



European Securities and
Markets Authority

Reply form for the ESMA MiFID II/MiFIR Discussion 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 Discussion 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. Authorisation of investment firms

Q1: Do you agree that the existing work/standards set out in points Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable. and Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable. Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable. provide a valid basis on which to develop implementing measures in respect of the authorisation of investment firms?

<ESMA_QUESTION_1>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_1>

Q2: What areas of these existing standards do you consider require adjustment, and in what way should they be adjusted?

<ESMA_QUESTION_2>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_2>

Q3: Do you consider that the list of information set out in point Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable. should be provided to Home State NCAs? If not, what other information should ESMA consider?

<ESMA_QUESTION_3>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_3>

Q4: Are there any other elements which may help to assess whether the main activities of an applicant investment firm is not in the territory where the application is made?

<ESMA_QUESTION_4>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_4>

Q5: How much would one-off costs incurred during the authorisation process increase, compared to current practices, in order to meet the requirements suggested in this section?

<ESMA_QUESTION_5>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_5>

Q6: Are there any particular items of information suggested above that would take significant time or cost to produce and if so, do you have alternative suggestions that would reduce the time/cost for firms yet provide the same assurance to NCAs?

<ESMA_QUESTION_6>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_6>

2.2. Freedom to provide investment services and activities / Establishment of a branch

Q7: Do you agree that development of technical standards required under Articles 34 and 35 of MiFID II should be based on the existing standards and forms contained in the CESR Protocol on MiFID Notifications (CESR/07-317c)? If not, what are the specific areas in the existing CESR standards requiring review and adjustment?

<ESMA_QUESTION_7>

AFG agrees that the CESR Protocol forms a good basis for technical standards under MiFID II, with suitable amendments to reflect the removal of passporting provisions for retail services and activities.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_7>

2.3. Best execution - publication of data related to the quality of execution by trading venues for each financial instrument traded

Q8: Do you agree data should be provided by all the execution venues as set out in footnote 24? If not, please state why not.

<ESMA_QUESTION_8>

Yes, we agree that Regulated Markets, MTFs, OTFs, SIs, market makers and other liquidity providers should provide data on the quality of the execution of transactions.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_8>

Q9: If you think that the different types of venues should not publish exactly the same data, please specify how the data should be adapted in each case, and the reasons for each adjustment.

<ESMA_QUESTION_9>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_9>

Q10: Should the data publication obligation apply to every financial instrument traded on the execution venue? Alternatively, should there be a minimum threshold of activity and, if so, how should it be defined (for example, frequency of trades, number of trades, turnover etc.)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_10>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_10>

Q11: How often should all execution data be published by trading venues? Is the minimum requirement specified in MiFID II sufficient, or should this frequency be increased? Is it reasonable or beneficial to require publication on a monthly basis and is it possible to reliably estimate the marginal cost of increased frequency?

<ESMA_QUESTION_11>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_11>

Q12: Please provide an estimate of the cost of the necessary IT development for the production and the publication of such reporting.

<ESMA_QUESTION_12>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_12>

Q13: Do you agree that trading venues should publish the data relating to the quality of execution with regard to a uniform reference period, with a minimum of specific reporting details and in a compatible format of data based on a homogeneous calculation method? If not, please state why.

<ESMA_QUESTION_13>

Yes. Standard reference periods and reporting details are vital to enable comparison between venues. The specific reporting details may need to vary from one type of financial instrument to another to remain relevant.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_13>

Q14: Is the volume of orders received and executed a good indicator for investment firms to compare execution venues? Would the VBBO in a single stock published at the same time also be a good indicator by facilitating the creation of a periodic European price benchmark? Are there other indicators to be considered?

<ESMA_QUESTION_14>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_14>

Q15: The venue execution quality reporting obligation is intended to apply to all MiFID instruments. Is this feasible and what differences in approach will be required for different instrument types?

<ESMA_QUESTION_15>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_15>

Q16: Do you consider that this requirement will generate any additional cost? If yes, could you specify in which areas and provide an estimation of these costs?

<ESMA_QUESTION_16>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_16>

Q17: If available liquidity and execution quality are a function of order size, is it appropriate to split trades into ranges so that they are comparable? How should they be defined (for example, as a percentage of the average trading size of the financial instrument on the execution venue; fixed ranges by volume or value; or in another manner)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_17>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_17>

Q18: Do you agree that a benchmark price is needed to evaluate execution quality? Would a depth-weighted benchmark that relates in size to the executed order be appropriate or, if not, could you provide alternative suggestions together with justification?

<ESMA_QUESTION_18>

For fixed income instruments which may not be liquid there would be no index or value which could be used to determine a benchmark price. Thus a benchmark price may not be feasible for such instruments.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_18>

Q19: What kind of cost should be reported (e.g. regulatory levies, taxes, mandatory clearing fees) and how should this data be presented to enable recipients to assess the total consideration of transactions?

<ESMA_QUESTION_19>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_19>

Q20: What would be the most appropriate way to measure the likelihood of execution in order to get useful data? Would it be a good indicator for likelihood of execution to measure the percentage of orders not executed at the end of the applicable trading period (for example the end of each trading day)? Should the modification of an order be taken into consideration?

<ESMA_QUESTION_20>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_20>

Q21: What would be the most appropriate way to measure the speed of execution in order to get useful data?

<ESMA_QUESTION_21>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_21>

Q22: Are there other criteria (qualitative or quantitative) that are particularly relevant (e.g. market structures providing for a guarantee of settlement of the trades vs OTC deals; robustness of the market infrastructure due to the existence of circuit breakers)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_22>

In terms of other criteria the reliability / outages of each venue should be reported.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_22>

Q23: Is data on orders cancelled useful and if so, on what time basis should it be computed (e.g. within a single trading day)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_23>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_23>

Q24: Are there any adjustments that need to be made to the above execution quality metrics to accommodate different market microstructures?

<ESMA_QUESTION_24>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_24>

Q25: What additional measures are required to define or capture the above data and relevant additional information (e.g. depth weighted spreads, book depths, or others)? How should the data be presented: on an average basis such as daily, weekly or monthly for each financial instrument (or on more than one basis)? Do you think that the metrics captured in the Annex to this chapter are relevant to European markets trading in the full range of MiFID instruments? What alternative could you propose?

<ESMA_QUESTION_25>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_25>

Q26: Please provide an estimate of the costs of production and publication of all of the above data and, the IT developments required? How could these costs be minimised?

<ESMA_QUESTION_26>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_26>

Q27: Would increasing the frequency of venue execution quality data generate additional costs for you? Would these costs arise as a result of an increase of the frequency of the review, or because this review will require additional training for your staff in order to be able to analyse and take into account these data? Please provide an estimate of these costs.

<ESMA_QUESTION_27>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_27>

Q28: Do you agree that investment firms should take the publication of the data envisaged in this Discussion Paper into consideration, in order to determine whether they represent a “material change”?

<ESMA_QUESTION_28>

Yes

<ESMA_QUESTION_28>

2.4. Best execution - publication of data by investment firms

Q29: Do you agree that in order to allow clients to evaluate the quality of a firm’s execution, any proposed standards should oblige the firm to give an appropriate picture of the venues and the different ways they execute an order?

<ESMA_QUESTION_29>

Yes

<ESMA_QUESTION_29>

Q30: Do you agree that when systematic internalisers, market makers, OTC negotiation or dealing on own account represent one of the five most important ways for the firm to execute clients’ orders, they should be incorporated in the reporting obligations under Article 27(6) of MiFID II?

<ESMA_QUESTION_30>

Yes

<ESMA_QUESTION_30>

Q31: Do you think that the data provided should be different in cases when the firm directly executes the orders to when the firm transmits the orders to a third-party for execution? If yes, please indicate what the differences should be, and explain why.

<ESMA_QUESTION_31>

Whether or not the orders have been traded directly by the firm or passed onto a third-party for execution, the reporting should include the market or venue traded on. In the case of orders executed directly by the firm, the information should include how much of the order was transacted using internal proprietary flow or crossed internally as opposed to being traded as an agency order externally.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_31>

Q32: Do you consider that information on both directed and non-directed orders is useful? Should the data be aggregated so that both types of order are shown together or separated? Should there be a similar approach to disclosure of information on market orders versus limit orders? Do you think that another categorisation of client orders could be useful?

<ESMA_QUESTION_32>

There should be no need for distinction between directed and non-directed orders – the data should be aggregated to show all types of orders together. Similarly with market versus limit orders, there is no need for distinction on the part of the investment firm receiving the order – often instruction can change shape within the course of an order (especially when limits are being used or discussed), and therefore it could become over-complicated and unhelpful to separate information as to what part of the order was under different instruction. In the operation of the majority of orders, especially where a client has either made a decision regarding directing a part of the order, or placing a limit on the order or part of the order, there is undoubtedly more of a sharing of responsibility between client and investment firm in the provision of best execution. Under current interpretation, the burden of demonstrating best execution has tended to fall on the investment firm in these cases, especially if a commission is being paid by the client for an agency-type order, so it must be tempting for ESMA to try to distinguish more clearly exactly where the burden of responsibility must lie. However, the splitting of such data would not only be unhelpful for analysis, but would also begin to impede the relationship between investment firm and client, when the execution policies of both already set out to achieve the same goal of best result for the client. Working together to provide best execution is the key to success rather than over-analysis of what parts of certain orders were under direction or limit.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_32>

Q33: Do you think that the reporting data should separate retail clients from other types of clients? Do you think that this data should be publicly disclosed or only provided to the NCA (e.g. when requested to assess whether there is unfair discrimination between retail clients and other categories)? Is there a more useful way to categorise clients for these purposes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_33>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_33>

Q34: Do you agree that the investment firms should publish the data relating to their execution of orders with regard to a uniform reference period, with a minimum of specific reporting details and in a compatible format of data based on a homogeneous calculation method? If not, please state why.

