

**AMENDMENTS TO POLICY STATEMENT TO REGULATION 94-101
RESPECTING MANDATORY CENTRAL COUNTERPARTY CLEARING OF
DERIVATIVES**

1. Part 1 of *Policy Statement to Regulation 94-101 respecting Mandatory Central Counterparty Clearing of Derivatives* is amended by adding the following paragraph:

“Subsection 1(2) – Interpretation of “affiliated entity”

To determine whether two entities are affiliates, the Regulation uses an approach based on the concept of consolidated financial statements under IFRS or U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (U.S. GAAP). Consequently, two entities whose financial statements are consolidated, or would be consolidated if any financial statements were required, would be considered affiliated entities under the Regulation. We expect corporate groups that do not prepare financial statements in accordance with IFRS or U.S. GAAP to apply the consolidation test under either IFRS or U.S. GAAP to determine whether entities within the corporate group meet the “affiliated entity” interpretation”.

2. Part 2 of the Policy Statement is replaced with the following:

“PART 2 MANDATORY CENTRAL COUNTERPARTY CLEARING

“Subsections 3(0.1) and (0.2) – Exclusion of investment funds and certain entities

An investment fund whose financial statements are consolidated with those of another entity should not be considered an affiliated entity of the other entity for the application of paragraphs 3(1)(b) and (c). Accordingly, the month-end exposure of an investment fund should not be considered when calculating the month-end gross notional amount in accordance with those paragraphs.

However, an investment fund will be subject to the clearing requirements if it, on its own, exceeds the \$500 000 000 000 month-end gross notional amount for all outstanding derivatives.

Similarly, certain structured entities (commonly known as special purpose entities) should not be considered as affiliates for the purpose of paragraphs 3(1)(b) and (c) if they meet the conditions stated in subsection 3(0.2). An entity, including an entity such as a credit card securitization vehicle or an entity created to guarantee interest and principal payments under a covered bond program, that meets the conditions in subsection 3(0.2) would not be an affiliated entity. All obligations of such entities are required to be exclusively secured by their own assets to meet the condition in paragraph 3(0.2)(b). Also, a vehicle created to invest in real estate or an infrastructure that meets the conditions in subparagraph 3(0.2)(a)(iii) would not be an affiliated entity of another entity even if its financial statements are consolidated with the other entity.

“Subsection 3(1) – Duty to submit for clearing

The duty to submit a mandatory clearable derivative for clearing to a regulated clearing agency only applies at the time the transaction is executed. If a derivative or class of derivatives is determined to be a mandatory clearable derivative after the date of execution of a transaction in that derivative or class of derivatives, we would not expect a local counterparty to submit the mandatory clearable derivative for clearing. Therefore, we would not expect a local counterparty to clear a mandatory clearable derivative entered into as a result of a counterparty exercising a swaption that was entered into before the date on which the requirement to submit a mandatory clearable derivative for clearing is applicable to that counterparty or the date on which the derivative became a mandatory clearable derivative. Similarly, we would not expect a local counterparty to clear an extendible swap that was entered into before the date on which the requirement to submit a mandatory clearable derivative for clearing is applicable to that counterparty or the date on which the derivative became a mandatory clearable derivative and extended in

accordance with the terms of the contract after such date.

However, if after a derivative or class of derivatives is determined to be a mandatory clearable derivative, there is another transaction in that same derivative, including a material amendment to a previous transaction (as discussed in subsection 1(1) above), that derivative will be subject to the mandatory central counterparty clearing requirement.

Where a derivative is not subject to the mandatory central counterparty clearing requirement but the derivative is clearable through a regulated clearing agency, the counterparties have the option to submit the derivative for clearing at any time. For a complex swap with non-standard terms that regulated clearing agencies cannot accept for clearing, adherence to the Regulation would not require market participants to structure such derivative in a particular manner or disentangle the derivative in order to clear the component which is a mandatory clearable derivative if it serves legitimate business purposes. However, considering that it would not require disentangling, we would expect the component of a packaged transaction that is a mandatory clearable derivative to be cleared.

For a local counterparty that is not a participant of a regulated clearing agency, we have used the phrase “cause to be submitted” to refer to the local counterparty’s obligation. In order to comply with subsection (1), a local counterparty would need to have arrangements in place with a participant for clearing services in advance of entering into a mandatory clearable derivative.

