




European Securities and
Markets Authority

Reply form for the ESMA MiFID II/MiFIR Consultation Paper





European Securities and
Markets Authority

Date: 22 May 2014



Responding to this paper

The European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) invites responses to the specific questions listed in the ESMA MiFID II/MiFIR Consultation Paper, published on the ESMA website ([here](#)).

Instructions

Please note that, in order to facilitate the analysis of the large number of responses expected, you are requested to use this file to send your response to ESMA so as to allow us to process it properly. Therefore, please follow the instructions described below:

- i. use this form and send your responses in Word format;
- ii. do not remove the tags of type <ESMA_QUESTION_1> - i.e. the response to one question has to be framed by the 2 tags corresponding to the question; and
- iii. if you do not have a response to a question, do not delete it and leave the text “TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE” between the tags.

Responses are most helpful:

- i. if they respond to the question stated;
- ii. contain a clear rationale, including on any related costs and benefits; and
- iii. describe any alternatives that ESMA should consider

Given the breadth of issues covered, ESMA expects and encourages respondents to specially answer those questions relevant to their business, interest and experience.

To help you navigate this document more easily, bookmarks are available in “Navigation Pane” for Word 2010 and in “Document Map” for Word 2007.

Responses must reach us by **1 August 2014**.

All contributions should be submitted online at www.esma.europa.eu under the heading ‘Your input/Consultations’.

Publication of responses

All contributions received will be published following the end of the consultation period, unless otherwise requested. **Please clearly indicate by ticking the appropriate checkbox in the website submission form if you do not wish your contribution to be publicly disclosed. A standard confidentiality statement in an email message will not be treated as a request for non-disclosure.** Note also that a confidential response may be requested from us in accordance with ESMA’s rules on access to documents. We may consult you if we receive such a request. Any decision we make is reviewable by ESMA’s Board of Appeal and the European Ombudsman.

Data protection

Information on data protection can be found at www.esma.europa.eu under the heading ‘Disclaimer’.



1. Overview

2. Investor protection

2.1. Exemption from the applicability of MiFID for persons providing an investment service in an incidental manner

Q1: Do you agree with the proposed cumulative conditions to be fulfilled in order for an investment service to be deemed to be provided in an incidental manner?

<ESMA_QUESTION_1>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_1>

2.2. Investment advice and the use of distribution channels

Q2: Do you agree that it is appropriate to clarify that the use of distribution channels does not exclude the possibility that investment advice is provided to investors?

<ESMA_QUESTION_2>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_2>

2.3. Compliance function

Q3: Do you agree that the existing compliance requirements included in Article 6 of the MiFID Implementing Directive should be expanded?

<ESMA_QUESTION_3>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_3>

Q4: Are there any other areas of the Level 2 requirements concerning the compliance function that you consider should be updated, improved or revised?

<ESMA_QUESTION_4>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_4>

2.4. Complaints-handling



Q5: Do you already have in place arrangements that comply with the requirements set out in the draft technical advice set out above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_5>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_5>

2.5. Record-keeping (other than recording of telephone conversations or other electronic communications)

Q6: Do you consider that additional records should be mentioned in the minimum list proposed in the table in the draft technical advice above? Please list any additional records that could be added to the minimum list for the purposes of MiFID II, MiFIR, MAD or MAR.

<ESMA_QUESTION_6>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_6>

Q7: What, if any, additional costs and/or benefits do you envisage arising from the proposed approach? Please quantify and provide details.

<ESMA_QUESTION_7>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_7>

2.6. Recording of telephone conversations and electronic communications

Q8: What additional measure(s) could firms implement to reduce the risk of non-compliance with the rules in relation to telephone recording and electronic communications?

<ESMA_QUESTION_8>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_8>

Q9: Do you agree that firms should periodically monitor records to ensure compliance with the recording requirement and wider regulatory requirements?

<ESMA_QUESTION_9>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_9>

Q10: Should any additional items of information be included as a minimum in meeting minutes or notes where relevant face-to-face conversations take place with clients?

<ESMA_QUESTION_10>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_10>



Q11: Should clients be required to sign these minutes or notes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_11>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_11>

Q12: Do you agree with the proposals for storage and retention set out in the above draft technical advice?

<ESMA_QUESTION_12>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_12>

Q13: More generally, what additional costs, impacts and/or benefits do you envisage as a result of the requirements set out in the entire draft technical advice above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_13>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_13>

2.7. Product governance

Q14: Should the proposed distributor requirements apply in the case of distribution of products (e.g. shares and bonds as well as over-the-counter (OTC) products) available on the primary market or should they also apply to distribution of products on the secondary market (e.g. freely tradable shares and bonds)? Please state the reason for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_14>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_14>

Q15: When products are manufactured by non-MiFID firms or third country firms and public information is not available, should there be a requirement for a written agreement under which the manufacturer must provide all relevant product information to the distributor?

<ESMA_QUESTION_15>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_15>

Q16: Do you think it would be useful to require distributors to periodically inform the manufacturer about their experience with the product? If yes, in what circumstances and what specific information could be provided by the distributor?

<ESMA_QUESTION_16>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_16>

Q17: What appropriate action do you think manufacturers can take if they become aware that products are not sold as envisaged (e.g. if the product is being widely sold to clients outside of the product's target market)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_17>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE



<ESMA_QUESTION_17>

Q18: What appropriate action do you think distributors can take, if they become aware of any event that could materially affect the potential risk to the identified target market (e.g. if the distributor has mis-judged the target market for a specific product)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_18>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_18>

Q19: Do you consider that there is sufficient clarity regarding the requirements of investment firms when acting as manufacturers, distributors or both? If not, please provide details of how such requirements should interact with each other.

<ESMA_QUESTION_19>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_19>

Q20: Are there any other product governance requirements not mentioned in this paper that you consider important and should be considered? If yes, please set out these additional requirements.

<ESMA_QUESTION_20>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_20>

Q21: For investment firms responding to this consultation, what costs would you incur in order to meet these requirements, either as distributors or manufacturers?

<ESMA_QUESTION_21>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_21>

2.8. Safeguarding of client assets

Q22: Do you agree with the proposal for investment firms to establish and maintain a client assets oversight function?

<ESMA_QUESTION_22>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_22>

Q23: What would be the cost implications of establishing and maintaining a function with specific responsibility for matters relating to the firm's compliance with its obligations regarding the safeguarding of client instruments and funds?

<ESMA_QUESTION_23>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_23>

Q24: Do you think that the examples in this chapter constitute an inappropriate use of TTCA? If not, why not? Are there any other examples of inappropriate use of or features of inappropriate use of TTCA?



<ESMA_QUESTION_24>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_24>

Q25: Do you agree with the proposal to clarify that the use of TTCA is not a freely available option for avoiding the protections required under MiFID? Do you agree with the proposal to place high-level requirements on firms to consider the appropriateness of TTCA? Should risk disclosures be required in this area? Please explain your answer. If not, why not?

<ESMA_QUESTION_25>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_25>

Q26: Do you agree with the proposal to require a reasonable link between the client's obligation and the financial instruments or funds subject to TTCA?

<ESMA_QUESTION_26>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_26>

Q27: Do you already make any assessment of the suitability of TTCAs? If not, would you need to change any processes to meet such a requirement, and if so, what would be the cost implications of doing so?

<ESMA_QUESTION_27>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_27>

Q28: Are any further measures needed to ensure that the transactions envisaged under Article 19 of the MiFID Implementing Directive remain possible in light of the ban on concluding TTCAs with retail clients in Article 16(10) of MiFID II?

<ESMA_QUESTION_28>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_28>

Q29: Do you agree with the proposal to require firms to adopt specific arrangements to take appropriate collateral, monitor and maintain its appropriateness in respect of securities financing transactions?

<ESMA_QUESTION_29>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_29>

Q30: Is it suitable to place collateral, monitoring and maintaining measures on firms in respect of retail clients only, or should these be extended to all classes of client?

<ESMA_QUESTION_30>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_30>

Q31: Do you already take collateral against securities financing transactions and monitor its appropriateness on an on-going basis? If not, what would be the cost of developing and maintaining such arrangements?

<ESMA_QUESTION_31>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE



<ESMA_QUESTION_31>

Q32: Do you agree that investment firms should evidence the express prior consent of non-retail clients to the use of their financial instruments as they are currently required to do so for retail clients clearly, in writing or in a legally equivalent alternative means, and affirmatively executed by the client? Are there any cost implications?

<ESMA_QUESTION_32>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_32>

Q33: Do you anticipate any additional costs in order to comply with the requirements proposed in relation to securities financing transactions and collateralisation? If yes, please provide details.

<ESMA_QUESTION_33>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_33>

Q34: Do you think that it is proportionate to require investment firms to consider diversification of client funds as part of the due diligence requirements when depositing client funds? If not, why? What other measures could achieve a similar objective?

<ESMA_QUESTION_34>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_34>

Q35: Are there any cost implications to investment firms when considering diversification as part of due diligence requirements?