<ESMA_QUESTION_34>

Yes. In order to maximise the usefulness of the information for investors we consider this vital.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_34>

Q35: What would be an acceptable delay for publication to provide the clients with useful data?

<ESMA_QUESTION_35>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_35>

Q36: What format should the report take? Should there be any difference depending on the nature of the execution venues (MTF, OTF, Regulated Market, systematic internalisers, own account) and, if so, could you specify the precise data required for each type?

<ESMA_QUESTION_36>
The report should be broken down by nature of execution venue, as proposed. The data should show the total number of orders received, the combined value over the period, and then sub-divided down into individual transactions showing:

- i. Shares dealt
- ii. Execution venue used, and direct costs involved in using that venue (incl. rebates)
- iii. Average price of transaction
- iv. Arrival price
- v. Relative performance to arrival price
- vi. Volume weighted average price (VWAP) over period of transaction
- vii. Relative performance to VWAP
- viii. Total volume reported to market over the period
- ix. Shares dealt as percentage of total volume reported
- x. Percentage of shares crossed internally, if applicable

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_36>

Q37: Do you agree that it is proportionate to require investment firms to publish on an annual basis a summary based on their internal execution quality monitoring of their top five execution venues in terms of trading volumes, subject to certain minimum standards?

<ESMA_QUESTION_37>
Yes, as stated above, it is very difficult to distinguish execution quality that comes as a result of a client directing part of an order or setting a specific limit, as opposed to the execution quality that is derived from the investment firm taking the necessary diligence to obtain the best possible result. An annual summary of their top five execution venues regarding general execution quality, and the monitoring of these venues would be entirely sufficient in this regard; more granular analysis of the quarterly order flow reporting described in the answer to Q36 above would have already derived some conclusions for the client if he has been monitoring the reports over the previous four quarters sent to him by the investment firm.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_37>

Q38: Do you have views on how 'directed orders' covered by client specific instructions should be captured in the information on execution quality? Is it possible to disaggregate reporting for directed orders from those for which there are no specific instructions and, if so, what the most relevant criteria would be for this exercise?

<ESMA_QUESTION_38>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_38>

Q39: Minimum standards to ensure that the summary of the firm's internal execution quality monitoring of their top five execution venues (in terms of trading volumes) is comprehensive and contains sufficient analysis or context to allow it to be understood by market participants shall include the factors set out at paragraph 29. Do you agree with this analysis or are there any other relevant factors that should be considered as minimum standards for reporting?

<ESMA_QUESTION_39>

The factors set in at paragraph 29 of the Discussion Paper seem relevant, as long as these are applied proportionately. For example, if a firm executes only two orders in a class of financial instruments, or has only one retail customer, it may be proportionate to exclude these from the execution quality monitoring, and thus the summary of the monitoring.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_39>

Q40: Can you recommend an alternative approach to the provision of information on execution quality obtained by investment firms, which is consistent with Article 27(6) of MiFID II and with ESMA's overall objective to ensure proportionate implementation?

<ESMA_QUESTION_40>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_40>

Q41: Do you agree that ESMA should try to limit the number of definitions of classes of instruments and provide a classification that can be used for the different reports established by MiFID and MiFIR?

<ESMA_QUESTION_41>

ESMA should try to limit the number of definitions of classes of instruments, and provide a harmonised classification.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_41>

Q42: If this approach is not viable how should these classes be defined? What elements should be taken into consideration for that classification? Please explain the rationale of your classification. Is there a need to delay the publication of the reporting for particular class of financial instruments? If the schedule has to be defined, what timeframe would be the most relevant?

<ESMA_QUESTION_42>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_42>

Q43: Is any additional data required (for instance, on number of trades or total value of orders routed)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_43>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_43>

Q44: What information on conflicts of interest would be appropriate (inducements, capital links, payment for order flow, etc.)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_44>

From our perspective, it would be useful for clients to know if venues were associated with the firm, leading to the potential for conflicts of interest.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE



<ESMA_QUESTION_44>

3. Transparency

3.1. Pre-trade transparency - Equities

Q45: What in your view would be the minimum content of information that would make an indication of interest actionable? Please provide arguments with your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_45>

From our view, the minimum content of information that would make an indication of interest actionable should be:

- The price,
- The volume or size of the order,
- The direction (buy or sell);
- The time of input; and
- The firm commitment to trade under those parameters on a first-come, first-served basis in case of match of these criteria through the use of an explicit reference that it is actionable (to avoid capturing legitimate (non-actionable) Indications of Interest).

Based on those criteria, we believe that crossing networks, such as Liquidnet or ITG Posit for instance, does not constitute an actionable IOI as their matching process does not involve a firm commitment to trade on a specific price or volume before the latest stage of the negotiation.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_45>

Q46: Do you agree with ESMA's opinion that Table 1 of Annex II of Regulation 1287/2006 is still valid for shares traded on regulated markets and MTFs? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_46>

Yes we support ESMA's proposal because these criteria are the ones currently applied and the ones that are applied by the trading venues and trading systems.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_46>

Q47: Do you agree with ESMA's view that Table 1 of Annex II of Regulation 1287/2006 is appropriate for equity-like instruments traded on regulated markets and MTFs? Are there other trading systems ESMA should take into account for these instruments? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_47>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_47>

Q48: Do you agree with ESMA's view that ADT remains a valid measure for determining when an order is large in scale compared to normal market size? If not, what other measure would you suggest as a substitute or complement to the ADT? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_48>

We believe that the Average Daily Turnover (“ADT”) is the most relevant factor in determining the liquidity of a stock. This criteria is referring to real-traded volume, providing that all large transactions are eventually recorded within the turnover figures, no matter where the trade is reported.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_48>

Q49: Do you agree that ADT should be used as an indicator also for the MiFIR equity-like products (depositary receipts, ETFs and certificates)? Please provide reasons for your answers.

<ESMA_QUESTION_49>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_49>

Q50: Do you think there is merit in creating a new ADT class of 0 to €100,000 with an adequate new large in scale threshold and a new ADT class of €100,000 to €500,000? At what level should the thresholds be set? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_50>

In line with our reply to the questions on liquidity for shares in the consultation papers, we do support the creation of a new ADT class of 0 to €100,000.

As a reminder, the approach to define liquid equities and equities-like instruments that we suggest to ESMA is a model based on a decision tree model for equities:

(1) Free float adjusted for foreign investors (cf. emerging markets) defined by 4 families:

- the market capitalisation is \$5 billion or more for large caps,
- \$1 billion to \$5 billion for medium caps,
- \$250 million to \$1 billion for small caps, and
- less than \$250 million for micro caps.

NB: families could be defined also by the participation to the issue in the main index of its country of issuance

(2) The turn-over compared to the adjusted free-float by currency, segmentation to be defined

Additionally, we are of the view that the average trade size should be expressed in brackets

The reason for recommending these lower thresholds is that they correspond to the size of companies that benefit most from the protection of the market participants considering the size of the trades.

Without that protection, we are of the view that this will have a major negative impact on the liquidity in the markets (a number of our members are already confirming how difficult it became recently to trade block transactions on these securities). The attempt to enter into transaction with those issuers for smaller transaction amount and with full transparency would be even more detrimental to smaller companies as they would receive less favourable trading conditions.

For ETF, we have a more detailed view as the proposal made by ESMA regarding the liquidity thresholds for ETFs focuses on the intrinsic liquidity of the instrument itself.

There is however no mention made in the Discussion Paper (“DP”) of the other potential layers of liquidity that can benefit an ETF, notably the liquidity of the basket of securities to which the ETF is providing exposure. Due to the open-ended nature of ETFs this liquidity can be accessed through the Creation & Redemption process, adding to the intrinsic liquidity of the ETF.

The liquidity thresholds proposed for ETFs are therefore acceptable as such but would benefit from integrating criteria that take into account the liquidity of the underlying basket. While this might be difficult to implement for some exposures (notably in the Fixed Income space), we suggest below a possible way to measure liquidity for equity baskets:

| ETFs | Free Float (Number of units issued for trading) | Average daily number of transactions | Average daily turnover |
|------|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | 100 | 20 | 500,000 |

Or (for Equity ETFs)

| Underlying basket of stocks for Equity ETFs | Free Float | Average daily number of transactions | Average daily turnover |
|---|-----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | EUR 100,000,000 | 250 | EUR 1,000,000 |

With

Free Float = $\sum_{(i=1)^n} [w_i \text{ ff}]_i$ where w_i is the weight of stock i in the underlying basket and ff_i is the Free Float of stock i

$\text{ADNT} = \sum_{(i=1)^n} [w_i \text{ ADNT}]_i$ where w_i is the weight of stock i in the underlying basket and ADNT_i is the Average daily number of transactions of stock i

$\text{ADV} = \sum_{(i=1)^n} [w_i \text{ ADV}]_i$ where w_i is the weight of stock i in the underlying basket and ADV_i is the Average daily turnover of stock i

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_50>

Q51: Do you think there is merit in creating new ADT classes of €1 to €5m and €5 to €25m? At what level should the thresholds be set? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_51>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_51>

Q52: Do you think there is merit in creating a new ADT class for 'super-liquid' shares with an ADT in excess of €100m and a new class of €50m to €100m? At what level should the thresholds be set?

<ESMA_QUESTION_52>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_52>

Q53: What comments do you have in respect of the new large in scale transparency thresholds for shares proposed by ESMA?

