

**Cost Basis Steering Committee Meeting
Minutes**

January 17, 2012, Noon – 2 p.m.

I. Approval of January 10, 2012 Meeting Minutes

- The committee approved the minutes as written.

II. Issues discussed

- The committee revisited the discussion of the processing of records for ‘CBRS only’ accounts. There are some accounts on the CBRS Master File that are set up as ‘CBRS-only.’ For example:

CBRS #	Type	CBRS Account Name	Firm Account ID	Firm Account Type	CBRS Account Start Date	Exempt Recipient
0000A19Y	CBRACT	USAA TRANSFER AGENCY COMPANY			1/2/2012	N

It would be helpful if the Type CBRACT and the CBRS account number could be repeated in the ‘Firm Account ID’ and ‘Firm Account Type’ fields, or to place the ‘Firm Account Type’ in the ‘Type’ field...either way, the solution should involve having only one Type on the Master File. Lydia will discuss this solution with her development group, and report back to the committee about timing.

- The committee discussed adding a best practice to the current cost field for noncovered average cost mutual fund lots. Lydia will add the following text to the record layouts:
“For a noncovered average cost position with at least one lot with unknown basis, populate this field with the actual current cost for each lot with known basis.”
- The committee revisited the discussion of passing cost basis in the event of a conversion where one broker has gone out of business, and its accounts have been transferred to a new firm. It is possible to add an additional field, tentatively called ‘Alternate ID number’ so the new firm can indicate that it has assumed the out-of-business broker’s accounts. [For example, Broker 456 goes out of business, and all of its accounts have moved to Broker 123. Broker 123 would instruct DTCC to add number “456” to this ‘Alternative ID Number’ field. As a result, CBRS users looking to send cost basis to Broker 456 would know to send the records to Broker 123.] This proposed functionality includes the ability to add multiple ID numbers. When designing this functionality, the committee may want to keep in mind the eighteen month window during which a financial intermediary needs to send corrected cost basis, as applicable. This functionality may not be useful in all situations, such as when two firms assume the business of the out-of-business firm. While it may not eliminate the problem, this functionality will help to reduce exceptions. Lydia will continue to have internal discussions with how this functionality would work, and will report back to the committee.
- Lydia confirmed with the committee that the “Exchange Rate” field in the Tax Lot Input record layout corresponds to the amount in the Tax Lot Current Cost field. She will change the comments in the record layout to reflect this. The new comment will read, “Spot exchange rate used for converting the Tax Lot Current Cost as of the acquisition date of the tax lot.”

III. Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 24, 2012, Noon – 2 PM eastern

Parking Lot

1. **Should the Receiver Customer Account Number be required for Conversions?**
2. **“Exchange Rate” field:** Do we need to specify that this is the exchange rate for the Tax Lot Current Cost? Do we need another field for the exchange rate for the Tax Lot Original Cost? Would new fixed income cost fields (e.g. OID, bond premium) need exchange rates also?
3. **Enhancement for Exempt Recipient Accounts Indicator.** Provide three categories on the master file, from which a user could choose what kind of basis it wants to receive. Categories: 1) send all basis; 2) send everything except retirement accounts; 3) send no non-covered accounts (CBRS could systematically edit to this option). The committee will revisit this issue after the existing version of the Exempt Recipient Accounts Indicator has been in place for a few months; and after committee members have had the opportunity to research the issue and quantify the cost of records sent and received for non-covered non-retirement accounts.
4. **How should Transaction Type 06 = Other Depository Deliveries (e.g. FED) be used?** What fields should be required for this type? What fields need additional rules for this type? What fields need Best Practices for this type?
5. **Default format for Transfer Control Number for foreign asset transfers (Transaction Type 06 = Other Depository Deliveries).** There are two proposed formats for TCN for foreign asset transfers: Julian date (3 bytes) + sequence number (3 bytes) + CUSIP (9 bytes) + deliverer account number (15 bytes) [or receiver account number if deliverer account number is not available]; or the “D format” follows the format below:
 - Position 1: ‘D’ = Direct Transfer Indicator
 - Position 2-5: NSCC Participant Number for the Fund
 - Position 6: Last Digit of Current Year
 - Position 7-9: Julian Date
 - Position 10-15: Unique Number (randomly-generated, sequential)A primary difference in these formats is their length: the ‘D’ format is 15 bytes, the first format (‘Kevin’s format’) is 30 bytes. How will deliverer/receiver agree on the TCN?
6. **Remove Purchase/Dividend Reinvestment Indicator?**
7. **How should Transaction Type 07 = Physical Movement Settlement be used?** Fields that may be used for Transaction Type 07 = Physical Movement Settlement: Transfer Control Number; Alternate Control Number; Receiver/Deliverer Customer Account Number; Asset Category: require certain types?; Date Transfer was Initiated/Settlement Date of Transfer; Noncovered/Pending Indicator; Acquisition Date of Tax Lot; Tax Lot Current Cost/Tax Lot Original Cost [9/27/2011: this issue has been designated as lower priority. The security types applicable to this transaction type are not currently covered by the regulations.]