<ESMA_QUESTION_35>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_35>

Q36: Where an investment firm deposits client funds at a third party that is within its own group, should an intra-group deposit limit be imposed? If yes, would imposing an intra-group deposit limit of 20% in respect of client funds be proportionate? If not, what other percentage could be proportionate? What other measures could achieve similar objectives? What is the rationale for this percentage?

<ESMA_QUESTION_36>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_36>

Q37: Are there any situations that would justify exempting an investment firm from such a rule restricting intra-group deposits in respect of client funds, for example, when other safeguards are in place?

<ESMA_QUESTION_37>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_37>

Q38: Do you place any client funds in a credit institution within your group? If so, what proportion of the total?

<ESMA_QUESTION_38>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE



<ESMA_QUESTION_38>

Q39: What would be the cost implications for investment firms of diversifying holdings away from a group credit institution?

<ESMA_QUESTION_39>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_39>

Q40: What would be the impact of restricting investment firms in respect of the proportion of funds they could deposit at affiliated credit institutions? Could there be any unintended consequences?

<ESMA_QUESTION_40>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_40>

Q41: What would be the cost implications to credit institutions if investment firms were limited in respect of depositing client funds at credit institutions in the same group?

<ESMA_QUESTION_41>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_41>

Q42: Do you agree with the proposal to prevent firms from agreeing to liens that allow a third party to recover costs from client assets that do not relate to those clients, except where this is required in a particular jurisdiction?

<ESMA_QUESTION_42>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_42>

Q43: Do you agree with the proposal to specify specific risk warnings where firms are obliged to agree to wide-ranging liens exposing their clients to the risk?

<ESMA_QUESTION_43>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_43>

Q44: What would be the one off costs of reviewing third party agreements in the light of an explicit prohibition of such liens, and the on-going costs in respect of risk warnings to clients?

<ESMA_QUESTION_44>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_44>

Q45: Should firms be obliged to record the presence of security interests or other encumbrances over client assets in their own books and records? Are there any reasons why firms might not be able to meet such a requirement? Are there any cost implications of recording these?

<ESMA_QUESTION_45>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_45>



Q46: Should the option of ‘other equivalent measures’ for segregation of client financial instruments only be available in third country jurisdictions where market practice or legal requirements make this necessary?

<ESMA_QUESTION_46>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_46>

Q47: Should firms be required to develop additional systems to mitigate the risks of ‘other equivalent measures’ and require specific risk disclosures to clients where a firm must rely on such ‘other equivalent measures’, where not already covered by the Article 32(4) of the MiFID Implementing Directive?

<ESMA_QUESTION_47>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_47>

Q48: What would be the on-going costs of making disclosures to clients when relying on ‘other equivalent measures’?

<ESMA_QUESTION_48>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_48>

Q49: Should investment firms be required to maintain systems and controls to prevent shortfalls in client accounts and to prevent the use of one client’s financial instruments to settle the transactions of another client, including:

<ESMA_QUESTION_49>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_49>

Q50: Do you already have measures in place that address the proposals in this chapter? What would be the one-off and on-going cost implications of developing systems and controls to address these proposals?

<ESMA_QUESTION_50>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_50>

Q51: Do you agree that requiring firms to hold necessary information in an easily accessible way would reduce uncertainty regarding ownership and delays in returning client financial instruments and funds in the event of an insolvency?

<ESMA_QUESTION_51>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_51>

Q52: Do you think the information detailed in the draft technical advice section of this chapter is suitable for including in such a requirement?

<ESMA_QUESTION_52>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_52>

Q53: Do you already maintain the information listed in a way that would be easily accessible on request by a competent person, either before or after insolvency? What would be the cost of maintaining such information in a way that is easily accessible to an insolvency practitioner in the event of firm failure?

<ESMA_QUESTION_53>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_53>

2.9. Conflicts of interest

Q54: Should investment firms be required to assess and periodically review - at least annually - the conflicts of interest policy established, taking all appropriate measures to address any deficiencies? Please also state the reason for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_54>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_54>

Q55: Do you consider that additional situations to those identified in Article 21 of the MiFID Implementing Directive should be mentioned in the measures implementing MiFID II? Please explain your rationale for any additional suggestions.

<ESMA_QUESTION_55>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_55>

Q56: Do you consider that the distinction between investment research and marketing communications drawn in Article 24 of the MiFID Implementing Directive is sufficient and sufficiently clear? If not, please suggest any improvements to the existing framework and the rationale for your proposals.

<ESMA_QUESTION_56>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_56>

Q57: Do you consider that the additional organisational requirements listed in Article 25 of the MiFID Implementing Directive and addressed to firms producing and disseminating investment research are sufficient to properly regulate the specificities of these activities and to protect the objectivity and independence of financial analysts and of the investment research they produce? If not, please suggest any improvements to the existing framework and the rationale for your proposals.

<ESMA_QUESTION_57>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_57>

2.10. Underwriting and placing – conflicts of interest and provision of information to clients



Q58: Are there additional details or requirements you believe should be included?

<ESMA_QUESTION_58>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_58>

Q59: Do you consider that investment firms should be required to discuss with the issuer client any hedging strategies they plan to undertake with respect to the offering, including how these strategies may impact the issuer client's interest? If not, please provide your views on possible alternative arrangements. In addition to stabilisation, what other trading strategies might the firm take in connection with the offering that would impact the issuer?

<ESMA_QUESTION_59>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_59>

Q60: Have you already put in place organisational arrangements that comply with these requirements?

<ESMA_QUESTION_60>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_60>

Q61: How would you need to change your processes to meet the requirements?

<ESMA_QUESTION_61>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_61>

Q62: What costs would you incur in order to meet these requirements?

<ESMA_QUESTION_62>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_62>

2.11. Remuneration

Q63: Do you agree with the definition of the scope of the requirements as proposed? If not, why not?

<ESMA_QUESTION_63>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_63>

Q64: Do you agree with the proposal with respect to variable remuneration and similar incentives? If not, why not?

<ESMA_QUESTION_64>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_64>

2.12. Fair, clear and not misleading information

Q65: Do you agree that the information to retail clients should be up-to-date, consistently presented in the same language, and in the same font size in order to be fair, clear and not misleading?

<ESMA_QUESTION_65>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_65>

Q66: Do you agree that the information about future performance should be provided under different performance scenarios in order to illustrate the potential functioning of financial instruments?

<ESMA_QUESTION_66>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_66>

Q67: Do you agree that the information to professional clients should comply with the proposed conditions in order to be fair, clear and not misleading? Do you consider that the information to professional clients should meet any of the other conditions proposed for retail clients?

<ESMA_QUESTION_67>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_67>

2.13. Information to clients about investment advice and financial instruments

Q68: Do you agree with the objective of the above proposals to clarify the distinction between independent and non-independent advice for investors?

<ESMA_QUESTION_68>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_68>

Q69: Do you agree with the proposal to further specify information provided to clients about financial instruments and their risks?

<ESMA_QUESTION_69>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_69>

Q70: Do you consider that, in addition to the information requirements suggested in this CP (including information on investment advice, financial instruments, costs and charges and safeguarding of client assets), further improvements to the information requirements in other areas should be proposed? If yes, please specify, by making reference to existing requirements in the MiFID Implementing directive.

<ESMA_QUESTION_70>



TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_70>

2.14. Information to clients on costs and charges

Q71: Do you agree with the proposal to fully apply requirements on information to clients on costs and charges to professional clients and eligible counterparties and to allow these clients to opt-out from the application of these requirements in certain circumstances?

<ESMA_QUESTION_71>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_71>

Q72: Do you agree with the scope of the point of sale information requirements?

<ESMA_QUESTION_72>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_72>

Q73: Do you agree that post-sale information should be provided where the investment firm has established a continuing relationship with the client?

<ESMA_QUESTION_73>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_73>

Q74: Do you agree with the proposed costs and charges to be disclosed to clients, as listed in the Annex to this chapter? If not please state your reasons, including describing any other cost or charges that should be included.

<ESMA_QUESTION_74>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_74>

Q75: Do you agree that the point of sale information on costs and charges could be provided on a generic basis? If not, please explain your response.

<ESMA_QUESTION_75>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_75>

Q76: Do you have any other comments on the methodology for calculating the point of sale figures?

<ESMA_QUESTION_76>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_76>

Q77: Do you have any comments on the requirements around illustrating the cumulative effect of costs and charges?

<ESMA_QUESTION_77>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_77>

Q78: What costs would you incur in order to meet these requirements?

<ESMA_QUESTION_78>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_78>

2.15. The legitimacy of inducements to be paid to/by a third person

Q79: Do you agree with the proposed exhaustive list of minor non-monetary benefits that are acceptable? Should any other benefits be included on the list? If so, please explain.

<ESMA_QUESTION_79>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_79>

Q80: Do you agree with the proposed approach for the disclosure of monetary and non-monetary benefits, in relation to investment services other than portfolio management and advice on an independent basis?