<ESMA_QUESTION_53>

We do not believe that increasing the number of ADT classes adds anything to the information or price formation mechanisms. We believe that this is a way of increasing the thresholds generally and trying to increase trading on the lit markets under the guise of improved price discovery.

The thresholds for large in scale transactions need to be lowered generally across the 5 (or 6) bands, with the possible exception of the most liquid band (ADT > €50m) where it should stay the same.

Without doing so, the impact of information leakage on the lit order books with greater transparency will increase even more costs that our clients are facing due to the increased implicit costs of trading, and the lack of trust investors now have in placing larger orders on the lit market.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_53>

Q54: Do you agree with the ADT ranges selected? Do you agree with the large in scale thresholds set for each ADT class? Which is your preferred option? Would you calibrate the ADT classes and related large in scale thresholds differently? Please provide reasons for your answers, including describing your own role in the market (e.g. market-maker, issuer etc).

<ESMA_QUESTION_54>

We are of the opinion that the benefits of pre-trade transparency to the ETF market would have mixed impacts.

Having a trading obligation on ETF could lead to increasing the number of transactions on trading venues and out of OTC markets, which would facilitate transparency.

By nature, ETFs are created to be liquid. Providing a firm bid or offer for standard market size is possible on any ETF

However, it is only possible for some underlying instruments and for some liquidity profile (see our comments on liquidity for equities and equities-like instruments in the CP and DP). Consequently, viewing liquidity only through the trading venues volume is not relevant and misleading.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_54>

Q55: Which is your preferred scenario? Would you calibrate the ADT classes differently? Please provide reasons for your answers.

<ESMA_QUESTION_55>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_55>

Q56: Do you agree that the same ADT classes should be used for both pre-trade and post-trade transparency? Please provide reasons for your answers.

<ESMA_QUESTION_56>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_56>

Q57: How would you calibrate the large in scale thresholds for each ADT class for pre- and post-trade transparency? Please provide reasons for your answers.

<ESMA_QUESTION_57>

As explained above (please see our reply to question Q53), we believe that values of the Large In Scale ("LIS") should be as follows:

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| ADT €0 - €100,000 | LIS Threshold €10,000 |
| ADT €100,000 – 500,000 | LIS Threshold €50,000 |
| ADT €500,000 – 1m | LIS Threshold €80,000 |
| ADT €1m - €25m | LIS Threshold €200,000 |
| ADT €25m - €50m | LIS Threshold €350,000 |
| ADT >€50m | LIS Threshold €500,000 |

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_57>

Q58: Do you agree with ESMA's view that the large in scale thresholds (i.e. the minimum size of orders qualifying as large in scale and the ADT classes) should be subject to a review no earlier than two years after MiFIR and Level 2 apply in practice?

<ESMA_QUESTION_58>

AFG agrees with the principle of a review of large in scale thresholds.

The first at review should indeed not take place earlier than two years after first day of application.

This would allow the markets to measure the impacts and adapt to them.

If, however, (i) the proposed changes from 5 to 8 ADT classes, (ii) the new thresholds are approved and adopted, and (iii) this had a materially detrimental effect on the liquidity of markets or the implicit costs of trading, we would recommend to ESMA to foresee the capability to review immediately the standards on the request of market participants, and to review the thresholds revised again accordingly.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_58>

Q59: How frequently do you think the calculation per financial instrument should be performed to determine within which large in scale class it falls? Which combination of frequency and period would you recommend?

<ESMA_QUESTION_59>

From frequently checked data available to our members, we believe that the market does have seasonal high and low peaks of activity.

Relying on calculation of each financial instrument based on data of less than a full year would increase the impact of verifications based on seasonality. We would then recommend a quarterly calculation based approach on the previous 12 month rolling averages in order to exclude seasonal/pro-cyclical effects

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_59>

Q60: Do you agree with ESMA's opinion that stubs should become transparent once they are a certain percentage below the large in scale thresholds? If yes, at what percentage would you set the transparency threshold for large in scale stubs? Please provide reasons to support your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_60>

No, we do not agree with ESMA's opinion.

Stub-orders should not become transparent and must remain protected by the large in scale waiver..

Transparency is not helpful for the final execution of the stub-order as market-participants know about the "need" for the completion of a large order.

If the stub is immediately made public, it gives sensitive trading information to market participants. As the part of a large transaction is often uncertain (due to the uncertainty on the time needed to execute these large transactions), an immediate disclosure would give an unfair advantage to structures using timing to position themselves, thus damaging the protection that has been identified as necessary for large-in-scale traders.

Protection of the stub is therefore just as important as protection of the original large-in-scale order. We believe that large institutional order flows must be protected and must not be forced to be broken up into smaller transactions, leading to higher implicit and explicit transaction costs.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_60>

Q61: Do you agree with ESMA's view that the most relevant market in terms of liquidity should be the trading venue with the highest turnover in the relevant financial instrument? Do you agree with an annual review of the most relevant market in terms of liquidity? Please give reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_61>

In principle, we would agree with the fact that the reference price is taken from the trading venue with the highest turnover over a relevant period.

However, we think that the most relevant markets in terms of liquidity should be the relevant trading venues (e.g. exchanges, MTFs) which display together at least more than 50 per cent of the turnover in the relevant financial instrument

Besides, we also believe that the period should be calculated on a rolling 12-month average measured quarterly. Despite the higher operational cost, this would prevent historic, and possibly irrelevant, trading data forming the basis of the reference price source (e.g. if a stock was traded massively on the LSE during the months of January to March 2014, but subsequently had most of its volume conducted on BATS Chi-X but in cumulative size smaller than in the first three months, the LSE would be deemed to be the reference market for the whole of 2015, despite the fact that BATS Chi-X had become the more relevant market in the last 9 months of the previous year.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_61>

Q62: Do you agree with ESMA's view on the different ways the member or participant of a trading venue can execute a negotiated trade? Please give reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_62>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_62>

Q63: Do you agree that the proposed list of transactions are subject to conditions other than the current market price and do not contribute to the price formation process? Do you think that there are other transactions which are subject to conditions other than the current market price that should be added to the list? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_63>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_63>

Q64: Do you agree that these are the two main groups of order management facilities ESMA should focus on or are there others?

<ESMA_QUESTION_64>

We agree with ESMA's proposal. The group listed in the DP is the main one to focus on.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_64>

Q65: Do you agree with ESMA's general assessment on how to design future implementing measures for the order management facility waiver? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_65>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_65>

Q66: Are there other factors that need to be taken into consideration for equity-like instruments? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_66>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_66>

Q67: Do you agree that the minimum size for a stop order should be set at the minimum tradable quantity of shares in the relevant trading venue? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_67>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_67>

Q68: Are there additional factors that need to be taken into consideration for equity-like instruments?

<ESMA_QUESTION_68>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_68>

Q69: Which minimum overall sizes for iceberg orders are currently employed in the markets you use and how are those minimum sizes determined?

<ESMA_QUESTION_69>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_69>

Q70: Which minimum sizes and which methods for determining them should be prescribed via implementing measures? To what level of detail should such an implementing measure go and what should be left to the discretion of the individual market to attain an appropriate level of harmonisation?

<ESMA_QUESTION_70>
We believe that the existing criteria should be kept.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_70>

Q71: Which methods for determining the individual peak sizes of iceberg orders are currently employed in European markets?

<ESMA_QUESTION_71>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_71>

Q72: Which methods for determining peaks should be prescribed by implementing measures, for example, should these be purely abstract criteria or a measure expressed in percentages against the overall size of the iceberg order? To what level of details should such an implementing measure go and what should be left to the discretion of the individual market to attain an appropriate level of harmonisation?

<ESMA_QUESTION_72>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_72>

Q73: Are there additional factors that need to be taken into consideration for equity-like instruments?

<ESMA_QUESTION_73>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_73>

3.2. Post-trade transparency - Equities

Q74: Do you agree that the content of the information currently required under existing MiFID is still valid for shares and applicable to equity-like instruments? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_74>
We broadly agree with the proposed information to provide.

However we have a couple of concerns on the approach taken in this section.

Firstly, we wish to express our astonishment as to the fact that the next section of the Discussion Paper focuses on the Double Volume Cap mechanism, but does not ask any questions on

- whether these caps will have an effect on liquidity, or
- whether the transactions currently traded under the reference price waiver and the negotiated trade waiver are indeed harming price formation.

Instead the discussion paper immediately moves on to another section on the Order Management facilities waiver. Given that in the FTSE 250 range of companies there are already a large number of companies that have more than 8% of their trading conducted in dark pools under these waivers, we believe that it would have been relevant to have questions on this topic in the DP.

ESMA is not giving sufficient room for comments on these issues and did not indicate it is intending:

- to measure the trading effectively,
- collate the information, and subsequently
- impose the bans.

Secondly, the process by which the information is collected and published is raising some concerns in our membership.

Given that (i) ESMA will require a database of information starting from a year preceding the actual implementation and (ii) no venue is forced to provide that information to the NCAs or ESMA until after the implementation date, we have doubts about the accuracy and the relevance of any data being used to measure those caps, at least at the first possible time of implementation.

From AFG's perspective, the impact we see of each of the two alternatives for collation of volumes traded under these waivers are the following:

- In Option 1, there will a cost to the venues in submitting their entire volume to ESMA (including also a view of the trades made under these waivers), with a sub-division of which trades have been executed via the waivers. This cost is likely to be passed on to customers via venue fees. The receipt of the information and subsequent aggregation of data by ESMA may also cause problems around accuracy and timing,
- In Option 2, using data retrieved from the CTPs would seem more sensible, but we are unsure of the impact on costs and charges. The trading data is already published once (and paid for by those

customers using post-trade data publication services) and should not have to be paid for indirectly a second time.