A transaction in a mandatory clearable derivative is required to be cleared when at least one of the counterparties is a local counterparty and one or more of paragraphs (a), (b) or (c) apply to both counterparties. For example, a local counterparty under any of paragraphs (a), (b) or (c) must clear a mandatory clearable derivative entered into with another local counterparty under any of paragraphs (a), (b) or (c). As a further example, a local counterparty under any of paragraphs (a), (b) or (c) must also clear a mandatory clearable derivative with a foreign counterparty under paragraphs (a) or (b). For instance, a local counterparty that is an affiliated entity of a foreign participant would be subject to mandatory central counterparty clearing for a mandatory clearable derivative with a foreign counterparty that is an affiliated entity of another foreign participant considering that there is one local counterparty to the transaction and both counterparties meet the criteria under paragraph (b).

Pursuant to paragraph (c) a local counterparty that had a month-end gross notional amount of outstanding derivatives exceeding the \$500 000 000 000 threshold in subparagraph (c)(ii) must clear a mandatory clearable derivative entered into with another counterparty that meets the criteria under paragraph (a), (b) or (c). In order to determine whether the \$500 000 000 000 threshold in subparagraph (c)(ii) is exceeded, a local counterparty must add the gross notional amount of all outstanding derivatives of its affiliated entities that are also local counterparties, to its own. However, investments funds and consolidated structured entities that meet the criteria under subsections 3(0.1) and (0.2) are not included in the calculation.

Where a local counterparty is a member of a group of affiliated entities that exceeds the \$500 000 000 000 threshold but is not itself a counterparty to derivatives that have an average month-end gross notional amount exceeding the \$1 000 000 000 000 threshold, calculated in accordance with subparagraph (c)(iii), it is not required to clear a mandatory clearable derivative.

A person that exceeds the \$1 000 000 000 notional exposure, calculated according to paragraphs (b) and (c), is required to fulfill the mandatory clearing requirement from September 1 of a given year until August 31 of the next year. This is referred to as the “reference period” in the Regulation.

For example, local counterparty XYZ had an average month-end gross notional amount under all outstanding derivatives of \$75 000 000 000 for the months of March, April and May of 2022. Counterparty XYZ also had, combined with each of its

affiliated entities that are local counterparties, a month-end gross notional amount for all derivatives of \$525 000 000 000 at the end of November 2021. Considering that (i) the aggregated month-end gross notional amount outstanding of \$525 000 000 000 exceeds the \$500 000 000 000 threshold, (ii) it occurred during the previous 12 months, and (iii) the average month-end gross notional amount of \$75 000 000 000 for March, April and May of 2022 exceeds the \$1 000 000 000 threshold, counterparty XYZ will need to comply with the Regulation in respect of mandatory clearable derivatives entered into during the reference period starting September 1, 2022. Conversely, if local counterparty XYZ does not exceed, on its own, the \$1 000 000 000 threshold, it is not subject to clearance even if the aggregated month-end gross notional amount outstanding with all of its affiliated entities exceeds the \$500 000 000 000 threshold.

Furthermore, in the example, even if local counterparty XYZ is subject to mandatory clearing from September 1, 2022 until August 31, 2023, but no longer exceeds the \$1 000 000 000 threshold for the months of March, April and May of 2023, it will no longer be required to comply with section 3 for the next reference period starting September 1, 2023. However, the local counterparty will have to evaluate its application every year. Consequently, if local counterparty XYZ exceeds the \$1 000 000 000 threshold again in a future year, it will become subject to the requirements of the Regulation until the following year.

The calculation of the gross notional amount outstanding under paragraphs (b) and (c) excludes derivatives with affiliated entities, which would be exempted under section 7 if they were mandatory clearable derivatives.

In addition, a local counterparty determines whether it exceeds the threshold in subparagraph (c)(ii) by adding the gross notional amount of all outstanding derivatives of its affiliated entities that are also local counterparties, to its own.

A local counterparty that is a participant at a regulated clearing agency, but does not subscribe to clearing services for the class of derivatives to which the mandatory clearable derivative belongs, would still be required to clear if it is subject to paragraph (c).

A local counterparty subject to mandatory central counterparty clearing that engages in a mandatory clearable derivative is responsible for determining whether the other counterparty is also subject to mandatory central counterparty clearing. To do so, the local counterparty may rely on the factual statements made by the other counterparty, provided that it does not have reasonable grounds to believe that such statements are false.

We would not expect that all the counterparties of a local counterparty provide their status as most counterparties would not be subject to the Regulation. However, a local counterparty cannot rely on the absence of a declaration from a counterparty to avoid the requirement to clear. Instead, when no information is provided by a counterparty, the local counterparty may use factual statements or available information to assess whether the mandatory clearable derivative is required to be cleared in accordance with the Regulation.

We would expect counterparties subject to the Regulation to exercise reasonable judgement in determining whether a person may be near or above the thresholds set out in paragraphs (b) and (c). We would expect a counterparty subject to the Regulation to solicit confirmation from its counterparty where there is reasonable basis to believe that the counterparty may be near or above any of the thresholds.