<ESMA_QUESTION_80>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_80>

Q81: Do you agree with the non-exhaustive list of circumstances and situations that NCAs should consider in determining when the quality enhancement test is not met? If not, please explain and provide examples of circumstances and situations where you believe the enhancement test is met. Should any other circumstances and/or situations be included in the list? If so, please explain.

<ESMA_QUESTION_81>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_81>

Q82: Do you anticipate any additional costs in order to comply with the requirements proposed in this chapter? If yes, please provide details.

<ESMA_QUESTION_82>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_82>

2.16. Investment advice on independent basis

Q83: Do you agree with the approach proposed in the technical advice above in order to ensure investment firm's compliance with the obligation to assess a sufficient range of financial instruments available on the market? If not, please explain your reasons and provide for alternative or additional criteria.

<ESMA_QUESTION_83>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_83>

Q84: What type of organisational requirements should firms have in place (e.g. degree of separation, procedures, controls) when they provide both independent and non-independent advice?

<ESMA_QUESTION_84>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_84>

Q85: Do you anticipate any additional costs in order to comply with the requirements proposed in this chapter? If yes, please provide details.

<ESMA_QUESTION_85>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_85>

2.17. Suitability

Q86: Do you agree that the existing suitability requirements included in Article 35 of the MiFID Implementing Directive should be expanded to cover points discussed in the draft technical advice of this chapter?

<ESMA_QUESTION_86>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_86>

Q87: Are there any other areas where MiFID Implementing Directive requirements covering the suitability assessment should be updated, improved or revised based on your experiences under MiFID since it was originally implemented?

<ESMA_QUESTION_87>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_87>

Q88: What is your view on the proposals for the content of suitability reports? Are there additional details or requirements you believe should be included, especially to ensure suitability reports are sufficiently 'personalised' to have added value for the client, drawing on any initiatives in national markets?

<ESMA_QUESTION_88>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_88>

Q89: Do you agree that periodic suitability reports would only need to cover any changes in the instruments and/or circumstances of the client rather than repeating information which is unchanged from the first suitability report?

<ESMA_QUESTION_89>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_89>



2.18. Appropriateness

Q90: Do you agree the existing criteria included in Article 38 of the Implementing Directive should be expanded to incorporate the above points, and that an instrument not included explicitly in Article 25(4)(a) of MiFID II would need to meet to be considered non-complex?

<ESMA_QUESTION_90>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_90>

Q91: Are there any other areas where the MiFID Implementing Directive requirements covering the appropriateness assessment and conditions for an instrument to be considered non-complex should be updated, improved or revised based on your experiences under MiFID I?

<ESMA_QUESTION_91>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_91>

2.19. Client agreement

Q92: Do you agree that investment firms should be required to enter into a written (or equivalent) agreement with their professional clients, at least for certain services? If yes, in which circumstances? If no, please state your reason.

<ESMA_QUESTION_92>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_92>

Q93: Do you agree that investment firms should be required to enter into a written (or equivalent) agreement for the provision of investment advice to any client, at least where the investment firm and the client have a continuing business relationship? If not, why not?

<ESMA_QUESTION_93>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_93>

Q94: Do you agree that investment firms should be required to enter into a written (or equivalent) agreement for the provision of custody services (safekeeping of financial instruments) to any client? If not, why not?

<ESMA_QUESTION_94>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_94>

Q95: Do you agree that investment firms should be required to describe in the client agreement any advice services, portfolio management services and custody services to be provided? If not, why not?

<ESMA_QUESTION_95>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE



<ESMA_QUESTION_95>



2.20.

2.20. Reporting to clients

Q96: Do you agree that the content of reports for professional clients, both for portfolio management and execution of orders, should be aligned to the content applicable for retail clients?

<ESMA_QUESTION_96>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_96>

Q97: Should investment firms providing portfolio management or operating a retail client account that includes leveraged financial instruments or other contingent liability transactions be required to agree on a threshold with retail clients that should at least be equal to 10% (and relevant multiples) of the initial investments (or the value of the investment at the beginning of each year)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_97>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_97>

Q98: Do you agree that Article 43 of the MiFID Implementing Directive should be updated to specify that the content of statements is to include the market or estimated value of the financial instruments included in the statement with a clear indication of the fact that the absence of a market price is likely to be indicative of a lack of liquidity?

<ESMA_QUESTION_98>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_98>

Q99: Do you consider that it would be beneficial to clients to not only provide details of those financial instruments that are subject to TTCA at the point in time of the statement, but also details of those financial instruments that have been subject to TTCA during the reporting period?

<ESMA_QUESTION_99>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_99>

Q100: What other changes to the MiFID Implementing Directive in relation to reporting to clients should ESMA consider advising the Commission on?

<ESMA_QUESTION_100>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_100>



2.21. Best execution

Q101: Do you have any additional suggestions to provide clarity of the best execution obligations in MiFID II captured in this section or to further ESMA’s objective of facilitating clear disclosures to clients?

<ESMA_QUESTION_101>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_101>

Q102: Do your policies and your review procedures already the details proposed in this chapter? If they do not, what would be the implementation and recurring cost of modifying them and distributing the revised policies to your existing clients? Where possible please provide examples of the costs involved.

<ESMA_QUESTION_102>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_102>

2.22. Client order-handling

Q103: Are you aware of any issues that have emerged with regard to the application of Articles 47, 48 and 49 of the MiFID Implementing Directive? If yes, please specify.

<ESMA_QUESTION_103>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_103>

2.23. Transactions executed with eligible counterparties

Q104: Do you agree with the proposal not to allow undertakings classified as professional clients on request to be recognised as eligible counterparties?

<ESMA_QUESTION_104>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_104>

Q105: For investment firms responding to this consultation, how many clients have you already classified as eligible counterparties using the following approaches under Article 50 of the MiFID Implementing Directive:

<ESMA_QUESTION_105>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_105>

Q106: For investment firms responding to this consultation, what costs would you incur in order to meet these requirements?



<ESMA_QUESTION_106>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_106>



2.24. Product intervention

Q107: Do you agree with the criteria proposed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_107>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_107>

Q108: Are there any additional criteria that you would suggest adding?

<ESMA_QUESTION_108>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_108>



3. Transparency

3.1. Liquid market for equity and equity-like instruments

Q109: Do you agree with the liquidity thresholds ESMA proposes for equities? Would you calibrate the thresholds differently? Please provide reasons for your answers.

<ESMA_QUESTION_109>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_109>

Q110: Do you agree that the free float for depositary receipts should be determined by the number of shares issued in the issuer's home market? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_110>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_110>

Q111: Do you agree with the proposal to set the liquidity threshold for depositary receipts at the same level as for shares? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_111>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_111>

Q112: Do you agree with the liquidity thresholds ESMA proposes for depositary receipts? Would you calibrate the thresholds differently? Please provide reasons for your answers.

<ESMA_QUESTION_112>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_112>

Q113: Do you agree that the criterion of free float could be addressed through the number of units issued for trading? If yes, what *de minimis* number of units would you suggest? Is there any other more appropriate measure in your view? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_113>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_113>

Q114: Based on your experience, do you agree with the preliminary results related to the trading patterns of ETFs? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_114>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_114>



Q115: Do you agree with the liquidity thresholds ESMA proposes for ETFs? Would you calibrate the thresholds differently? Please provide reasons for your answers, including describing your own role in the market (e.g. market-maker, issuer etc).

<ESMA_QUESTION_115>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_115>

Q116: Can you identify any additional instruments that could be caught by the definition of certificates under Article 2(1)(27) of MiFIR?

<ESMA_QUESTION_116>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_116>

Q117: Based on your experience, do you agree with the preliminary results related to the trading patterns of certificates? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_117>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_117>

Q118: Do you agree with the liquidity thresholds ESMA proposes for certificates? Would you calibrate the thresholds differently? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_118>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_118>

Q119: Do you agree that the criterion of free float could be addressed through the issuance size? If yes, what *de minimis* issuance size would you suggest? Is there any other more appropriate measure in your view? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_119>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_119>

Q120: Do you think the discretion permitted to Member States under Article 22(2) of the Commission Regulation to specify additional instruments up to a limit as being liquid should be retained under MiFID II?

<ESMA_QUESTION_120>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_120>

3.2. Delineation between bonds, structured finance products and money market instruments

Q121: Do you agree with ESMA's assessment concerning financial instruments outside the scope of the MiFIR non-equity transparency obligations?

<ESMA_QUESTION_121>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE



<ESMA_QUESTION_121>

3.3. The definition of systematic internaliser

Q122: For the systematic and frequent criterion, ESMA proposes setting the percentage for the calculation between 0.25% and 0.5%. Within this range, what do you consider to be the appropriate level? Please provide reasons for your answer. If you consider that the threshold should be set at a level outside this range, please specify at what level this should be with justifications.

<ESMA_QUESTION_122>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_122>

Q123: Do you support calibrating the threshold for the systematic and frequent criterion on the liquidity of the financial instrument as measured by the number of daily transactions?