We would then expect more clarity from ESMA on the costs to the industry associated with ESMA collating and publishing the double volume cap data.

Thirdly, ESMA gave not giving any indication about the level of details that it will require in terms of the format of the information that will be publically available for free on its website. For proper monitoring of where the volumes are in relation to their cap thresholds, market participants would need to see these publications on at least a daily basis, rather than just once extra on, or close to, the 15th of the month.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_74>

Q75: Do you think that any new field(s) should be considered? If yes, which other information should be disclosed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_75>

We are globally in agreement with the currently proposed fields.

We see the benefit of reporting an indication of any deferred publication and the conditions under which they were declined.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_75>

Q76: Do you think that the current post-trade regime should be retained or that the identity of the systematic internaliser is relevant information which should be published? Please provide reasons for your response, distinguishing between liquid shares and illiquid shares.

<ESMA_QUESTION_76>

We think the current post-trade regime for the identification of the systematic internaliser should be retained. Only "SI" is required as an identifier by MiFID.

We believe that the only relevant information for the market participants is that a trade has taken place and at what price, and that mentioning the identity of the SI is of no added value to them.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_76>

Q77: Do you agree with the proposed list of identifiers? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_77>

Yes, we agree with the proposed list of identifiers.

Additionally, we are of the opinion that these identifiers could be useful to improve the review of best execution of transactions.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_77>

Q78: Do you think that specific flags for equity-like instruments should be envisaged? Please justify your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_78>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_78>

Q79: Do you support the proposal to introduce a flag for trades that benefit from the large in scale deferral? Please provide reasons for your response.

<ESMA_QUESTION_79>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_79>

Q80: What is your view on requiring post-trade reports to identify the market mechanism, the trading mode and the publication mode in addition to the flags for the different types of transactions proposed in the table above? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_80>
From our perspective, these proposed additional reports have no additional value for the buy side.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_80>

Q81: For which transactions captured by Article 20(1) would you consider specifying additional flags as foreseen by Article 20(3)(b) as useful?

<ESMA_QUESTION_81>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_81>

Q82: Do you agree with the definition of “normal trading hours” given above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_82>
Yes, we agree with the definition of “normal working hours”, being the continuous trading hours period.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_82>

Q83: Do you agree with the proposed shortening of the maximum permissible delay to 1 minute? Do you see any reason to have a different maximum permissible deferral of publication for any equity-like instrument? Please provide reasons for your answer

<ESMA_QUESTION_83>
We prefer to keep the current ruling with a delay to 3 minutes to protect big order execution and to facilitate manual activity if still required? However, the requirement to report the majority of trades "as close to real time as possible" might encourage effectively to bring average reporting times down.

Equity-like instruments should be treated the same way.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_83>

Q84: Should the deferred publication regime be subject to the condition that the transaction is between an investment firm dealing on own account and a client of the firm? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_84>
Yes, we agree for the protection of both counterparties. This should remain as a condition to the deferred publication regime.

The exemption from immediate publication was created to allow investment firms sufficient time to unwind their positions in an orderly manner.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_84>

Q85: Which of the two options do you prefer in relation to the deferral periods for large in scale transactions (or do you prefer another option that has not been proposed)? Please provide reasons for your answer

<ESMA_QUESTION_85>

We are of the view that the current deferral regime for the post-trade transparency equity large in scale waivers should be further used and therefore retained in relation to the time frames and the thresholds. Our preferred option would be the status quo, as this currently gives investment firms sufficient time to unwind more bespoke transactions, whilst at the same time forcing them to publish trades immediately as soon as they are executed.

According to our observations, the proposed deferral post-trade transparency equity large in scale regime is too restrictive and does not sufficiently protect the balance between the needs to protect large institutional equity orders on the one hand and the requirement to publish these transactions on the other hand.

Between the two options, we prefer the option B, as proposed in the CESR advice of 2010 (CESR Technical Advice to the European Commission n° CESR/10-882 in the Context of the MiFID Review on Equity Markets Post-trade Transparency Standards), but with the modification of deferred publication for large trades conducted after 15:00 to 12:00 noon of the following day rather than the opening on the following day.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_85>

Q86: Do you see merit in adding more ADT classes and adjusting the large in scale thresholds as proposed? Please provide alternatives if you disagree with ESMA's proposal

<ESMA_QUESTION_86>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_86>

Q87: Do you consider the thresholds proposed as appropriate for SME shares?

<ESMA_QUESTION_87>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_87>

Q88: How frequently should the large in scale table be reviewed? Please provide reasons for your answer

<ESMA_QUESTION_88>

We support the annual review of the large in scale table.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_88>

Q89: Do you have concerns regarding deferred publication occurring at the end of the trading day, during the closing auction period?

<ESMA_QUESTION_89>

In line with our reply to question Q85, we prefer Option B which provides for deferred publication until noon the following day for the reason that such publication would have a price distorting effect during the closing auction period.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_89>

Q90: Do you agree with ESMA's preliminary view of applying the same ADT classes to the pre-trade and post-trade transparency regimes for ETFs? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_90>

We do not agree with ESMA's view.

ESMA has used data communicated by the stock exchanges to determine the criteria for the definition of "large" ETF trades.

We believe that this approach is not appropriate because trade size on exchange has steadily fallen since the entry into force of MiFID I.

Additionally, this approach does not reflect OTC volumes for ETFs that are not currently reported.

Post trade transparency in the ETF market is likely to be less effective if reporting is delayed for the majority of traded volume and might favour OTC trading.

In our view, the solution is reachable through the development of post-trade reporting on the consolidated tape. The metric used for delay should be specific to the ETF market and easier to understand.

We would propose that ESMA adopts one of the two following options:

Option 1: All ETF trades reported real time (currently the situation in the US)

Option 2: Delayed reporting based on absolute value triggers

- < €10mn - Real time reporting; €10m - €50mn - 60mins; > €50mn - End of Day.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_90>

3.3. Systematic Internaliser Regime - Equities

Q91: Do you support maintaining the existing definition of quotes reflecting prevailing market conditions? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_91>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_91>

Q92: Do you support maintaining the existing table for the calculation of the standard market size? If not, which of the above options do you believe provides the best trade-off between maintaining a sufficient level of transparency and ensuring that obligations for systematic internalisers remain reasonable and proportionate? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_92>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_92>

Q93: Do you agree with the proposal to set the standard market size for depositary receipts at the same level as for shares? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_93>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_93>

Q94: What are your views regarding how financial instruments should be grouped into classes and/or how the standard market size for each class should be established for certificates and exchange traded funds?

<ESMA_QUESTION_94>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_94>

3.4. Trading obligation for shares (Article 23, MiFIR)

Q95: Do you consider that the determination of what is non-systematic, ad-hoc, irregular and infrequent should be defined within the same parameters applicable for the systematic internaliser definition? In the case of the exemption to the trading obligation for shares, should the frequency concept be more restrictive taking into consideration the other factors, i.e. 'ad-hoc' and 'irregular'?

<ESMA_QUESTION_95>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_95>

Q96: Do you agree with the list of examples of trades that do not contribute to the price discovery process? In case of an exhaustive list_would you add any other type of transaction? Would you exclude any of them? Please, provide reasons for your response.

<ESMA_QUESTION_96>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_96>

Q97: Do you consider it appropriate to include benchmark and/or portfolio trades in the list of those transactions determined by factors other than the current valuation of the share? If not, please provide an explanation with your response.

<ESMA_QUESTION_97>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_97>

3.5. Introduction to the non-equity section and scope of non-equity financial instruments

Q98: Do you agree with the proposed description of structured finance products? If not, please provide arguments and suggestions for an alternative.

<ESMA_QUESTION_98>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_98>

Q99: For the purposes of transparency, should structured finance products be identified in order to distinguish them from other non-equity transferable securities? If so, how should this be done?

<ESMA_QUESTION_99>
 TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
 <ESMA_QUESTION_99>

Q100: Do you agree with the proposed explanation for the various types of transferable securities that should be treated as derivatives for pre-trade and post trade transparency? If not, please provide arguments and suggestions for an alternative.

<ESMA_QUESTION_100>
 TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
 <ESMA_QUESTION_100>

Q101: Do you agree with ESMA's proposal that for transparency purposes market operators and investment firms operating a trading venue should assume responsibility for determining to which MiFIR category the non-equity financial instruments which they intend to introduce on their trading venue belong and for providing their competent authorities and the market with this information before trading begins?

<ESMA_QUESTION_101>
 TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
 <ESMA_QUESTION_101>

Q102: Do you agree with the definitions listed and proposed by ESMA? If not, please provide alternatives.

<ESMA_QUESTION_102>
 TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
 <ESMA_QUESTION_102>

3.6. Liquid market definition for non-equity financial instruments

Q103: Do you agree with the proposed approach? If you do not agree please provide reasons for your answers. Could you provide for an alternative approach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_103>

We tend to agree that option 3 seems the best option and would like to suggest a couple of refined elements to have more precise criteria:

The criteria proposed by ESMA to define liquidity are:

- (i) the average frequency and size of transactions having regard to the life-cycle of products;
- (ii) the number and type of market participants; and
- (iii) the average size of spreads, when available.