The status of a counterparty under this subsection should be determined before entering into a mandatory clearable derivative. We would not expect a local counterparty to clear a mandatory clearable derivative entered into after the date on which the requirement to submit a mandatory clearable derivative for clearing is applicable to that counterparty, but before one of the counterparties was captured under one of paragraphs (a), (b) or (c), unless there is a material amendment to the derivative after the date that both counterparties are so captured.

“Subsection 3(2) – 90-day transition

This subsection provides that only transactions in mandatory clearable derivatives executed on or after the 90th day after the end of the month in which the local counterparty first exceeded the threshold set out in subparagraph 3(1)(c)(ii) are subject to subsection 3(1). We do not intend that transactions executed between the 1st day on which the local counterparty became subject to subsection 3(1) and the 90th day be back-loaded after the 90th day.

“Subsection 3(3) – Submission to a regulated clearing agency

We would expect that a transaction subject to mandatory central counterparty clearing be submitted to a regulated clearing agency as soon as practicable, but no later than the end of the day on which the transaction was executed or if the transaction occurs after business hours of the regulated clearing agency, the next business day.

“Subsection 3(5) – Substituted compliance

Substituted compliance is only available to a local counterparty that is a foreign affiliated entity of a counterparty organized under the laws of the local jurisdiction or with a head office or principal place of business in the local jurisdiction and that is responsible for all or substantially all the liabilities of the affiliated entity. The local counterparty would still be subject to the Regulation, but its mandatory clearable derivatives, as per the definition under the Regulation, may be cleared at a clearing agency pursuant to a foreign law listed in Appendix B if the counterparty is subject to and compliant with that foreign law.

Despite the ability to clear pursuant to a foreign law listed in Appendix B, the local counterparty is still required to fulfill the other requirements in the Regulation, as applicable. This includes the retention period for the record keeping requirement.”.

3. Part 3 of the Policy Statement is amended:

(1) in section 7:

(a) in paragraph (1):

(i) by deleting the third paragraph;

(ii) by replacing the seventh paragraph with the following:

“Paragraph (d) refers to the terms of the mandatory clearable derivative that is not cleared. A trade confirmation, for instance, would be acceptable.”;

(b) by repealing paragraphs (2) and (3);

(2) in section 8:

(a) by adding, at the end of the second paragraph, the following sentence:

“We expect each amended derivative or replacement derivative generated by the multilateral portfolio compression exercise to be entered into for the sole purpose of reducing operational or counterparty credit risk and that such derivative(s) is (are) entered into between the same two counterparties as the original derivative(s).”;

(b) by replacing the fifth paragraph with the following:

“We would expect that a mandatory clearable derivative resulting from the multilateral portfolio compression exercise would have the same material terms (including the floating index, the maximum maturity of the derivative and the weighted

average maturity of the derivative) as the derivatives that were replaced with the exception of reducing the number or notional amount of outstanding derivatives.”.

4. Parts 4 and 6 of the Policy Statement are replaced with the following:

“APPENDIX A – MANDATORY CLEARABLE DERIVATIVES

In the course of determining whether a derivative or class of derivatives will be subject to mandatory central counterparty clearing, the factors we will consider include the following:

- the derivative is available to be cleared on a regulated clearing agency;
- the level of standardization of the derivative, such as the availability of electronic processing, the existence of master agreements, product definitions and short form confirmations;
- the effect of central clearing of the derivative on the mitigation of systemic risk, taking into account the size of the market for the derivative and the available resources of the regulated clearing agency to clear the derivative;
- whether mandating the derivative or class of derivatives to be cleared would bring undue risk to regulated clearing agencies;
- the outstanding notional amount of the counterparties transacting in the derivative or class of derivatives, the current liquidity in the market for the derivative or class of derivatives, the concentration of participants active in the market for the derivative or class of derivatives, and the availability of reliable and timely pricing data;
- the existence of third-party vendors providing pricing services;
- with regards to a regulated clearing agency, the existence of an appropriate rule framework, and the existence of capacity, operational expertise and resources, and credit support infrastructure to clear the derivative on terms that are consistent with the material terms and trading conventions on which the derivative is traded;
- whether a regulated clearing agency would be able to manage the risk of the additional derivatives that might be submitted due to the mandatory central counterparty clearing requirement determination;
- the effect on competition, taking into account appropriate fees and charges applied to clearing, and whether mandating clearing of the derivative could harm competition;
- alternative derivatives or clearing services co-existing in the same market;
- the public interest.”.

5. Form 94-101F1 and Form 94-101F2 of the Policy Statement are repealed.