<ESMA_QUESTION_123>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_123>

Q124: For the substantial criterion, ESMA proposes setting the percentage for the calculation between 15% and 25% of the total turnover in that financial instrument executed by the investment firm on own account or on behalf of clients and between 0.25% and 0.5% of the total turnover in that financial instrument in the Union. Within these ranges, what do you consider to be the appropriate level? Please provide reasons for your answer. If you consider that the thresholds should be set at levels outside these ranges, please specify at what levels these should be with justifications.

<ESMA_QUESTION_124>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_124>

Q125: Do you support thresholds based on the turnover (quantity multiplied by price) as opposed to the volume (quantity) of shares traded? Do you agree with the definition of total trading by the investment firm? If not please provide alternatives and reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_125>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_125>

Q126: ESMA has calibrated the initial thresholds proposed based on systematic internaliser activity in shares. Do you consider those thresholds adequate for:

<ESMA_QUESTION_126>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_126>

Q127: Do you consider a quarterly assessment of systematic internaliser activity as adequate? If not, which assessment period would you propose? Do you consider that one month provides sufficient time for investment firms to establish all the necessary arrangements in order to comply with the systematic internaliser regime?



<ESMA_QUESTION_127>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_127>

Q128: For the systematic and frequent criterion, do you agree that the thresholds should be set per asset class? Please provide reasons for your answer. If you consider the thresholds should be set at a more granular level (sub-categories) please provide further detail and justification.

<ESMA_QUESTION_128>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_128>

Q129: With regard to the ‘substantial basis’ criterion, do you support thresholds based on the turnover (quantity multiplied by price) as opposed to the volume (quantity) of instruments traded. Do you agree with the definition of total trading by the investment firm? If not please provide alternatives and reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_129>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_129>

Q130: Do you agree with ESMA’s proposal to apply the systematic internaliser thresholds for bonds and structured finance products at an ISIN code level? If not please provide alternatives and reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_130>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_130>

Q131: For derivatives, do you agree that some aggregation should be established in order to properly apply the systematic internaliser definition? If yes, do you consider that the tables presented in Annex 3.6.1 of the DP could be used as a basis for applying the systematic internaliser thresholds to derivatives products? Please provide reasons, and when necessary alternatives, to your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_131>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_131>

Q132: Do you agree with ESMA’s proposal to set a threshold for liquid derivatives? Do you consider any scenarios could arise where systematic internalisers would be required to meet pre-trade transparency requirements for liquid derivatives where the trading obligation does not apply?

<ESMA_QUESTION_132>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_132>

Q133: Do you consider a quarterly assessment by investment firms in respect of their systematic internaliser activity is adequate? If not, what assessment period would you propose?

<ESMA_QUESTION_133>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_133>



Q134: Within the ranges proposed by ESMA, what do you consider to be the appropriate level? Please provide reasons for your answer. If you consider that the threshold should be set at a level outside this range, please specify at what level this should be with justifications and where possible data to support them.

<ESMA_QUESTION_134>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_134>

Q135: Do you consider that thresholds should be set as absolute numbers rather than percentages for some specific categories? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_135>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_135>

Q136: What thresholds would you consider as adequate for the emission allowance market?

<ESMA_QUESTION_136>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_136>

3.4. Transactions in several securities and orders subject to conditions other than the current market price

Q137: Do you agree with the definition of portfolio trade and of orders subject to conditions other than the current market price? Please give reasons for your answer?

<ESMA_QUESTION_137>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_137>

3.5. Exceptional market circumstances and conditions for updating quotes

Q138: Do you agree with the list of exceptional circumstances? Please give reasons for your answer. Do you agree with ESMA's view on the conditions for updating the quotes? Please give reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_138>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_138>

3.6. Orders considerably exceeding the norm



Q139: Do you agree that each systematic internaliser should determine when the number and/or volume of orders sought by clients considerably exceed the norm? Please give reasons for your answer?

<ESMA_QUESTION_139>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_139>

3.7. Prices falling within a public range close to market conditions

Q140: Do you agree that any price within the bid and offer spread quoted by the systematic internaliser would fall within a public range close to market conditions? Please give reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_140>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_140>

3.8. Pre-trade transparency for systematic internalisers in non-equity instruments

Q141: Do you agree that the risks a systematic internaliser faces is similar to that of an liquidity provider? If not, how do they differ?

<ESMA_QUESTION_141>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_141>

Q142: Do you agree that the sizes established for liquidity providers and systematic internalisers should be identical? If not, how should they differ?

<ESMA_QUESTION_142>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_142>

4. Data publication

4.1. Access to systematic internalisers' quotes

Q143: Do you agree with the proposed definition of “regular and continuous” publication of quotes? If not, what would definition you suggest?

<ESMA_QUESTION_143>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_143>

Q144: Do you agree with the proposed definition of “normal trading hours”? Should the publication time be extended?

<ESMA_QUESTION_144>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_144>

Q145: Do you agree with the proposal regarding the means of publication of quotes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_145>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_145>

Q146: Do you agree that a systematic internaliser should identify itself when publishing its quotes through a trading venue or a data reporting service?

<ESMA_QUESTION_146>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_146>

Q147: Is there any other mean of communication that should be considered by ESMA?

<ESMA_QUESTION_147>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_147>

Q148: Do you agree with the importance of ensuring that quotes published by investment firms are consistent across all the publication arrangements?

<ESMA_QUESTION_148>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_148>

Q149: Do you agree with the compulsory use of data standards, formats and technical arrangements in development of Article 66(5) of MiFID II?

<ESMA_QUESTION_149>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_149>



Q150: Do you agree with the imposing the publication on a ‘machine-readable’ and ‘human readable’ to investment firms publishing their quotes only through their own website?

<ESMA_QUESTION_150>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_150>

Q151: Do you agree with the requirements to consider that the publication is ‘easily accessible’?

<ESMA_QUESTION_151>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_151>

4.2. Publication of unexecuted client limit orders on shares traded on a venue

Q152: Do you think that publication of unexecuted orders through a data reporting service or through an investment firm’s website would effectively facilitate execution?

<ESMA_QUESTION_152>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_152>

Q153: Do you agree with this proposal. If not, what would you suggest?

<ESMA_QUESTION_153>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_153>

4.3. Reasonable commercial basis (RCB)

Q154: Would these disclosure requirements be a meaningful instrument to ensure that prices are on a reasonable commercial basis?

<ESMA_QUESTION_154>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_154>

Q155: Are there any other possible requirements in the context of transparency/disclosure to ensure a reasonable price level?

<ESMA_QUESTION_155>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_155>

Q156: To what extent do you think that comprehensive transparency requirements would be enough in terms of desired regulatory intervention?

<ESMA_QUESTION_156>



TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_156>

Q157: What are your views on controlling charges by fixing a limit on the share of revenue that market data services can represent?

<ESMA_QUESTION_157>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_157>

Q158: Which percentage range for a revenue limit would you consider reasonable?

<ESMA_QUESTION_158>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_158>

Q159: If the definition of “reasonable commercial basis” is to be based on costs, do you agree that LRIC+ is the most appropriate measure? If not what measure do you think should be used?

<ESMA_QUESTION_159>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_159>

Q160: Do you agree that suppliers should be required to maintain a cost model as the basis of setting prices against LRIC+? If not how do you think the definition should be implemented?

<ESMA_QUESTION_160>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_160>

Q161: Do you believe that if there are excessive prices in any of the other markets, the same definition of “reasonable commercial basis” would be appropriate, or that they should be treated differently? If the latter, what definition should be used?

<ESMA_QUESTION_161>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_161>

Q162: Within the options A, B and C, do you favour one of them, a combination of A+B or A+C or A+B+C? Please explain your reasons.

<ESMA_QUESTION_162>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_162>

Q163: What are your views on the costs of the different approaches?

<ESMA_QUESTION_163>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_163>

Q164: Is there some other approach you believe would be better? Why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_164>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE



<ESMA_QUESTION_164>

Q165: Do you think that the offering of a ‘per-user’ pricing model designed to prevent multiple charging for the same information should be mandatory?

<ESMA_QUESTION_165>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_165>

Q166: If yes, in which circumstances?

<ESMA_QUESTION_166>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_166>

5. Micro-structural issues

5.1. Algorithmic and high frequency trading (HFT)

Q167: Which would be your preferred option? Why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_167>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_167>

Q168: Can you identify any other advantages or disadvantages of the options put forward?

<ESMA_QUESTION_168>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_168>

Q169: How would you reduce the impact of the disadvantages identified in your preferred option?

<ESMA_QUESTION_169>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_169>

Q170: If you prefer Option 2, please advise ESMA whether for the calculation of the median daily lifetime of the orders of the member/participant, you would take into account only the orders sent for liquid instruments or all the activity in the trading venue.

<ESMA_QUESTION_170>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_170>

Q171: Do you agree with the above assessment? If not, please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_171>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_171>

5.2. Direct electronic access (DEA)

Q172: Do you consider it necessary to clarify the definitions of DEA, DMA and SA provided in MiFID? In what area would further clarification be required and how would you clarify that?