Based on the ESMA statement, we believe that the outstanding percentage is more relevant than the transaction size and we are proposing to define the liquidity of bonds as follows:

- (1) Use the criteria proposed by ESMA
- (2) Add the ratio between the size of the envisaged transaction and the total amount of issuance on that issue

Our approach would be as follows:

Sovereign Bonds

| | | Sovereign | Sovereign |
|------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Issue Size | transaction size | disclosure requirement | vol/trade |

| | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Above 5bn | 20 mm above | volume omission, EOD | 10bn/500trd |
| | 10-20mm | real-time | 10bn/500trd |
| | 1-10mm | real-time | 10bn/500trd |
| | up to 1mm | real-time | 10bn/500trd |
| | | | |
| 500mm - 1bn | Above 10 mm up | volume omission, EOD | 300 mm/100 trd |
| | 5-10 mm | T+3 | 300 mm/100 trd |
| | 1-5 mm | EOD? Depending on the bonds? | 300 mm/100 trd |
| | 500k-1m | EOD | 300 mm/100 trd |
| | Under 500 k | real-time | 300 mm/100 trd |
| | | | |
| up to 500 mm | all trade sizes | time delay | all trade sizes |

Corporate bonds

| | | corporate bonds | corporate bonds |
|--------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Issue Size | transaction size | disclosure requirement | vo (eur)/trade no |
| Above 5bn | 20 mm above | Volume omission, EOD | 5Bn / 200 tr |
| | 10-20mm | Volume omission, EOD | 5Bn / 200 tr |
| | 1-10mm | real-time | 5Bn / 200 tr |
| | up to 1mm | real-time | 5Bn / 200 tr |
| | | | |
| 500mm - 1bn | Above 10 mm up | volume omission, EOD | 20mm/20 tr |
| | 5-10 mm | T+3 | 20mm/20 tr |
| | 1-5 mm | T+3 | 20mm/20 tr |
| | 500k-1m | T+3 | 20mm/20 tr |
| | Under 500 k | Real-time | 20mm/20 tr |
| | | | |
| up to 500 mm | all trade sizes | time delay | all trade sizes |

Emerging bonds

| | | emerging bonds | emerging bonds |
|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Issue Size | transaction size | disclosure requirement | vo (eur)/trade no |
| Above 5bn | 20 mm above | Volume Omission, T+3 | omm/o tr |
| | 10-20mm | Volume Omission, T+3 | omm/o tr |
| | 1-10mm | Volume Omission, T+3 | omm/o tr |
| | up to 1mm | real-time | omm/o tr |
| | | | |
| 500mm - 1bn | Above 10 mm up | volume omission t+7 | omm/otr |
| | 5-10 mm | volume omission t+7 | omm/otr |

| | | | |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| | 1-5 mm | volume omission t+7 | omm/otr |
| | 500k-1m | volume omission t+7 | omm/otr |
| | Under 500 k | Real time/EOD | omm/otr |
| | | | |
| up to 500 mm | all trade sizes | time delay | all trade sizes |

Other criteria might be added and could bring some further information but with less importance.

For instance, ESMA could use:

- Average frequency of trade in absolute numbers
- Time period for calculation with a monthly retrospective calibration;
- Calculation of total turnover with the ADT calculated by dividing the notional volume turnover (rather than market value) by the number of days in the period on a monthly period.
- The calculation of the total number of trades based on the use of block trades rather than allocations (due to the matching process applied to bond trading).

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_103>

Q104: Do you agree with the proposed approach? If you do not agree please provide reasons. Could you provide an alternative approach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_104>

Firstly, we would like to mention that there is no requirement in Level 1 texts to define those elements.

Additionally, we believe that there is no direct link between liquidity and the number of market participants, especially for large transactions on bonds.

Secondly, however, as Average Value of Transactions (AVT) is not meaningful for the fixed income markets (due to the absence of standard market size) and should ESMA maintain that approach, we would agree that the option 2 is the more appropriate, bearing in mind our comments stated above in terms of data.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_104>

Q105: Do you agree with the proposed approach? If you do not agree please provide reasons. Could you provide an alternative approach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_105>

As stated above, we are of the opinion that there is no legal requirement under MiFID/R to incorporate market participants as a parameter. Consequently, we suggest that Article 2 MiFIR/MiFID does not require the number of market participants to be included in the calculation of liquidity.

Therefore, we believe that the number of market participants should not be a factor in the determination of liquidity for fixed income. A high number of retail investors actively trading in very small size does not greatly contribute to liquidity nor does it guarantee it.

Should ESMA nevertheless persevere in that direction, we would agree with Option 1.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_105>

Q106: Do you agree with the proposed approach? If you do not agree please provide reasons. Could you provide an alternative approach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_106>

We would agree with ESMA's proposal to use the end-of-day relative bid-ask spreads as published by the most relevant market as long as :

- Trading takes place on the the order book of the trading venue;
- Both sides of the spread are available;
- The information on the spread includes information on the volume as a volume attached; and
- Data are quickly and data is easily accessible via a central source.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_106>

Q107: Should different thresholds be applied for different (classes of) financial instruments? Please provide proposals and reasons.

<ESMA_QUESTION_107>

We believe that all classes of assets should be treated equally. Consequently, the parameters used should be set accordingly.

As expressed above, should there be an important spread between bid and offer, this signals a small liquidity of that instrument and this might be a hint that all the asset class might be illiquid as well.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_107>

Q108: Do you have any proposals for appropriate spread thresholds? Please provide figures and reasons.

<ESMA_QUESTION_108>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_108>

Q109: How could the data necessary for computing the average spreads be obtained?

<ESMA_QUESTION_109>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_109>

Q110: Do you agree with the proposed approach? If you do not agree please provide reasons for your answer. Could you provide an alternative approach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_110>

As stated in our reply to question Q108, we believe that ESMA should treat equally all arguments.

We would then agree to the Option 1 as, like we said above, it is taking into account the two most important criteria to define liquidity (total frequency of trades and ADT).

Additionally, we would urge ESMA to be extremely cautious in that definition's exercise as erroneously categorising a bond as liquid rather than illiquid would create more and greater problems.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_110>

Q111: Overall, could you think of an alternative approach on how to assess whether a market is liquid bearing in mind the various elements of the liquid market definition in MiFIR?

<ESMA_QUESTION_111>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_111>

Q112: Which is your preferred scenario or which combination of thresholds would you propose for defining a liquid market for bonds or for a sub-category of bonds (sovereign, corporate, covered, convertible, etc.)? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_112>

Please refer to our detailed answer to question Q103.

Based on the ESMA statement, we believe that the outstanding percentage is more relevant than the transaction size and we are proposing you to define the liquidity of bonds as follows:

(1) Use the criteria proposed by ESMA

(2) Add the ratio between the size of the envisaged transaction and the total amount of issuance on that issue

We believe that Scenario 3 is the most relevant as it takes into account the average daily volume and trading activities (to be categorized as liquid an instrument should be traded at least once a day on average).

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_112>

Q113: Should the concept of liquid market be applied to financial instruments (IBIA) or to classes of financial instruments (COFIA)? Would be appropriate to apply IBIA for certain asset classes and COFIA to other asset classes? Please provide reasons for your answers

<ESMA_QUESTION_113>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_113>

Q114: Do you have any (alternative) proposals how to take the 'range of market conditions and the life-cycle' of (classes of) financial instruments into account - other than the periodic reviews described in the sections periodic review of the liquidity threshold and periodic assessment of the liquidity of the instrument class, above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_114>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_114>

Q115: Do you have any proposals on how to form homogenous and relevant classes of financial instruments? Which specifics do you consider relevant for that purpose? Please distinguish between bonds, SFPs and (different types of) derivatives and across qualitative criteria (please refer to Annex 3.6.1).

<ESMA_QUESTION_115>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_115>

Q116: Do you think that, in the context of the liquidity thresholds to be calculated under MiFID II, the classification in Annex 3.6.1 is relevant? Which product types or sub-product types would you be inclined to create or merge? Please provide reasons for your answers

<ESMA_QUESTION_116>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_116>

Q117: Do you agree with the proposed approach? If not, please provide rationales and alternatives.

<ESMA_QUESTION_117>

We would agree with ESMA's proposed approach.

We would also encourage ESMA to clearly explain how they plan to practically implement that approach as it would have to happen quickly and efficiently.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_117>

Q118: Do you agree with the proposed thresholds? If not, please provide rationales and alternatives.

<ESMA_QUESTION_118>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_118>

3.7. Pre-trade transparency requirements for non-equity instruments

Q119: Do you agree with the description of request-for-quote system? If not, how would you describe a request-for-quote system? Please give reasons to support your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_119>

We agree with the proposed description.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_119>

Q120: Do you agree with the inclusion of request-for-stream systems in the definition of request-for-quote system? Please give reasons to support your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_120>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_120>

Q121: Do you think that – apart from request-for-stream systems – other functionalities should be included in the definition of request-for-quote system? If yes, please provide a description of this functionality and give reasons to support your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_121>

We would possibly add the trading carried out via Bloomberg IB messaging as based on a "request for quote" trading.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_121>

Q122: Do you agree with the description of voice trading system? If not, how would you describe a voice trading system?

<ESMA_QUESTION_122>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_122>

Q123: Do you agree with the proposed table setting out different types of trading systems for non-equity instruments?

<ESMA_QUESTION_123>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_123>

Q124: Do you think that the information to be made public for each type of trading system provides adequate transparency for each trading system?

<ESMA_QUESTION_124>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_124>

Q125: Besides the trading systems mentioned above, are there additional trading models that need to be considered for pre-trade transparency requirements in the non-equity market space?

<ESMA_QUESTION_125>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_125>

Q126: If you think that additional trading systems should be considered, what information do you think should be made public for each additional type of trading model?

<ESMA_QUESTION_126>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_126>

Q127: Based on your experience, what are the different types of voice trading systems in the market currently? What specific characteristics do these systems have?

<ESMA_QUESTION_127>
We see two types of RFQ: Telephone and Bloomberg IB.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_127>

Q128: How do these voice trading systems currently make information public or known to interested parties at the pre-trade stage?

