

MEMO# 25389

August 8, 2011

Tri-Party Repo Task Force Delays Mandatory Three-Way Confirmation Requirement Until October 3

[25389]

August 8, 2011

TO: MONEY MARKET FUNDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE No. 49-11
SEC RULES MEMBERS No. 99-11 RE: TRI-PARTY REPO TASK FORCE DELAYS MANDATORY
THREE-WAY CONFIRMATION REQUIREMENT UNTIL OCTOBER 3

Today, the Tri-Party Repo Infrastructure Reform Task Force ("Task Force") issued an announcement that modifies the timeline published in its July 6, 2011 Progress Report. [*] Specifically, the Task Force announced the following:

- On August 1, 2011, Task Force members agreed to establish a grace period from the start of three-way deal matching on August 29 until October 3, to allow adequate time for remaining firms to sign the required amendments to their custodial undertaking agreements and complete the necessary systems testing. According to the announcement, during this grace period, three-way deal matching will be supported and encouraged, and all participants ready to go live are expected to do so. The grace period will end October 3, and three-way deal matching will become mandatory for all tri-party repo market participants as of that date.
- The rule changes necessary to implement the GCF RepoTM timing changes to accommodate afternoon settlement were published by the SEC in the Federal Register on July 29. The Fixed Income Clearing Corporation will announce the implementation date of this change if/when the rule and implementation date are finalized. The implementation may not, however, occur on August 29 as previously anticipated.
- The August 22 target to move the unwind for tri-party repo trades to 3:30pm NYT is on schedule to proceed as planned.

Jane G. Heinrichs
Senior Associate Counsel

endnotes

[*] Copies of the [announcement](#) and the [Progress Report](#) are available at <http://newyorkfed.org/tripartyrepo/>.

Copyright © by the Investment Company Institute. All rights reserved. Information may be abridged and therefore incomplete. Communications from the Institute do not constitute, and should not be considered a substitute for, legal advice.