<ESMA_QUESTION_172>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_172>

Q173: Is there any other activity that should be covered by the term “DEA”, other than DMA and SA? In particular, should AOR be considered within the DEA definition?

<ESMA_QUESTION_173>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_173>

Q174: Do you consider that electronic order transmission systems through shared connectivity arrangements should be included within the scope of DEA?

<ESMA_QUESTION_174>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_174>

Q175: Are you aware of any order transmission systems through shared arrangements which would provide an equivalent type of access as the one provided by DEA arrangements?

<ESMA_QUESTION_175>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_175>

6. Requirements applying on and to trading venues

6.1. SME Growth Markets

Q176: Do you support assessing the percentage of issuers on the basis of number of issuers only? If not, what approach would you suggest?

<ESMA_QUESTION_176>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_176>

Q177: Which of the three different options described in the draft technical advice box above for assessing whether an SME-GM meets the criterion of having at least fifty per cent of SME issuers would you prefer?

<ESMA_QUESTION_177>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_177>

Q178: Do you agree with the approach described above (in the box Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden.), that only falling below the qualifying 50% threshold for a number of three consecutive years could lead to deregistration as a SME-GM or should the period be limited to two years?

<ESMA_QUESTION_178>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_178>

Q179: Should an SME-GM which falls below the 50% threshold in one calendar year be required to disclose that fact to the market?

<ESMA_QUESTION_179>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_179>

Q180: Which of the alternatives described above on how to deal with non-equity issuers for the purposes of the “at least 50% criterion” do you consider the most appropriate? Please give reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_180>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_180>

Q181: Do you agree that an SME-GM should be able to operate under the models described above, and that the choice of model should be left to the discretion of the operator (under the supervision of its NCA)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_181>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_181>



Q182: Do you agree that an SME-GM should establish and operate a regime which its NCA has assessed to be effective in ensuring that its issuers are “appropriate”?

<ESMA_QUESTION_182>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_182>

Q183: Do you agree with the factors to which a NCA should have regard when assessing if an SME-GM’s regulatory regime is effective?

<ESMA_QUESTION_183>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_183>

Q184: Do you think that there should be an appropriateness test for an SME-GM issuer’s management and board in order to confirm that they fulfil the responsibilities of a publicly quoted company?

<ESMA_QUESTION_184>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_184>

Q185: Do you think that there should be an appropriateness test for an SME-GM issuer’s systems and controls in order to confirm that they provide a reasonable basis for it to comply with its continuing obligations under the rules of the market?

<ESMA_QUESTION_185>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_185>

Q186: Do you agree with Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden., Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden. or Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden. Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden.?

<ESMA_QUESTION_186>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_186>

Q187: Are there any other criteria that should be set for the initial and on-going admission of financial instruments of issuers to SME-GMs?

<ESMA_QUESTION_187>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_187>

Q188: Should the SME-GM regime apply a general principle that an admission document should contain sufficient information for an investor to make an informed assessment of the financial position and prospects of the issuer and the rights attaching to its securities?

<ESMA_QUESTION_188>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_188>

Q189: Do you agree that SME-GMs should be able to take either a ‘top down’ or a ‘bottom up’ approach to their admission documents where a Prospectus is not required?

<ESMA_QUESTION_189>



TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_189>

Q190: Do you think that MiFID II should specify the detailed disclosures, or categories of disclosure, that the rules of a SME-GM would need to require, in order for admission documents prepared in accordance with those rules to comply with Article 33(3)(c) of MiFID II? Or do you think this should be the responsibility of the individual market, under the supervision of its NCA?

<ESMA_QUESTION_190>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_190>

Q191: If you consider that detailed disclosure requirements should be set at a MiFID level, which specific disclosures would be essential to the proper information of investors? Which elements (if any) of the proportionate schedules set out in Regulation 486/2012 should be dis-applied or modified, in order for an admission document to meet the objectives of the SME-GM framework (as long as there is no public offer requiring that a Prospectus will be drafted under the rules of the Prospectus Directive)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_191>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_191>

Q192: Should the future Level 2 Regulation require an SME-GM to make arrangements for an appropriate review of an admission document, designed to ensure that the information it contains is complete?

<ESMA_QUESTION_192>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_192>

Q193: Do you agree with this initial assessment by ESMA?

<ESMA_QUESTION_193>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_193>

Q194: In your view which reports should be included in the on-going periodic financial reporting by an issuer whose financial instruments are admitted to trading on an SME-GM?

<ESMA_QUESTION_194>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_194>

Q195: How and by which means should SME-GMs ensure that the reporting obligations are fulfilled by the issuers?

<ESMA_QUESTION_195>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_195>

Q196: Do you think that the more generous deadlines proposed for making reports public above (in the Box above, paragraph Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden.) are suitable, or should the deadlines imposed under the rules of the Transparency Directive also apply to issuers on SME-GMs?



<ESMA_QUESTION_196>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_196>

Q197: Do you agree with this assessment that the MiFID II framework should not impose any additional requirements/additional relief to those envisaged by MAR?

<ESMA_QUESTION_197>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_197>

Q198: What is your view on the possible requirements for the dissemination and storage of information?

<ESMA_QUESTION_198>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_198>

Q199: How and by which means should trading venues ensure that the dissemination and storage requirements are fulfilled by the issuers and which of the options described above do you prefer?

<ESMA_QUESTION_199>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_199>

Q200: How long should the information be stored from your point of view? Do you agree with the proposed period of 5 years or would you prefer a different one (e.g., 3 years)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_200>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_200>

Q201: Do you agree with this assessment that the MiFID II framework should not impose any additional requirements to those presented in MAR?

<ESMA_QUESTION_201>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_201>

6.2. Suspension and removal of financial instruments from trading

Q202: Do you agree that an approach based on a non-exhaustive list of examples provides an appropriate balance between facilitating a consistent application of the exception, while allowing appropriate judgements to be made on a case by case basis?

<ESMA_QUESTION_202>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_202>

Q203: Do you agree that NCAs would also need to consider the criteria described in paragraph Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden. Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden. and Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden., when making an assessment of relevant costs or risks?

<ESMA_QUESTION_203>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_203>

Q204: Which specific circumstances would you include in the list? Do you agree with the proposed examples?

<ESMA_QUESTION_204>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_204>

6.3. Substantial importance of a trading venue in a host Member State

Q205: Do you consider that the criteria established by Article 16 of MiFID Implementing Regulation remain appropriate for regulated markets?

<ESMA_QUESTION_205>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_205>

Q206: Do you agree with the additional criteria for establishing the substantial importance in the cases of MTFs and OTFs?

<ESMA_QUESTION_206>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_206>

6.4. Monitoring of compliance – information requirements for trading venues

Q207: Which circumstances would you include in this list? Do you agree with the circumstances described in the draft technical advice? What other circumstances do you think should be included in the list?

<ESMA_QUESTION_207>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_207>



6.5. Monitoring of compliance with the rules of the trading venue - determining circumstances that trigger the requirement to inform about conduct that may indicate abusive behaviour

Q208: Do you support the approach suggested by ESMA?

<ESMA_QUESTION_208>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_208>

Q209: Is there any limitation to the ability of the operator of several trading venues to identify a potentially abusive conduct affecting related financial instruments?

<ESMA_QUESTION_209>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_209>

Q210: What can be the implications for trading venues to make use of all information publicly available to complement their internal analysis of the potential abusive conduct to report such as managers' dealings or major shareholders' notifications)? Are there other public sources of information that could be useful for this purpose?

<ESMA_QUESTION_210>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_210>

Q211: Do you agree that the signals listed in the Annex contained in the draft advice constitute appropriate indicators to be considered by operators of trading venues? Do you see other signals that could be relevant to include in the list?

<ESMA_QUESTION_211>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_211>

Q212: Do you consider that front running should be considered in relation to the duty for operators of trading venues to report possible abusive conduct? If so, what could be the possible signal(s) to include in the list?

<ESMA_QUESTION_212>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_212>

7. Commodity derivatives

7.1. Financial instruments definition - specifying Section C 6, 7 and 10 of Annex I of MiFID II

Q213: Do you agree with ESMA’s approach on specifying contracts that “must” be physically settled and contracts that “can” be physically settled?

<ESMA_QUESTION_213>

We agree with ESMA’s approach to distinguish contracts that ‘must’ be physically settled and contracts that ‘can’ be physically settled. Moreover, we generally support ESMA’s interpretation of the definition of contracts that ‘can’ be physically settled. In this context, we would like to draw ESMA’s attention to a possible but certainly unintended ‘carve out’ which might potentially lead to an even bigger loophole than the one described in Question 215. We are convinced that although the term ‘forward’ is not explicitly mentioned in Annex I Section C (6) of MiFID II, forward contracts traded on regulated markets, MTFs or OTFs should be fully captured by the C (6) definition exactly as futures and other derivative contracts. Interestingly, the FCA already clarified this issue in a ‘Statement about broker-operated systems trading physically settled gas and power forwards’ on 11 September 2013 by stating that “Physically settled gas and power forwards that are traded on multilateral trading facilities (MTFs) are ‘financial instruments’ for the purposes of MiFID, and ‘OTC derivatives’ or ‘OTC derivative contracts’ for the purposes of EMIR.” Consequently, in case a ‘forward’ contract is traded on an OTF, it should be fully considered as a financial instrument, except for gas and power derivative contracts that ‘must be physically settled’.

