RESTRICTED

Feedback to consultation paper

Document Title	T2S Consultation Paper: Principles and High Level Proposals	
Document Reference	070323_note_ConsultPrincipalsProposals_v0.98.doc	
Issued for review	26.04.2007	
Deadline for review	27.06.2007	

Proposal Nr.	Statement	Comment	Institution	Confidential
	1 I agree	In this context support of the end-investor account structure is considered as	ESBG	No
		important to a level playing field.		
	2 I agree	It is essential that sub-accounts dedicated to securities can be used.	ESBG	No
	3 I agree		ESBG	No
	4 I agree		ESBG	No
	5 I agree		ESBG	No
	6 I do not agree entirely	Users who maintain accounts with 2 or more CSDs must be able to consolidate their securities positions	ESBG	No
	7 I agree		ESBG	No
	8 I agree	It is noted that this proposal is high-level, and that the different roles still need to be precisely defined.	ESBG	No
	9 I agree		ESBG	No
1	0 I agree	It is noted that the account structure will be the object of a dedicated market consultation at a later stage.	ESBG	No
1	1 I do not agree entirely	The reference data is required not only for settlement and auto-collaterization, but also for all account management tasks to be performed by a participant	ESBG	No
1	2 I agree		ESBG	No
1	3 I agree		ESBG	No
1	4 I agree		ESBG	No
1	5 I agree		ESBG	No
1	6 I agree		ESBG	No
1	7 I agree		ESBG	No
1	8 I do not agree entirely	We would submit that Proposal 18 is beyond the scope of T2S - notably as recalled under Principle 3	ESBG	No
19	9 I agree		ESBG	No
	0 I agree	It is recommended to make paragraph 2 ("Harmonization of opening hours is a precondition for equal treatment of CSDs") a distinct Proposal, as it is a critical matter.	ESBG	No

RESTRICTED

Proposal Nr.	Statement	Comment	Institution	Confidential
21	I agree	It is assumed at this stage that the processes that will support night-time settlement will be the object of a separate consultation. Also see comment on Proposal 23 below.		No
	I agree		ESBG	No
	I do not agree entirely	Having several CSDs not offering night-time settlement is likely to create a sub- optimal situation for the market as a whole, not only for the users of these CSDs. Therefore any CSD's decision not to offer night-settlement should be the result of a wide and transparent user consultation process.	ESBG	No
	I agree	Domestic and internal cross-border deadlines must not differ.	ESBG	No
	I agree		ESBG	No
	I agree		ESBG	No
27	I agree		ESBG	No
28	I do not agree entirely	Users should have the possibility to enter new instructions also throughout the night (except of course for maintenance windows)	ESBG	No
29	I agree		ESBG	No
30	I do not agree entirely	A process for gradually bringing all matching into T2S should be defined with the market	ESBG	No
31	I do not agree entirely	A governance and a process for maintaining the "ECSDA Report" must be defined and agreed with market participants	ESBG	No
32	I agree		ESBG	No
33	I do not agree entirely	See remark to Proposal 31	ESBG	No
34	I agree		ESBG	No
35	I do not agree entirely	Instructions should be enriched prior to matching being attempted. Once matched no enrichment should take place.	ESBG	No
36	I agree	•	ESBG	No
	I do not agree entirely	A functionality allowing for chaining, linking, blocking as well as unblocking should be provided as well.	ESBG	No
38	I agree		ESBG	No
39	I do not agree entirely	Where (paragraph 2) specific functionalities are provided (such as imposed by different legal set-ups) their effect must be the same, and the playing field not distorted.	ESBG	No
40	I agree		ESBG	No
41	I agree		ESBG	No
	I agree		ESBG	No
	I agree		ESBG	No
	I agree	We expect the algorithm to be the object of a consultation at a later stage.	ESBG	No
	I agree	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ESBG	No
	I agree		ESBG	No
	I agree		ESBG	No

RESTRICTED

Proposal Nr.	Statement	Comment	Institution	Confidential
_	48 I do not agree entirely		ESBG	No
		of instructions and the type of risks of the underlying asset. For some a deadline		
		should be set after which recycling will not be attempted any longer. We would		
		expect this matter to be the object of a specific consultation at a later stage.		
		J		
	49 I agree		ESBG	No
	50 I agree		ESBG	No
	51 I do not agree entirely	Whilst we fully support Principle 12, we'd require additional views as to how the	ESBG	No
		Eurosystem envisions to prevent that the provision of cross-border links to non-		
		participating CSDs results in a disincentive for CSDs to join.		
	52 I do not agree entirely	A minima user interfaces must also allow for viewing their consolidated securities and	ESBG	No
		cash positions		
	53 I agree		ESBG	No
	54 I agree		ESBG	No
	55 I do not agree entirely	Beyond the technical consideration contained in this Proposal, it is essential that	ESBG	No
		transparent and as harmonized as possible criteria are established for users to access		
		T2S directly. The process and governance for maintaining these criteria should be		
		facilitated by the Eurosystem.		
	56 I agree	See also remark to Proposal 28 above.	ESBG	No
	57 I do not agree entirely	Users must have unrestricted access to reports and information throughout the T2S	ESBG	No
		operating cycles.		
	58 I agree		ESBG	No
	59 I agree		ESBG	No
	60 I do not agree entirely	We would need to understand the assumptions leading to such figure, which	ESBG	No
		flexibility for growth or contraction the system will allow without re-engineering, and		
		whether this figure takes into account market structure and evolution beyond 2013.		
	61 I do not agree entirely	Same remark as above	ESBG	No
	62 I agree	Builte Tellidik do doove	ESBG	No
	63 I agree		ESBG	No
	64 I agree		ESBG	No
	65 I agree		ESBG	No
	66 I do not agree entirely	The working assumption would be that migration will be infrastructure by	ESBG	No
	ao not agree entirery	infrastructure. However this assumption must be validated through further analysis. It		
		will be necessary to take into consideration progress made by local markets and		
		National Central Banks, and avoid distortions. It is too early for a conclusion on this		
		matter.		
	67 I do not agree entirely		ESBG	No
	or it do not agree entitlery	it is recommended to consider upprying the user pays principle to functionalities	2020	110