

Domestic CSD WG (CSD DDQ subgroup)

03 August 2026 Teams Call

Meeting Minutes

Participants (in attendance in bold):

▪ Julia	McKenny	ISSA, PMD
▪ Julie	Huxford	ISSA, PMD
▪ Fraser	Moodie	Australian Securities Exchange ASX
▪ Adeyinka	Shonekan	CSCS PLC
▪ Kenneth	Woo	CMU OmniClear Limited
▪ Lavinia	Gheorghe	Depozitarul Central S.A.
▪ Ahmed	Marzouk	Egyptian Central Securities Depository
▪ Sohayla	Ezzat	Egyptian Central Securities Depository
▪ Tarek	Khorshid	Egyptian Central Securities Depository
▪ Matthew	Pallett	Euroclear
▪ Jiahua	Liu	Macao Central Securities Depository and Clearing Limited
▪ Gemma	Campbell	NZX
▪ Catherine	Tinavapi	Standard Chartered Bank
▪ Esther	Chen	Standard Chartered Bank
▪ Palesa	Banda	Standard Bank
▪ Jim	Micklethwaite	Thomas Murray Network Management Ltd

Meeting purpose

Monthly meeting of Domestic CSD WG subgroup to catch up on status / tracking on review of CSD DDQ questionnaires (including AFME, AGC), with a particular emphasis on determination of the appropriate Questionnaire for CSDs.

Discussion

Overview

The meeting focused on reviewing and validating an AI-assisted methodology for consolidating multiple source questionnaires into a single, traceable requirements framework for a future due diligence questionnaire. Discussion centered on the structure, quality, and governance of the consolidation process, the treatment of overlapping and unique requirements, and the mechanisms for maintaining traceability and working group oversight. The group also considered stakeholder engagement, future review activities, and the role of emerging topics such as AI and cybersecurity within the evolving framework.

Key updates

- **Stakeholder Engagement and AI Enablement:** Julia and Jim discussed upcoming engagement with industry groups and outlined a vision for using AI capabilities to help organizations automatically populate questionnaire responses. Concerns were raised about questionnaire scale, with reference to prior surveys containing more than 750 questions, and the group agreed that supporting tools would be necessary if a large questionnaire emerges (although this is not the intent).
- **Data Sharing Considerations:** Julia and Jim discussed longstanding concerns about data sharing and third-party access, particularly raised by Monica Singer and the WFC, and agreed that these issues must be addressed directly as part of the AI-driven solution. The outcome was recognition that data-sharing expectations must be addressed directly as part of future industry discussions.

- **Stakeholder Communication:** Julia emphasized the need to gauge current comfort levels with third-party data access among WFC members and others, and to communicate transparently about the necessity and safeguards of the new approach.
- **Questionnaire Consolidation Methodology:** Julie presented an AI-assisted process that analyzed AFME, AGC, PFMI, and WFC source materials, extracted common requirements, removed duplication, and preserved full traceability back to original questions. The resulting framework captures requirements rather than questionnaire wording in the current Phase and provides an auditable mapping between source content and consolidated outputs.
- **Requirements Register and Traceability:** Julie explained that approximately 350 AFME questions were reduced to 152 consolidated requirement records through grouping and deduplication, with mappings maintained to AFME, AGC, PFMI, and WFC sources. The outcome was creation of a requirements register designed to support future questionnaire generation while ensuring no source material is lost.
- **Validation and Governance Controls:** Julie described validation processes that cross-checked requirement mappings in both directions and instructed the AI to record uncertainties rather than make decisions. This approach produced approximately 35 open issues that have been consolidated into around eight thematic Working Group decisions that now require human review.

Working Group Decision Framework: Julie reviewed the decision summary process, where a small number of policy decisions can resolve multiple related issues across the consolidated framework. The agreed next step is for the WG subgroup to review and document decisions, which will then be fed back into the AI process for consistent application and regeneration of requirements.

- **Industry Outreach and Governance Participation:** Julia reported expanded engagement with AFME, AGC, and WFC stakeholders and noted that the team is seeking broad industry input on the initiative. The plan remains to present the WG work at the WFC meeting in mid-October. Julia suggested that the Co-chairs in the next WG DDQ subgroup discussion be called upon to provide direction, and Adeyinka agreed to reconnect with Catherine and support preparation for future WG subgroup discussions. It was noted that the detailed review will remain within the DDQ subgroup before wider dissemination.
- **Gap Analysis and Scope Review:** Jim questioned whether the source questionnaires contained requirements unrelated to CSDs and whether important topics were missing. Julie confirmed that AFME-only content had been identified for later review however the group agreed to retain all questions for traceability during the initial phase, with plans to consciously remove or update outdated or non-CSD-specific content in later stages.
- **Emerging Risk Topics:** Jim and Julia identified AI governance, modern cybersecurity requirements, and asset-servicing activities as areas that may not be fully represented in the existing source materials. The outcome was agreement that additional requirement families or enhancements may be required in further AI iterations of the framework.
- **Long-Term Vision Beyond Traditional Questionnaires:** Jim expressed skepticism about questionnaires as an end-state solution. He argued that the real objective is obtaining risk information and assurances, not collecting answers to large numbers of individually worded questions. He suggested that organizations could instead provide structured information once, allowing technology to satisfy information requirements without repeated questionnaires. While recognizing this vision may be further in the future, he viewed Julie's requirements-based approach as a significant step toward that model.
- **Future Questionnaire Design Strategy:** As above, Jim emphasized reducing reliance on large questionnaires and focusing instead on core information requirements, while Julie noted that AI-enabled document and evidence collection could ultimately support that objective. The group agreed that the current deliverable is a traceable consolidation framework, with future work required to remove unnecessary questions, add missing content, and develop a practical end-state model.

Follow up actions

Julie confirmed that the next steps involve sharing the spreadsheet and documentation with the wider subgroup, collecting feedback, and workshopping at further scheduled meetings to work through the eight key thematic decisions and finalize the requirements before generating the questionnaire.

- **Document Distribution:** Julie will send the consolidated spreadsheet and supporting documentation to all participants for review, ensuring everyone has the necessary materials to provide informed feedback.
- **Feedback and Review:** Participants are encouraged to review the process, methodology, and requirements, flag any issues, and suggest additions or corrections, with a focus on ensuring nothing is missed before wider group engagement.
- **Scheduling and Coordination:** Julie will coordinate with Adeyinka and Catherine to make further arrangements in relation to the subgroup discussions as the WG moves into the next phase of decision-making.
- **Iterative Refinement:** The intent is for the WG subgroup to iteratively refine the requirements, resolve open issues, and update the issues register before instructing the AI to generate the final questionnaire, with further meetings already scheduled to support this process.

Summary of Follow Up Actions

No.	Action Description	Responsibility	Deadline
1.	Julie to coordinate with Adeyinka and Catherine to make further arrangements in relation to the subgroup discussions as the WG moves into the next phase of decision-making.	Julie (Adeyinka / Catherine)	Ahead of next meeting
2.	Jim to review the consolidated spreadsheet and process documentation, provide any feedback or flag missing items, and send comments to Julie before the next meeting.	Jim	Ahead of next meeting
3.	Julie to send the consolidated spreadsheet and supporting documentation to the group for review ahead of the next meeting.	Julie	5 August 2026