<ESMA_QUESTION_128>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_128>

Q129: Do you agree with ESMA's approach in relation to the content, method and timing of pre-trade information being made available to the wider public?

<ESMA_QUESTION_129>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_129>

Q130: Do you agree with the above mentioned approach with regard to indicative pre-trade bid and offer prices which are close to the price of the trading interests? Please give reasons to support your answer

<ESMA_QUESTION_130>

We would agree, bearing in mind the need for a careful approach. Indicative prices can be very misleading as it is very easy for brokers to put aggressive indication prices in, but then step back when they come close to execution. of an indicative price.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_130>

Q131: If you do not agree with the approach described above please provide an alternative

<ESMA_QUESTION_131>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_131>

3.8. Post-trade transparency requirements for non-equity instruments

Q132: Do you agree with the proposed content of post-trade public information? If not, please provide arguments and suggestions for an alternative.

<ESMA_QUESTION_132>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_132>

Q133: Do you think that the current post-trade regime for shares on the systematic internaliser's identity should be extended to non-equity instruments or that the systematic internaliser's identity is relevant information which should be published without exception?

<ESMA_QUESTION_133>
Even more forcefully than for equities, we disagree with the publication of disclosing S.I. data.

We cannot see any benefit or reason for disclosing the S.I. data. This would potentially discourage counterparties to enter into transactions.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_133>

Q134: Is there any other information that would be relevant to the market for the above mentioned asset classes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_134>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_134>

Q135: Do you agree with the proposed table of identifiers for transactions executed on non-equity instruments? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_135>
Yes, we would agree with the proposed approach although we would like to express a slight concern that making it complex lessens the chance of success.

Consequently, we certainly would not want any more identifiers than currently proposed by ESMA.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_135>

Q136: Do you support the use of flags to identify trades which have benefitted from the use of deferrals? Should separate flags be used for each type of deferral (e.g. large in scale deferral, size specific to the instrument deferral)? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_136>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_136>

Q137: Do you think a flag related to coupon payments (ex/cum) should be introduced? If yes, please describe the cases where such flags would be warranted and which information should be captured.

<ESMA_QUESTION_137>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_137>

Q138: Do you think that give-up/give-in trades (identified with a flag) should be included in post-trade reports or not made public? Please provide reasons for your answers.

<ESMA_QUESTION_138>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_138>

Q139: Do you agree that securities financing transactions should be exempted from the post-trade transparency regime?

<ESMA_QUESTION_139>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_139>

Q140: Do you agree that for the initial application of the new transparency regime the information should be made public within five minutes after the relevant non-equity transaction? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_140>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_140>

Q141: Do you agree with the proposed text or would you propose an alternative option? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_141>
We agree with the proposed text and we would suggest using TRACE as an example of a system that is already in operation.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_141>

Q142: Do you agree that the intra-day deferral periods should range between 60 minutes and 120 minutes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_142>
We would rather see longer periods. It should then be considered as a possible deferral period that would end with the closure of the market where this security is first registered.

We are willing to preserve liquidity as much as possible rather than forcing reporting.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_142>

Q143: Do you agree that the maximum deferral period, reserved for the largest transactions, should not exceed end of day or, for transactions executed after 15.00, the opening of the following trading day? If not, could you provide alternative proposals? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_143>

We believe that a longer period may be appropriate in certain circumstances.

Additionally and in line with AFG's request for longest possible reporting period (see e.g. our replies to section 3.2 and 3.6 of the DP) what we expressed above, we cannot see any benefit in forcing trades after 3pm to be reported at the following day's opening

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_143>

Q144: Do you consider there are reasons for applying different deferral periods to different asset classes, e.g. fixing specific deferral periods for sovereign bonds? Please provide arguments to support your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_144>

As stated above, we believe that there must be some real homogeneous approach that could be achieved through application of identical criteria within the same classes of assets.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_144>

Q145: Do you support the proposal that the deferral for non-equity instruments which do not have a liquid market should be until the end of day + 1? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_145>

We would encourage ESMA to consider even a larger period of time.

This would help protecting liquidity and would in line with ECB work on T+2 and T2S.

<ESMA_QUESTION_145>

Q146: Do you think that one universal deferral period is appropriate for all non-equity instruments which do not have a liquid market or that the deferrals should be set at a more granular level, depending on asset class and even sub asset class. Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_146>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_146>

Q147: Do you agree with the proposal that during the deferred period for non-equity instruments which do not have a liquid market, the volume of the transaction should be omitted but all the other details of individual transactions must be published? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_147>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_147>

Q148: Do you agree that publication in an aggregated form with respect to sovereign debt should be authorised for an indefinite period only in limited circumstances? Please give reasons for your answers. If you disagree, what alternative approaches would you propose?

<ESMA_QUESTION_148>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_148>

Q149: In your view, which criteria and/or conditions would it be appropriate to specify as indicating there is a need to authorise extended/indefinite deferrals for sovereign debt??

<ESMA_QUESTION_149>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_149>

Q150: In your view, could those transactions determined by other factors than the valuation of the instrument be authorised for deferred publication to the end of day? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_150>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_150>

3.9. The transparency regime of non-equity large in scale orders and transactions

Q151: Do you agree with the proposed option? Which option would be more suitable for the calibration of the large in scale requirements within an asset class?

<ESMA_QUESTION_151>
We agree with option 2 as it would be easier to administer.

We would also definitely be looking for improved accuracy.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_151>

Q152: Do you consider there are reasons for opting for different options for different asset classes? Please provide arguments.

<ESMA_QUESTION_152>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_152>

Q153: Do you agree that the choice between the two options should be consistent with the approach adopted for the assessment of liquidity? If not, please provide arguments.

<ESMA_QUESTION_153>
AFG members suggested using the outstanding percentage rather than the transaction size.

Please see also our reply to question Q103.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_153>

Q154: Do you agree with the proposed approach? If no, which indicator would you consider more appropriate for the determination of large in scale thresholds for orders and transactions?

<ESMA_QUESTION_154>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_154>

Q155: Do you agree that the proxy used for the determining the large in scale thresholds should be the same as the one used to assess the average size of transactions in the context of the definition of liquid markets? Please provide arguments.

<ESMA_QUESTION_155>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_155>

Q156: In your view, which option would be more suitable for the determination of the large in scale thresholds? Please provide arguments.

<ESMA_QUESTION_156>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_156>

Q157: Alternatively which method would you suggest for setting the large in scale thresholds?

<ESMA_QUESTION_157>

We agree with Option 1.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_157>

Q158: In your view, should large in scale thresholds for orders differ from the large in scale thresholds for transactions? If yes, which thresholds should be higher: pre-trade or post-trade? Please provide reasons to support your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_158>

We believe that treating them separately would increase complexity without improving the transparency. We would also insist on the need to develop model sufficiently flexible to be applicable by market participants.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_158>

Q159: Do you agree that the large in scale thresholds should be computed only on the basis of transactions carried out on trading venues following the implementation of MiFID II? Please, provide reasons for the answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_159>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_159>

Q160: Do you think that the condition for deferred publication of large in scale transactions currently applying to shares (transaction is between an investment firm that deals on own account and a client of the investment firm) is applicable to non-equity instruments? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_160>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_160>

Q161: Do you agree that the large in scale regime should be reviewed no earlier than two years after application of MiFIR in practice?

<ESMA_QUESTION_161>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_161>

3.10. Size specific to the instrument

Q162: Do you agree with the above description of the applicability of the size specific to the instrument? If not please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_162>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_162>

Q163: Do you agree with the proposal that the size specific to the instrument should be set as a percentage of the large in scale size? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_163>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_163>

Q164: In your view, what methodologies would be most appropriate for measuring the undue risk in order to set the size specific threshold?

<ESMA_QUESTION_164>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_164>

Q165: Would you suggest any other practical ways in which ESMA could take into account whether, at such sizes, liquidity providers would be able to hedge their risks?

<ESMA_QUESTION_165>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_165>

Q166: Do you agree with ESMA's description of how the size specific to the instrument waiver would interact with the large in scale waiver? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_166>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_166>

Q167: Do you agree with ESMA's description of how the size specific to the instrument deferrals would interact with the large in scale deferrals? In particular, do you agree that the deferral periods for the size specific to the instrument and the large in scale should differ and have any specific proposals on how the deferral periods should be calibrated? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_167>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_167>

3.11. The Trading Obligation for Derivatives

Q168: Do you agree that there should be consistent categories of derivatives contracts throughout MiFIR/EMIR?

<ESMA_QUESTION_168>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_168>

Q169: Do you agree with this approach to the treatment of third countries?

<ESMA_QUESTION_169>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_169>

Q170: Do you agree with the proposed criteria based anti-avoidance procedure?

<ESMA_QUESTION_170>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_170>

Q171: Do you think it would be reasonable for ESMA to consult venues with regard to which classes of derivatives contracts are traded on venue? Do you think venues would be well placed to undertake this task?

<ESMA_QUESTION_171>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_171>

Q172: The discussion in section 3.6 on the liquid market for non-equity instruments around ‘average frequency’, ‘average size’, ‘number and type of active market participants’ and average size of spreads is also relevant to this chapter and we would welcome respondent’s views on any differences in how the trading obligation procedure should approach the following:

<ESMA_QUESTION_172>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_172>

Q173: Do you have a view on how ESMA should approach data gathering about a product’s life cycle, and how a dynamic calibration across that life cycle might work? How frequently should ESMA revisit its assumptions? What factors might lead the reduction of the liquidity of a contract currently traded on venue? Are you able to share with ESMA any analysis related to product lifecycles?

<ESMA_QUESTION_173>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_173>

Q174: Do you have any suggestions on how ESMA should consider the anticipated effects of the trading obligation on end users and on future market behaviour?

