**Consultation Document on Corporate Actions and Data History in the Global LEI System**

**Annex 1: Questionnaire for the public**

Please type your answers into the attached questionnaire and send it to leiroc@bis.org by COB 29 September 2017. Where possible, please specify the reasons for the preferences expressed or the details of any trade-offs you see.

The responses to the questionnaire will be shared within the ROC membership and with the GLEIF. **Unless participants check the box below, responses will also be made public on the LEI ROC website**. If participants check the box, neither participants’ identity nor any specifically identified reference to their opinion will be made public without their express consent. However, the responses themselves may be quoted or aggregated on an anonymised basis. A standard confidentiality statement in an email message or requests for confidential treatment other than the box below will not be treated as a request for non-disclosure.

|  |
| --- |
| **Identification of the respondent and confidentiality** |
| **Respondent: LEI DB AddIn**  **Name and email of a contact person: Johan Hol – johan@leidbaddin.com**  **Please check this box if you object to the publication of your responses to this questionnaire.** |
| *Please specify here as needed if there are specific response(s) that should not be quoted:* |
| **Question 1: Have any important corporate actions that may affect the ownership, legal perimeter or material composition of an entity and/or the reference or relationship data in the GLEIS been omitted from Table 1?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  The most important corporate actions are covered in Table 1. You may think of adding ‘Delisting’ as another corporate actions and treat it in the same way as bankruptcy and liquidation |
| **Question 2: How would you rank the priority in the context of the GLEIS of the proposed corporate actions in Table 1?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  The most important are the corporate actions that have a direct impact on the LEI Level1 ánd Level 2 data: (de)mergers, acquisitions, (reverse) takeover etc. |
| **Question 3: Do the changes described in Table 1 sufficiently characterize the effects of the corporate actions on the GLEIS reference and relationship data? Please note any additional unique data needs not already reflected in the table that would help to identify or verify each action. What would you like to see as an end-user of the data?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  As an end user I’d like to see the final effect of the corporate actions. In case of e.g. a reverse take over I don’t have to see the ‘1 minute change’. |
| * **Question 4: Feedback is sought on the questions raised in Table 1:**   **a) Proposal to (i) provide a history of data record changes due to corporate events and actions that can easily be searched by end-users of the GLEIS and (ii) add to the LEI reference data the effective date of the change for cases 1, 2, 3, 8, 12, 13, 15 and 17 (name change, trading name change, change of legal address and headquarters address, demerger/spinoff, transformation of an international branch into a subsidiary, transformation of subsidiary into an international branch, dissolution of an entity, and umbrella fund changing its legal structure to a stand-alone fund).**  **b) Proposal to facilitate the retrieval of predecessor entities for cases 4 and 5 (mergers).**  **c) Whether an indicator of a spinoff relationship should be added in case 8.**  **d) Two options to address a demerger/spinoff as described in case 9 as either (i) a combination of two corporate actions (demerger/spinoff and acquisition) or (ii) a spinoff relationship between two entities.**  **e) Whether a spinoff relationship should be recorded when legally indistinct sub-entities are bought/sold as described in case 10.**  **f) Whether a specific data element should be added to signal that an entity is under liquidation as described in case 14.**  **g) Whether in the case of a breakup as described in case 16 the two entities resulting from the breakup should appear as successor entities, or whether the GLEIS should seek to identify a main successor, and apply a spinoff relationship to the other entity.** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  In general: having easy access to history of data (not only corporate events and actions) is very useful and will be an improvement of the GLEIS. Adding data element to distinguish between corporate actions is also a plus.  Regarding the effective date: the field itself will add value, but there should be a maximum number of days between the effective date of the corporate action and the first date this corporate action will be reflected in the GLEIS. For regulatory reporting purposes this should be limited to 5-10 days after the corporate action, otherwise it will be difficult for e.g. insurers to include possibly LEI changes in their Solvency II reporting. |
| **Question 5: What is the best approach for the GLEIS to address complex mergers where there is a meaningful question about which entity is the survivor? Should there be some element of flexibility or choice, or should there be strict rules around how such actions are processed and reflected in the reference and relationship data?** |
| *Please insert your response here:* In this case I expect that there is one standard set by LEI ROC/GLEIF that cover those complex mergers. |
| **Question 6: To what extent should the GLEIS track spinoffs of business lines? Which entity is best placed to report a spinoff relationship?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  If the spinoff results in a new LEI it will already be included in GLEIS in the current situation.  Tracking spinoffs of business lines is a ‘nice to have’. |
| **Question 7: What concept of materiality, if any, should be considered relevant for reporting spinoffs? Should the GLEIS capture all publicly verifiable spinoffs regardless of materiality, or is there a minimum materiality threshold that could reasonably be established and objectively measured? Should spinoff reporting be optional?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  All publicly verifiable spinoffs should be reported in GLEIS and the ones that are the most material should be reported closer to the effective date than the minor ones. |