<ESMA_QUESTION_213>

Q214: Which oil products in your view should be caught by the definition of C6 energy derivatives contracts and therefore be within the scope of the exemption? Please give reasons for your view stating, in particular, any practical repercussions of including or excluding products from the scope.

<ESMA_QUESTION_214>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_214>

Q215: Do you agree with ESMA’s approach on specifying contracts that must be physically settled?

<ESMA_QUESTION_215>

We do not fully agree with ESMA’s approach on the specification of which requirements contracts that ‘must be physically settled’ should meet.

The proposed definition of ‘must be physically settled’ comprises contracts that do not result in actual physical delivery. Indeed, ESMA’s current proposal does not forbid offsetting and is therefore in contradiction to Recital 10 of MiFID II.

If the current proposal was to be applied, it would significantly reduce the scope of MiFID II. This would lead to the undesired situation in which the majority of physically settled gas and power derivative contracts would be out of the scope of any financial regulation. Indeed:

- In many regions in Europe today, more than 80% of gas and power derivative trading is still done through broker platforms (often through non-MTFs platforms that are likely to become OTFs in the future). In certain European energy commodity markets, however, volumes of exchange-traded derivatives have fortunately steadily increased with a positive impact on transparency and a reduction of systemic risk as all exchange traded contracts are being cleared. This applies in particular to power derivative market in the Nordics where 95% of the trading is centrally cleared, the derivative markets for natural gas in the UK (NBP) and the Netherlands (TTF) as well as increasingly to German power derivatives trading. This positive progress is now under threat.
- With the implementation of Annex I Section C (6), the delineation between instruments classified as 'financial' and those that are not, based on where they are traded, will have the undesired effect of disincentivising the use of REMIT instruments on regulated markets and correspondingly incentivising the use of REMIT instruments traded on OTFs as the different types of instruments are easily substitutable.
- OTF traded physically settled gas and electricity contracts would not be subject to any regulatory requirements from financial regulation. This applies in particular to position limits, mandatory clearing, the future Benchmark Regulation and the Financial Transaction Tax. Of course, the carved out products would remain subject to the market abuse framework REMIT.
- Many market participants expect that a significant portion of the volumes currently traded on regulated markets would shift to OTFs. They would indeed try to avoid a regulatory trading environment which they perceive as more restrictive whilst similar products with the same economic rationale are available in a less regulated framework.
- This seems to be in clear contradiction to the G20 Pittsburgh commitments of September 2009 which aim to ensure that all standardised OTC derivative contracts are traded on regulated exchanges and where appropriate are cleared through CCPs "by the end of 2012 at the latest".

Physical delivery is a particularly complex process in wholesale gas and power markets. It therefore constitutes a great challenge to exclude the 'right' contracts from the scope of MiFID II without creating significant loopholes that may lead to large scale regulatory arbitrage. Hence, it is crucial to bear in mind that non-financial entities trading financial instruments in the context of their applied commercial strategies would in any case be exempted from the majority of the regulatory obligations (cf. Article 2(1)(j) of MiFID II and Article 10(3) of EMIR). Furthermore, thresholds exist for the clearing mandate in EMIR and the position limits regime in MiFID II. The exemptions/thresholds mentioned are appropriate tools for addressing the specific concerns of non-financial companies trading with financial instruments, concerns which are indeed important. However, the definition of financial instruments is not the appropriate tool for this purpose and, on the contrary, should be applied broadly in order to avoid loopholes and regulatory arbitrage.

Against this background, we would like to suggest an approach that limits the carve-out of 'must be physically settled' contracts to those contracts which actually go into physical delivery, in accordance with Recital 10. You will find a concrete proposal at the end of this answer. In order to better understand the logic of our approach, here at first a few comments on ESMA's initial proposal as well as some further considerations:

- Concerning (i): we generally agree with outlining the obligation for both counterparties to be able to perform the physical settlement. Nevertheless, we suggest additionally emphasizing the contractual obligation of the entitled purchasing party (the 'buyer') to accept the entitled selling party's (the 'seller') delivery of the underlying commodity. The same applies to the seller who must be contractually obliged to deliver the underlying commodity. For wholesale gas and power markets the parties should at least have a balancing agreement and a supplying licence.
- Concerning (ii): we fully agree that no contractual option must exist in the contractual agreement to cash settle the given physical delivery obligations.

- Concerning (iii): we are convinced that the wording suggested by ESMA does not yet fully reflect the offsetting interdiction outlined in Recital 10. The term ‘cancelled out’ cannot be used as a synonym for ‘to offset’. Indeed, it is possible to offset quantities to be physically delivered without cancelling out any obligation from a previous contract with the same party. Therefore, we recommend amending ESMA’s draft technical advice and aligning it closer with the expression of ‘to offset’ in Recital 10. In order to be considered as a ‘must be physically settled’ contract, the contract specifications need to explicitly state that it is forbidden to offset the quantity contracted with any other physical quantity stemming from another obligation of the party concerned. This means that for a given delivery day, all the derivative contracts going to delivery that are classified as being ‘must be physically settled’ should be either on the buy side or on the sell side.

- Concerning (iv): We deem it crucial to add another criterion to the specifications in order to impede all the contracts on the buy side (or on the sell side) to be captured by the ‘must be physically settled’ exemption. Yet, it is difficult to check whether any offsetting has taken place, even on an ex-post basis, as the nominations processes vary significantly from one EU member state to another. For this reason, a check where the party needs to be able to demonstrate that the overall sum of its contractual obligations which must be physically settled does not exceed the quantities of its commercial activities should be put in place. We believe that this approach is significantly easier to apply and more practical than to rely on actual nominations.

We support this option as the physical settlement of a contract and its commercial purpose are intrinsically linked. This is also highlighted in the International Accounting Standards (IAS). More precisely, we suggest relying on the International Accounting Standard 39 on ‘Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement’. Hereby, IAS 39 (6) defines what the contrary to physical settlement is, namely a contract that is not entered into for the purpose of the receipt or delivery of the non-financial item in accordance with the entity’s expected purchase, sale or usage requirements:

“(6) There are various ways in which a contract to buy or sell a non-financial item can be settled net in cash or another financial instrument or by exchanging financial instruments. These include:

[...]

(b) when the ability to settle net in cash or another financial instrument, or by exchanging financial instruments, is not explicit in the terms of the contract, but the entity has a practice of settling similar contracts net in cash or another financial instrument or by exchanging financial instruments (whether with the counterparty, by entering into offsetting contracts or by selling the contract before its exercise or lapse);

(c) when, for similar contracts, the entity has a practice of taking delivery of the underlying and selling it within a short period after delivery for the purpose of generating a profit from short-term fluctuations in price or dealer’s margin; [...]”

Hence, IAS 39 (6) clearly links the receipt or the delivery of the underlying commodity to the purpose of commercial risk reduction. In this context, we consider that the IC6 exemption for energy commodity derivatives that ‘must be physically settled’ shall be limited to transactions with the purpose of commercial risk reduction only. For this reason, the existing hedging definition of the European Market Infrastructure Regulation (EMIR) shall be fully applicable but is not sufficient. In addition, there needs to be a direct relation between the transactions ‘that must be physically settled’ and the actual underlying volumes in the traded physical commodity as part of the overall commercial activity of the respective company. In other words, only those volumes can be delivered in an enforceable and binding manner where the party has either:

- a) The equivalent capacity to produce or to purchase the respective commodity; or
- b) The equivalent capacity to consume or sell the respective commodity.

Those commercial activities should be restrained to the following list: the generation, storage and consumption of the underlying physical commodity / the procurement of the underlying physical commodity from producers via non-standardised long term procurement contracts / the operation of energy transmission and distribution networks. Therefore, this requirement can only be met when the transactions that ‘must be physically settled’ do not exceed the gross volumes of the underlying commercial activities at group level.

Given the considerations made above, we would like to suggest the following amendments to the initial ESMA proposal:

1. Contracts *that must be physically settled if shall contain the following specifications:*

*i. the party to the contract entitled to receive the underlying commodity has an unrestricted and unconditional right to physical delivery **and inversely an unrestricted and unconditional obligation to accept the physical delivery (e.g., for gas and electricity, a contractual balancing agreement with an energy network operator at all the time between contract closing and physical delivery);***

ii. there is no option for either party to replace physical delivery with cash settlement;

iii. the underlying physical quantity that must be delivered cannot be offset with any physical quantities from other obligations of the party at group level.

iv. the party needs to be able to demonstrate that the overall sum of the contractual obligations which must be physically settled does not exceed the quantities of its commercial activities.