Future enhancements (agreed upon by the Committee)

1. When the wash sale date is populated, it would always be equal or earlier than the acquisition date.
2. Add an edit that says Tax Lot Current Cost cannot be unknown if the lot is covered.

3. Add the ACATS asset sequence number to the Asset Input record. Required for transaction type 01 = ACATS; and required for all record content indicator types (original, corrected, firm reject, request).
4. New exchange rate field on the Tax Lot record corresponding to the Fair Market Value (FMV) of the Date of Gift.
5. The Deliverer Customer Account Number should be required for Transaction Type 04 = Conversions.
6. The following fields should be required for request records (they are currently conditional):
 - Option fields (required only for Asset Category = OPT): Put/call indicator; Symbol; Expiration Date; Strike Price Integer; Strike Price Decimal
 - Asset Category
 - Total Position Quantity
 - Position Code
7. Add an edit that the Deliverer Customer Account Number and Receiver Customer Account Number should be required for Transaction Type 56 = Networking Transaction. [Note: this requirement will be included in the year-end 2012 release.]

Closed Parking Lot issues

1. Which value is more important, the ACATS Asset Sequence Number, or the CUSIP? Closed 11/29/2011. On 11/29/2011, the committee discussed the question, if the ACATS Asset Sequence Number does not match the CUSIP on the CBRS record, which data element should the contra party use? The group decided that the ACATS Asset Sequence Number is the value to use in this case.
2. Should CBRACK be a valid firm type for other transaction types? Closed 09/20/2011. From minutes: Earlier this year a firm asked to join CBRS as a CBRS-only user to pass basis on ACATS transactions. CBRS does not allow type CBRACK to pass basis on an ACATS transaction, so this firm did not pursue this option. However, this situation led to the question of whether CBRACK should be a valid submitting/contra type for more transactions than it is currently valid for today. The committee discussed this issue, and decided against making CBRACK a valid type for additional transactions: allowing CBRS-only users to submit/receive for additional transaction types may cause more breaks. If an issue arises in the future for a specific CBRS user, the committee can revisit the issue at that time. For now the issue will be moved to the “Closed Parking Lot Issues” list.
3. Should the Deliverer Customer Account Number be required for all transactions? Closed 09/20/2011. The committee agreed on a Best Practice where if the receiver of the asset provides the Deliverer Customer Account Number on the asset transfer, the submitter of the CBRS record should provide it in CBRS. The number should not be required in CBRS: it will not always be available, and there are times when the submitter of the CBRS record is not willing to provide it. This issue is now closed, and will be moved to the “Closed Parking Lot Issues” list.
4. Mutual funds passing cost basis on 01 = ACATS transactions for fund-controlled assets. Closed 09/28/2011. The committee discussed that this is a problem related to a low volume of transfers. Various service bureaus are making changes to prevent firms from transferring mutual funds that are Level 4, fund-controlled assets, which will help to reduce the potential for a firm to receive cost basis from both a firm and a fund. There may be changes to

ACATS-Fund/SERV files to help address this issue as well. Groups outside the Steering Committee are working on this issue, so this is a closed issue for this committee._

5. User CUSIP issue part 3, adding ACATS sequence number to CBRS record. Closed 10/04/2011. The committee agreed to add the ACATS sequence number to the CBRS record.
6. New fields needed to support the passing of cost basis on a gift denominated in a foreign currency. Closed 10/11/2011. The committee agreed to add this new field to the requirements for future CBRS enhancements: CBRS needs a new exchange rate field corresponding to the Fair Market Value (FMV) of the Date of Gift. A new currency code field is not necessary.
7. Best Practice about how to populate the deliverer/receiver customer account numbers for mutual fund transfers. Closed 11/08/2011. This question came about as the result of a discussion on the CBRS Working Group call. The question has not come up again, so this issue is currently closed. If customers revive the question, Lydia will bring up the issue again.