & Modify, ASX recommendation revised to only do cancel/correct for bilateral modifications (and not allow modify – removal of EIS 121). ASX to contact users of EIS 121, and action remains open until all members confirmed their agreement with the recommendation.	ASX, Members	22 August 2017
30	6 June 2017	Obtain international usage comparisons on the use of UTC time format. Members to provide input from international offices where possible.	ASX, members	22 August 2017
35	18 July 2017	ASX to publish all final draft usage guidelines in MyStandards and highlight to members those usage guidelines that need their review. SWIFT to advise if a flag is available in MyStandards to indicate particular review items.	ASX, SWIFT	22 August 2017
36	18 July 2017	Provide members with details of feature in MyStandards to affirm a comment.	ASX, SWIFT	22 August 2017