<ESMA_QUESTION_215>

Q216: How do operational netting arrangements in power and gas markets work in practice? Please describe such arrangements in detail. In particular, please describe the type and timing of the actions taken by the various parties in the process, and the discretion over those actions that the parties have.

<ESMA_QUESTION_216>

From a trading point of view, the delivery of gas and power is carried out through nomination. Operational netting is done by the grid operator when it receives the nominations of the respective nominating parties.

Nomination in general takes place between two days and several hours before the actual delivery, depending on the commodity and the country (nominations can be done beforehand depending on the country but the final nomination to be taken into account always takes place on the final trading day). Market participants have to submit schedules to the energy network operator (e.g. TSOs or hub operators), indicating the amount of gas they have sold or bought to other counterparties for this delivery period. Nominations are either done:

a) on a net basis: if a company has bought and then sold to the same counterpart a specific amount of gas/power for the same delivery period, only the net quantity is nominated. At the end, the energy network operator exercises multilateral netting, enabling it to measure the amount of gas/power that would actually flow from/to this counterpart.

b) or on a gross basis: in this case, every contract is nominated to the energy network operator. The operator does both bilateral and multilateral netting.

It should be noted in this context that in case of a counterpart being an ‘exclusive’ buyer or seller, the energy network operator cannot perform any netting as this quantity is the actual flow running through the grid.

Hence, operational netting constitutes a non-discretionary practice conducted by the energy network operator which only nets the contracts that can be netted at portfolio level of a company. A company that is not engaged in speculative trading and that exclusively performs the delivery of gas/power would only have a small part of its contracts netted by the energy network operator (if any at all). The result of this operational netting is the actual flow of the commodity. It is therefore absolutely crucial that only this part of trading is considered as ‘must be physically settled’ as it is the only one which corresponds to the actual physical delivery.

Operational netting is therefore a ‘normal’ technical netting process by the energy network operator. As outlined in Recital 10 of MiFID II, contracts that must be physically settled should be limited to contracts that are not off-set, including via operational netting.

<ESMA_QUESTION_216>

Q217: Please provide concrete examples of contracts that must be physically settled for power, natural gas, coal and oil. Please describe the contracts in detail and identify on which platforms they are traded at the moment.

<ESMA_QUESTION_217>

Based on the draft definition of ‘must be physically settled’ in the present Consultation Paper (, the majority of gas and power contracts would be excluded from financial regulation. This is because the current approach would allow a company which nets all its positions to still characterise its contracts as being ‘must be physically settled’. This means that all contracts traded on broker platforms (cf. ‘non-MTFs’ that will eventually transform into OTFs under MiFID II) would fall under the C6 OTF exemption. As mentioned in our response to Question 215, depending on the country, the market share of brokers vs. regulated markets varies significantly in the EU: Yet, the market share of brokers today is already above 80% in the large majority of the EU member states.

Given that derivatives traded on regulated markets and broker platforms are perfectly substitutable, defining contracts traded on regulated markets as financial instruments and contracts traded on OTFs as non-financial instruments will undoubtedly result in a shift of trading from regulated markets to OTFs. If this was to apply, there would be no more financial regulation in the gas and power sector. Clearly, if regulation incentivises the use of non-regulated instruments, the market will shift to using those instruments, irrespective of which instruments are being used at the moment and where they are traded.

With the amendments that we suggest in our response to Q215, we aim to capture all contracts ‘that must be physically settled’ and that result in actual physical delivery of gas or power. These contracts correspond for instance to contracts bought by a supplier (traded bilaterally or via an OTF) and directly delivered to the final energy consumers. At a global level, the total volume of contracts to which the condition of ‘must be physically delivered’ apply should be inferior to the total net volume of the commercial activities of the party at group level. With those criteria in place, only a small part of gas and power contracts, representing actual delivery for commercial purposes, will be excluded from financial regulation. This would be in accordance with the G20 Pittsburgh commitments as well as with Recital 10 of MiFID II.

<ESMA_QUESTION_217>

Q218: How do you understand and how would you describe the concepts of “force majeure” and “other bona fide inability to settle” in this context?

<ESMA_QUESTION_218>

The ‘force majeure’ clause relieves both parties from their obligation to physically deliver or accept physical delivery in extraordinary circumstances beyond their control.



The 'bona fide inability to perform' condition in Recital 10 of MiFID II is limited to cases where the performance of the physical settlement obligation specified in the contract cannot be fulfilled due to objective reasons that have not been intentionally caused by either party. For instance, the inability of the energy network operator (e.g. TSOs or hub operators) to perform the nomination services in compliance with the respective grid access rules would constitute such an extraordinary event. However, reasons of inability to perform or accept delivery that lie within the responsibility of a party concerned must not be considered bona fide inability.

<ESMA_QUESTION_218>

Q219: Do you agree that Article 38 of Regulation (EC) No 1287/2006 has worked well in practice and elements of it should be preserved? If not, which elements in your view require amendments?

<ESMA_QUESTION_219>

Since its entry into force, Article 38 has been difficult to apply as its current wording leaves room for interpretation. Europex therefore welcomes ESMA's initiative to further clarify and review this. In this context, we deem it to be important that the C7 definition (and its specification in Article 38) must restrict the possibility to operate a trading venue that is neither a regulated market nor an MTF or an OTF.

<ESMA_QUESTION_219>

Q220: Do you agree that the definition of spot contract in paragraph 2 of Article 38 of Regulation (EC) 1287/2006 is still valid and should become part of the future implementing measures for MiFID II? If not, what changes would you propose?

<ESMA_QUESTION_220>

The overall delivery period for electricity and gas spot contracts often exceeds the two days defined in Art 38 (2). Hence, we recommend to amend the present wording as follows:

"2. A spot contract for the purposes of paragraph 1 means a contract for the sale of a commodity, asset or right, under the terms of which delivery is scheduled to be **started made** within the longer of the following periods:"

<ESMA_QUESTION_220>

Q221: Do you agree that the definition of a contract for commercial purposes in paragraph 4 of Article 38 of Regulation (EC) 1287/2006 is still valid and should become part of the future implementing measures for MiFID II? If not, what changes would you propose? What other contracts, in your view, should be listed among those to be considered for commercial purposes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_221>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_221>

Q222: Do you agree that the future Delegated Act should not refer to clearing as a condition for determining whether an instrument qualifies as a commodity derivative under Section C 7 of Annex I?

<ESMA_QUESTION_222>

We strongly agree that the clearing criterion should be deleted. If a contract is a financial instrument or not must not depend on whether it is cleared or not.

<ESMA_QUESTION_222>

Q223: Do you agree that standardisation of a contract as expressed in Article 38(1) Letter c of Regulation (EC) No 1287/2006 remains an important indicator for classifying financial instruments and therefore should be maintained?

<ESMA_QUESTION_223>



TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_223>

Q224: Do you agree with the proposal to maintain the alternatives for trading contracts in Article 38(1)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 1287/2006 taking into account the emergence of the OTF as a MiFID trading venue in the future Delegated Act?

<ESMA_QUESTION_224>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_224>

Q225: Do you agree that the existing provision in Article 38(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1287/2006 for determining whether derivative contracts within the scope of Section C(10) of Annex I should be classified as financial instruments should be updated as necessary but overall be maintained? If not, which elements in your view require amendments?

<ESMA_QUESTION_225>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_225>

Q226: Do you agree that the list of contracts in Article 39 of Regulation (EC) No 1287/2006 should be maintained? If not, which type of contracts should be added or which ones should be deleted?

<ESMA_QUESTION_226>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_226>

Q227: What is your view with regard to adding as an additional type of derivative contract those relating to actuarial statistics?

<ESMA_QUESTION_227>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_227>

Q228: What do you understand by the terms “reason of default or other termination event” and how does this differ from “except in the case of force majeure, default or other bona fide inability to perform”?

<ESMA_QUESTION_228>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_228>

7.2. Position reporting thresholds

Q229: Do you agree with the proposed threshold for the number of position holders? If not, please state your preferred thresholds and the reason why.

<ESMA_QUESTION_229>
Assuming an exchange has only one member belonging to one of the five categories of ‘commercial undertakings’ and is subject to reporting, it would still have to publish positions held by persons who constitute such ‘commercial undertaking’, including sensitive information like the trading purpose, etc.. In a situation where only one person at the exchange belongs to a specific category, its positions would suddenly become publicly available to all. This would pose a serious threat to competition. Hence, we disagree with

the proposed threshold as it might lead to unintended consequences for the publication of sensitive information of small markets and suggest amending ESMA's proposal accordingly.

In order to avoid a situation as described above we would like to suggest the following approach:

1) A minimum threshold should apply to each of the five categories. Against this background, we consider the proposed number of five participants per category to be sufficiently balanced. If the number of participants in a specific category is smaller than five, the report of the respective category should be summarized with the next smallest group provided that the number of participants in this merged category is at least five. If the number of participants is still below five, the new group will have to be merged with the next smallest category as long as the minimum amount of five participants is reached.