<ESMA_QUESTION_174>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_174>

Q175: Do you have any other comments on our overall approach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_175>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_175>

3.12. Transparency Requirements for the Members of ESCB

Q176: Do you agree that the above identifies the types of operations that can be undertaken by a member of the ESCB for the purpose of monetary, foreign exchange and financial stability policy and that are within the MiFID scope? Please give reasons to support your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_176>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_176>

Q177: What is your view about the types of transactions for which the member of the ESCB would be able to provide prior notification that the transaction is exempt?

<ESMA_QUESTION_177>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_177>

3.13. Article 22, MiFIR: Providing information for the purposes of transparency and other calculations

Q178: Do you have any comments on the content of requests as outlined above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_178>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_178>

Q179: Do you have proposals on how NCAs could collect specific information on the number and type of market participants in a product?

<ESMA_QUESTION_179>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_179>

Q180: Do you consider the frequency of data requests proposed as appropriate?

<ESMA_QUESTION_180>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_180>

Q181: How often should data be requested in respect of newly issued instruments in order to classify them correctly based on their actual liquidity?

<ESMA_QUESTION_181>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_181>

Q182: What is your view of ESMA's initial assessment of the format of data requests and do you have any proposals for making requests cost-efficient and useful for all parties involved?

<ESMA_QUESTION_182>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_182>

Q183: Do you consider a maximum period of two weeks appropriate for responding to data requests?

<ESMA_QUESTION_183>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_183>

Q184: Do you consider a storage time for relevant data of two years appropriate?

<ESMA_QUESTION_184>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_184>

4. Microstructural issues

4.1. Microstructural issues: common elements for Articles 17, 48 and 49 MiFID II

Q185: Is there any element that has not been considered and/or needs to be further clarified in the ESMA Guidelines that should be addressed in the RTS relating to Articles 17, 48 and 49 of MiFID II?

<ESMA_QUESTION_185>

Since the publication of the ESMA Guidelines, several changes occurred (on reconciliation, continuous comparison of books with exchange records, etc.) that would have to be taken into account and reflected in the RTS.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_185>

Q186: Do you agree with the definition of ‘trading systems’ for trading venues?

<ESMA_QUESTION_186>

We do not agree with ESMA’s definition as we believe that it is too prescriptive and does not add much value to the definition.

In our opinion, ESMA’s proposed definition would take into account irrelevant elements of a trading structure or could forget some other important criteria such as IT progress.

We are of the view that the existing definitions of “continuous order book trading system” and “quote driven trading system” are remaining relevant as they are set on principal-based approach and could easily be adapted to reflect technological improvements.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_186>

Q187: Do you agree that the requirements under Articles 48 and 49 of MiFID II are only relevant for continuous auction order book systems and quote-driven trading systems and not for the other systems mentioned above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_187>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_187>

Q188: Which hybrid systems, if any, should be considered within the scope of Articles 48 and 49, and why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_188>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_188>

Q189: Do you agree with the definition of “trading system” for investment firms?

<ESMA_QUESTION_189>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_189>

Q190: Do you agree with the definition of 'real time' in relation to market monitoring of algorithmic trading activity by investment firms?

<ESMA_QUESTION_190>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_190>

Q191: Is the requirement that real time monitoring should take place with a delay of maximum 5 seconds appropriate for the risks inherent to algorithmic trading and from an operational perspective? Should the time frame be longer or shorter? Please state your reasons.

<ESMA_QUESTION_191>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_191>

Q192: Do you agree with the definition of 't+1' in relation to market monitoring of algorithmic trading activity by investment firms?

<ESMA_QUESTION_192>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_192>

Q193: Do you agree with the parameters to be considered to define situations of 'severe market stress' and 'disorderly trading conditions'?

<ESMA_QUESTION_193>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_193>

Q194: Do you agree with the above approach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_194>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_194>

Q195: Is there any element that should be added to/removed from the periodic self-assessment?

<ESMA_QUESTION_195>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_195>

Q196: Would the MiFID II organisational requirements for investment firms undertaking algorithmic trading fit all the types of investment firms you are aware of? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_196>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_196>

Q197: Do you agree with the approach described above regarding the application of the proportionality principle by investment firms? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_197>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_197>

Q198: Are there any additional elements that for the purpose of clarity should be added to/removed from the non-exhaustive list contained in the RTS? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_198>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_198>

4.2. Organisational requirements for investment firms (Article 17 MiFID II)

Q199: Do you agree with a restricted deployment of algorithms in a live environment? Please elaborate

<ESMA_QUESTION_199>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_199>

Q200: Do you agree with the parameters outlined for initial restriction? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_200>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_200>

Q201: Do you agree with the proposed testing scenarios outlined above? Would you propose any alternative or additional testing scenarios? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_201>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_201>

Q202: Do you agree with ESMA's approach regarding the conditions under which investment firms should make use of non-live trading venue testing environments? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_202>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_202>

Q203: Do you consider that ESMA should specify more in detail what should be the minimum functionality or the types of testing that should be carried out in non-live trading venue testing environments, and if so, which?

<ESMA_QUESTION_203>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_203>

Q204: Do you consider that the requirements around change management are appropriately laid down, especially with regard to testing? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_204>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_204>

Q205: Do you agree with the proposed monitoring and review approach? Is a twice yearly review, as a minimum, appropriate?

<ESMA_QUESTION_205>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_205>

Q206: To what extent do you agree with the usage of drop copies in the context of monitoring? Which sources of drop copies would be most important?

<ESMA_QUESTION_206>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_206>

Q207: Do you agree with the proposed approach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_207>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_207>

Q208: Is the proposed list of pre trade controls adequate? Are there any you would add to or remove from the list?

<ESMA_QUESTION_208>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_208>

Q209: To what extent do you consider it appropriate to request having all the pre-trade controls in place? In which cases would it not be appropriate? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_209>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_209>

Q210: Do you agree with the record keeping approach outlined above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_210>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_210>

Q211: In particular, what are your views regarding the storage of the parameters used to calibrate the trading algorithms and the market data messages on which the algorithm's decision is based?

<ESMA_QUESTION_211>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_211>

Q212: Do you consider that the requirements regarding the scope, capabilities, and flexibility of the monitoring system are appropriate?

<ESMA_QUESTION_212>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_212>

Q213: Trade reconciliation – should a more prescriptive deadline be set for reconciling trade and account information?

<ESMA_QUESTION_213>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_213>

Q214: Periodic reviews – would a minimum requirement of undertaking reviews on a half-yearly basis seem reasonable for investment firms engaged in algorithmic trading activity, and if not, what would be an appropriate minimum interval for undertaking such reviews? Should a more prescriptive rule be set as to when more frequent reviews need be taken?

<ESMA_QUESTION_214>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_214>

Q215: Are there any elements that have not been considered and / or need to be further clarified here?

<ESMA_QUESTION_215>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_215>

Q216: What is your opinion of the elements that the DEA provider should take into account when performing the due diligence assessment? In your opinion, should any elements be added or removed? If so, which?

<ESMA_QUESTION_216>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_216>

Q217: Do you agree that for assessing the adequacy of the systems and controls of a prospective DEA user, the DEA provider should use the systems and controls requirements applied by trading venues for members as a benchmark?

<ESMA_QUESTION_217>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_217>

Q218: Do you agree that a long term prior relationship (in other areas of service than DEA) between the investment firm and a client facilitates the due diligence process for providing DEA and, thus, additional precautions and diligence are needed when allowing a new client (to whom the investment firm has never provided any other services previously) to use DEA? If yes, to what extent does a long term relationship between the investment firm and a client facilitate the due diligence process of the DEA provider? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_218>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_218>

Q219: Do you agree with the above approach? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_219>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_219>

Q220: Do you agree with the above approach, specifically with regard to the granular identification of DEA user order flow as separate from the firm's other order flow? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_220>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_220>

Q221: Are there any criteria other than those listed above against which clearing firms should be assessing their potential clients?

<ESMA_QUESTION_221>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_221>

Q222: Should clearing firms disclose their criteria (some or all of them) in order to help potential clients to assess their ability to become clients of clearing firms (either publicly or on request from prospective clients)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_222>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_222>

Q223: How often should clearing firms review their clients' ongoing performance against these criteria?

<ESMA_QUESTION_223>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_223>

Q224: Should clearing firms have any arrangement(s) other than position limits and margins to limit their risk exposure to clients (counterparty, liquidity, operational and any other risks)? For example, should clearing firms stress-test clients' positions that could pose material risk to the clearing firms, test their own ability to meet initial margin and variation margin requirements, test their own ability to liquidate their clients' positions in an orderly manner and estimate the cost of the liquidation, test their own credit lines?

<ESMA_QUESTION_224>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_224>

Q225: How regularly should clearing firms monitor their clients' compliance with such limits and margin requirements (e.g. intra-day, overnight) and any other tests, as applicable?

<ESMA_QUESTION_225>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_225>

Q226: Should clearing firms have a real-time view on their clients' positions?

<ESMA_QUESTION_226>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_226>

Q227: How should clearing firms manage their risks in relation to orders from managers on behalf of multiple clients for execution as a block and post-trade allocation to individual accounts for clearing?

<ESMA_QUESTION_227>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_227>

Q228: Which type(s) of automated systems would enable clearing members to monitor their risks (including clients' compliance with limits)? Which criteria should apply to any such automated systems (e.g. should they enable clearing firms to screen clients' orders for compliance with the relevant limits etc.)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_228>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_228>

4.3. Organisational requirements for trading venues (Article 48 MiFID II)

Q229: Do you agree with requiring trading venues to perform due diligence on all types of entities willing to become members/participants of a trading venue which permits algorithmic trading through its systems?