| **Question 8: Should the ROC define an explicit policy on when an entity should be treated as “the same” over time, should it accept the decision of official sources in the country of the legal address of the entity, or something else? What do you see as the relative advantages and disadvantages of these options?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  The ROC should accept the decision of official sources, but if these sources don’t see an entity as ‘the same’ then there should also be a change in LEI code |
| **Question 9: Would the clarifications above concerning the use of the “inactive” entity status and “retired” registration status be appropriate? Do you have examples of cases where jurisdictions officially categorize legally existing entities as inactive, and if so, what source(s) could be used to validate this status?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  Yes, those classifications are appropriate. |
| **Question 10: Do the benefits of collecting actual dates of changes in relevant entity attributes, legal perimeter or material composition (“effective dates”) outweigh the costs? Are there important use cases that would not be possible if effective dates are not available in the LEI data?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  It depends on the time between the effective date and the date that these data is available in GLEIS. If it’s only a couple of days it won’t add much value. However, as said before it only adds value if the data is available within a short timeframe after the effective date. Otherwise those changes can’t be included in e.g. regulatory filings. |
| **Question 11: Should the GLEIS develop a comprehensive model for history of entity data as well as for the history of the entity and its relationships? If so, what is the preferred means of expressing such a structure?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  I prefer GLEIS developing such a centralized model and like to have the possibility to track changes on a detailed level.  Now I can see when a LEI record was last updated, but I can’t see with fields has been changed. |
| **Question 12: What user requirements would you foresee for a system to search and view historical entity data? Is there any approach to presenting entity history to end-users, whether in the public or private sector, that you can point to as an “industry standard” or one that implements “good practices”?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  For end-users it should be very simple to access and use the data. I don’t see much added value in a full download of all data as there’s for the current Level1 and Level2 data.  However, within the LEI records itself (online forms) it would be great to have hyperlinks that show historical data. As an example I’d like to refer to the European Rating Platform of ESMA. (https://registers.esma.europa.eu/publication/searchRegister?core=esma\_registers\_radar) |
| **Question 13: What do you see as the pros and cons of the proposed approach to leveraging corporate action data feeds? What sources (both public and private/commercial) would you recommend or not recommend?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  I agree that it can be very complicated to get such data feeds. My recommendation is that every entity that has an LEI has an obligation to report corporate actions to their LOU as well. |
| **Question 14: In cases where an entity has ceased to exist without reporting that information to the GLEIS, what would be the appropriate alternative sources and methods to capture this information? Are there ways to incentivize the prompt reporting by the entity to the LOU of other corporate actions, as foreseen in the Global LEI System, to maintain high quality reference data and data history?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  With the GLEIS being available for everyone at no cost, the entities could also benefit themselves have access to up-to-date entity data of their customers, suppliers, competitors etc. That in itself should already be a good incentive. If you apply for or renew the LEI every entity should accept that they have to report all relevant corporate actions going forward; if they refuse to accept then they will lose their LEI. |
| **Question 15: How timely should the GLEIS attempt to be in capturing information on corporate actions affecting the legal perimeter or material composition of an entity?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  With corporate actions taking place close to reporting period ends, data should be available as soon as possible, at least within a week after the corporate event. |
| **Question 16: What should the standard be for validating spinoffs? Where external validation is not possible, what should be the possibility of using entity-provided information?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  The standard should be information provided by the entity(ies) themselves, so either regulatory filings or financial statements. However, data should already be available before it has been validated (see Q15) |
| **Question 17: Are there any alternative approaches that are not outlined in this paper that would be necessary to support the long-term collection and maintenance of corporate actions on the LEI reference and relationship data and entity history?** |
| *Please insert your response here:*  If possible, try to get the collecting of data in line with the Level2 Data and urge entities to update their data asap. |
| **Question 18: What other input should the ROC consider with respect to the framework presented in this consultation paper?** |
| *Please insert your response here:* |
| **Question 19: Are you aware of any confidentiality or legal prohibitions that may impact the collection of corporate action information in the GLEIS? If so, please describe them in as much detail as possible?** |
| *Please insert your response here:* |