2) In addition, an overall minimum number of position holders should be defined. Here, we agree with ESMA's proposal of 30.
<ESMA_QUESTION_229>

Q230: Do you agree with the proposed minimum threshold level for the open interest criteria for the publication of reports? If not, please state your preferred alternative for the definition of this threshold and explain the reasons why this would be more appropriate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_230>

We generally agree with ESMA's considerations. However, when determining the deliverable supply of the same commodity derivative the following aspects should be considered:

- Gas and electricity are grid-bound commodities. Trading in gas and electricity is performed with physically and financially settled derivatives with different regional hubs and market areas as delivery points. Due to the various levels of maturity of the market areas (e.g. German/Austrian power vs. Swiss power), the derivatives offered for trading at mature hubs are used as proxy-hedges for positions at less mature hubs. Given this, we suggest building reasonable (sub-)groups of market areas when estimating the size of the deliverable supply. For gas and power, the easiest way could be to tackle the European gas or power deliverable supply and to have it from ACER or ENTSO-E or ENTSO-G.
- Other commodity markets are traded globally – e.g. coal or oil where the determination of the actual size of the deliverable supply is very difficult. For those markets the global nature of the underlying markets should be taken into account.

Regarding the proposed minimum threshold of four, we consider this number to be at the very low edge of a mature market. Furthermore, this number might be too low when judging the reporting effort and the market participants' interest to obtain transparent and detailed information on commodity derivatives with significant trading interest. We therefore suggest increasing the number to at least seven.

<ESMA_QUESTION_230>

Q231: Do you agree with the proposed timeframes for publication once activity on a trading venue either reaches or no longer reaches the two thresholds?

<ESMA_QUESTION_231>

In order to provide market participants with sustainable guidance, we deem that a minimum period should apply where both parameters exceed both thresholds. This period should be the same three months that are proposed as timeframe for the publication of reports once the activity on a trading venue no longer reaches the two thresholds.

<ESMA_QUESTION_231>

7.3. Position management powers of ESMA



Q232: Do you agree that the listed factors and criteria allow ESMA to determine the existence of a threat to the stability of the (whole or part of the) financial system in the EU?

<ESMA_QUESTION_232>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_232>

Q233: What other factors and criteria should be taken into account?

<ESMA_QUESTION_233>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_233>

Q234: Do you agree with ESMA’s definition of a market fulfilling its economic function?

<ESMA_QUESTION_234>
In order for the price discovery to be efficient and fair, we would like to add that transparency constitutes another important prerequisite for the orderly functioning and the integrity of financial commodity derivatives and physical markets.
<ESMA_QUESTION_234>

Q235: Do you agree that the listed factors and criteria allow ESMA to adequately determine the existence of a threat to the orderly functioning and integrity of financial markets or commodity derivative market so as to justify position management intervention by ESMA?

<ESMA_QUESTION_235>
We believe that the de facto inability by a trading venue to exercise its own position management powers because of an event preventing it from carrying on with business in a normal way requires further specification. In particular, the relevance of the specific venue in relation to the overall market liquidity as well as the potential existence of alternative trading venues available to perform necessary position management powers needs to be considered. The sole fact that a venue is temporarily not able to perform its own position management powers should not constitute a threat to the orderly functioning and integrity of financial markets and commodity derivative markets.

Additionally, the terms ‘significant’ and ‘abrupt’ require further specification.
<ESMA_QUESTION_235>

Q236: What other factors and criteria should be taken into account?

<ESMA_QUESTION_236>
The relevance of the specific venue in relation to the overall market liquidity as well as the potential existence of alternative trading venues available to perform necessary position management powers need to be considered. The sole fact that a venue is temporarily not able to perform its own position management powers should not constitute a threat to the orderly functioning and integrity of financial markets and commodity derivative markets.
<ESMA_QUESTION_236>

Q237: Do you consider that the above factors sufficiently take account of “the degree to which positions are used to hedge positions in physical commodities or commodity contracts and the degree to which prices in underlying markets are set by reference to the prices of commodity derivatives”? If not, what further factors would you propose?

<ESMA_QUESTION_237>

Substantial distortions in the respective physical supply, a significant and abrupt increase of the demand of a commodity and potential market squeezing capabilities of individual persons or persons acting in concert constitute the relevant factors to be considered when assessing whether market participants are able to hedge physical commodity market exposures / exposures in the spot market. Those factors do also take into account the degree to which prices in underlying markets are set by reference to the prices of commodity derivatives.

<ESMA_QUESTION_237>

Q238: Do you agree that the listed factors and criteria allow ESMA to determine the appropriate reduction of a position or exposure entered into via a derivative?

<ESMA_QUESTION_238>

We generally agree with the listed factors.

When assessing the overall market of a specific commodity the deliverable supply should be considered as relevant basis for the estimation of the limits applicable to spot or near-spot positions rather than the trading volumes in this specific market that can be more or less mature.

When considering the grid-bound commodities electricity and gas, it should be additionally taken into account that the European internal energy market is getting increasingly interlinked. This follows initiatives based on the European Energy Market Model like market coupling and mergers of market areas. As a consequence, the deliverable supply provided increases across market borders including the cross hedging practice of the market participants. Hence, the market size should be determined on an aggregated level (e.g. the European power supply volumes rather than individual national power supplies on a standalone basis). – Please also refer to our response to Q230.

Furthermore, the overall market size and structure should be taken into consideration (e.g. global vs. local markets, small vs. large numbers of participants, the maturity of markets or products, the liquidity of the markets or the products, etc.). In particular, non-grid bound commodities are increasingly globally traded and a restrictive analysis of the underlying commodity limited to the European production or consumption capacity may lead to wrong assessments for those contracts.

<ESMA_QUESTION_238>

Q239: What other factors and criteria should be taken into account?

<ESMA_QUESTION_239>

One additional factor is the maturity of the positions arising from derivative contracts. Positions close to maturity are the most relevant when it comes to preventing market abuse (e.g. market squeezing) by setting position limits. However, when calculating position limits per contract, it has to be considered that there may be overlapping maturities and substitution possibilities among the different types of contracts traded.

<ESMA_QUESTION_239>

Q240: Do you agree that some factors are more important than others in determining what an “appropriate reduction of a position” is within a given market? If yes, which are the most important factors for ESMA to consider?

<ESMA_QUESTION_240>

We deem the most important factors for the reduction of a position to be the following:

- The purpose of the position
- The maturity of a contract (cf. our response to Question 239)
- And for derivatives with short maturities: the size of a position vis-à-vis the physical market.

<ESMA_QUESTION_240>

Q241: Do you agree that the listed factors and criteria allow ESMA to adequately determine the situations where a risk of regulatory arbitrage could arise from the exercise of position management powers by ESMA?

<ESMA_QUESTION_241>

There is a high risk of regulatory arbitrage, if the same or similar contracts were to be treated differently due to their different regulatory statuses (e.g. derivatives / financial instruments vs. economically equivalent similar contracts). Hence, it is important to treat contracts traded on a Regulated Market or a MTF and contracts executed OTC or traded on an OTF equally and to provide the same position management powers to ESMA and the respective competent national authorities.

Additional potential of regulatory arbitrage may arise from the legislative transposition of the respective MiFID II articles into national law. Therefore, it is necessary to comprehensively harmonise the transposition and implementation process at national level.

It should be furthermore ensured that ESMA and the competent national authorities receive detailed position information:

- From all venue and off-venue OTC transactions (including from third country trading venues)
- In the same and similar derivatives and
- The same or similar non-financial instruments according to Annex I Section C (6)
- From all market participants (including third country trading participants)

<ESMA_QUESTION_241>

Q242: What other criteria and factors should be taken into account?

<ESMA_QUESTION_242>

Cf. our response to Question 241

<ESMA_QUESTION_242>

Q243: If regulatory arbitrage may arise from inconsistent approaches to interrelated markets, what is the best way of identifying such links and correlations?

<ESMA_QUESTION_243>

The identification of interrelations and interdependencies between different commodity markets needs to take into account the general behaviour of the acting market participants as well as a comprehensive analysis of the different markets' characteristics in terms of correlation, underlying and venues. In this context, especially third country venue access for market participants should be considered. In the gas and power sector, specific attention should be paid to physically settled contracts traded on trading venues and OTC. In particular, the definition of 'must be physically settled' should be precise enough in order to avoid regulatory arbitrage between OTFs and regulated markets.

<ESMA_QUESTION_243>



8. Portfolio compression

Q244: What are your views on the proposed approach for legal documentation and portfolio compression criteria?

<ESMA_QUESTION_244>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_244>

Q245: What are your views on the approach proposed by ESMA with regard to information to be published by the compression service provider related to the volume of transactions and the timing when they were concluded?

<ESMA_QUESTION_245>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_245>