<ESMA_QUESTION_229>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_229>

Q230: Do you agree with the list of minimum requirements that in all cases trading venues should assess prior to granting and while maintaining membership? Should the requirements for entities not authorised as credit institutions or not registered as investment firms be more stringent than for those who are qualified as such?

<ESMA_QUESTION_230>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_230>

Q231: If you agree that non-investment firms and non-credit institutions should be subject to more stringent requirements to become member or participants, which type of additional information should they provide to trading venues?

<ESMA_QUESTION_231>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_231>

Q232: Do you agree with the list of parameters to be monitored in real time by trading venues? Would you add/delete/redefine any of them? In particular, are there any trading models permitting algorithmic trading through their systems for which that list would be inadequate? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_232>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_232>

Q233: Regarding the periodic review of the systems, is there any element that has not been considered and/or needs to be further clarified in the ESMA Guidelines that should be included?

<ESMA_QUESTION_233>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_233>

Q234: Do you agree with the above approach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_234>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_234>

Q235: Do you think ESMA should determine minimum standards in terms of latency or is it preferable to consider as a benchmark of performance the principle “no order lost, no transaction lost”?

<ESMA_QUESTION_235>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_235>

Q236: Do you agree with requiring trading venues to be able to accommodate at least twice the historical peak of messages?

<ESMA_QUESTION_236>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_236>

Q237: Do you agree with the list of abilities that trading venues should have to ensure the resilience of the market?

<ESMA_QUESTION_237>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_237>

Q238: Do you agree with the publication of the general framework by the trading venues? Where would it be necessary to have more/less granularity?

<ESMA_QUESTION_238>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_238>

Q239: Which in your opinion is the degree of discretion that trading venues should have when deciding to cancel, vary or correct orders and transactions?

<ESMA_QUESTION_239>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_239>

Q240: Do you agree with the above principles for halting or constraining trading?

<ESMA_QUESTION_240>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_240>

Q241: Do you agree that trading venues should make the operating mode of their trading halts public?

<ESMA_QUESTION_241>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_241>

Q242: Should trading venues also make the actual thresholds in place public? In your view, would this publication offer market participants the necessary predictability and certainty, or would it entail risks? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_242>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_242>

Q243: Do you agree with the proposal above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_243>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_243>

Q244: Should trading venues have the ability to impose the process, content and timing of conformance tests? If yes, should they charge for this service separately?

<ESMA_QUESTION_244>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_244>

Q245: Should alternative means of conformance testing be permitted?

<ESMA_QUESTION_245>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_245>

Q246: Could alternative means of testing substitute testing scenarios provided by trading venues to avoid disorderly trading conditions? Do you consider that a certificate from an external IT audit would be also sufficient for these purposes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_246>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_246>

Q247: What are the minimum capabilities that testing environments should meet to avoid disorderly trading conditions?

<ESMA_QUESTION_247>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_247>

Q248: Do you agree with the proposed approach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_248>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_248>

Q249: In particular, should trading venues require any other pre-trade controls?

<ESMA_QUESTION_249>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_249>

Q250: Do you agree that for the purposes of Article 48(5) the relevant market in terms of liquidity should be determined according to the approach described above? If, not, please state your reasons.

<ESMA_QUESTION_250>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_250>

Q251: Are there any other markets that should be considered material in terms of liquidity for a particular instrument? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_251>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_251>

Q252: Which of the above mentioned approaches is the most adequate to fulfil the goals of Article 48? Please elaborate

<ESMA_QUESTION_252>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_252>

Q253: Do you envisage any other approach to this matter?

<ESMA_QUESTION_253>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_253>

Q254: Do you agree with the list of elements that should be published by trading venues to permit the provision of DEA to its members or participants?

<ESMA_QUESTION_254>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_254>

Q255: Do you agree with the list of systems and effective controls that at least DEA providers should have in place?

<ESMA_QUESTION_255>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_255>

Q256: Do you consider it is necessary to clarify anything in relation to the description of the responsibility regime?

<ESMA_QUESTION_256>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_256>

Q257: Do you consider necessary for trading venues to have any other additional power with respect of the provision of DEA?

<ESMA_QUESTION_257>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_257>

4.4. Market making strategies, market making agreements and market making schemes

Q258: Do you agree with the previous assessment? If not, please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_258>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_258>

Q259: Do you agree with the preliminary assessments above? What practical consequences would it have if firms would also be captured by Article 17(4) MiFID II when posting only one-way quotes, but doing so in different trading venues on different sides of the order book (i.e. posting buy quotes in venue A and sell quotes in venue B for the same instrument)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_259>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_259>

Q260: For how long should the performance of a certain strategy be monitored to determine whether it meets the requirements of Article 17(4) of MiFID II?

<ESMA_QUESTION_260>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_260>

Q261: What percentage of the observation period should a strategy meet with regard to the requirements of Article 17(4) of MiFID II so as to consider that it should be captured by the obligation to enter into a market making agreement?

<ESMA_QUESTION_261>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_261>

Q262: Do you agree with the above assessment?

<ESMA_QUESTION_262>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_262>

Q263: Do you agree with this interpretation?

<ESMA_QUESTION_263>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_263>

Q264: Do you agree with the above assessment? If not, please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_264>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_264>

Q265: Do you agree with the above interpretation?

<ESMA_QUESTION_265>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_265>

Q266: Do you agree with the above proposal?

<ESMA_QUESTION_266>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_266>

Q267: Do you agree with the above proposal?

<ESMA_QUESTION_267>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_267>

Q268: Do you agree with the approach described (non-exhaustive list of quoting parameters)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_268>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_268>

Q269: What should be the parameters to assess whether the market making schemes under Article 48 of MiFID II have effectively contributed to more orderly markets?

<ESMA_QUESTION_269>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_269>

Q270: Do you agree with the list of requirements set out above? Is there any requirement that should be added / removed and if so why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_270>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_270>

Q271: Please provide views, with reasons, on what would be an adequate presence of market making strategies during trading hours?

<ESMA_QUESTION_271>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_271>

Q272: Do you consider that the average presence time under a market making strategy should be the same as the presence time required under a market making agreement ?

<ESMA_QUESTION_272>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_272>

Q273: Should the presence of market making strategies during trading hours be the same across instruments and trading models? If you think it should not, please indicate how this requirement should be specified by different products or market models?

<ESMA_QUESTION_273>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_273>

Q274: Article 48(3) of MiFID II states that the market making agreement should reflect “where applicable any other obligation arising from participation in the scheme”. What in your opinion are the additional areas that that agreement should cover?

<ESMA_QUESTION_274>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_274>

Q275: Do you disagree with any of the events that would qualify as ‘exceptional circumstances’? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_275>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_275>

Q276: Are there any additional ‘exceptional circumstances’ (e.g. reporting events or new fundamental information becoming available) that should be considered by ESMA? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_276>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_276>

Q277: What type of events might be considered under the definition of political and macro-economic issues?

<ESMA_QUESTION_277>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_277>

Q278: What is an appropriate timeframe for determining whether exceptional circumstances no longer apply?

<ESMA_QUESTION_278>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_278>

Q279: What would be an appropriate procedure to restart normal trading activities (e.g. auction periods, notifications, timeframe)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_279>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_279>

Q280: Do you agree with this approach? If not, please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_280>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_280>

Q281: Would further clarification be necessary regarding what is “fair and non-discriminatory”? In particular, are there any cases of discriminatory access that should be specifically addressed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_281>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_281>

Q282: Would it be acceptable setting out any type of technological or informational advantages for participants in market making schemes for liquid instruments? If yes, please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_282>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_282>

Q283: In which cases should a market operator be entitled to close the number of firms taking part in a market making scheme?

<ESMA_QUESTION_283>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_283>

Q284: Do you agree that the market making requirements in Articles 17 and 48 of MiFID II are mostly relevant for liquid instruments? If not, please elaborate how you would apply the requirements in Articles 17 and 48 of MiFID II on market making schemes/agreements/strategies to illiquid instruments.

<ESMA_QUESTION_284>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_284>

Q285: Would you support any other assessment of liquidity different to the one under Article 2(1)(17) of MiFIR? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_285>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_285>

Q286: What should be deemed as a sufficient number of investment firms participating in a market making agreement?

<ESMA_QUESTION_286>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_286>

Q287: What would be an appropriate market share for those firms participating in a market making agreement?

<ESMA_QUESTION_287>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_287>

Q288: Do you agree that market making schemes are not required when trading in the market via a market making agreement exceeds this market share?

<ESMA_QUESTION_288>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_288>

Q289: In which cases should a market operator be entitled to close the number of firms taking part in a market making scheme?

<ESMA_QUESTION_289>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_289>

4.5. Order-to-transaction ratio (Article 48 of MiFID II)

Q290: Do you agree with the types of messages to be taken into account by any OTR?

<ESMA_QUESTION_290>

We agree with ESMA's approach.

In the DP, we can read that "All messages related to an order (submission, price and volume modifications and deletions" should be considered as being caught in the scope but we believe that ESMA should restrict that definition to messages that a firm can actively control to include them in any calculation.

The purpose of Article 48(6) MiFID II is to control the number of trades that members can send to a trading venues to ensure that the trading venues can treat all received transactions.

As the objective is the restriction of trading for members of the trading venues, we believe that any OTR calculation should only include messages that can be controlled by its members. Messages such as acknowledgment and confirmation messages relating to an order and sent by the trading venue to the member should be excluded.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_290>

Q291: What is your view in taking into account the value and/or volume of orders in the OTRs calculations? Please provide:

<ESMA_QUESTION_291>

Considering the aim of the introduction of an OTR, we believe that the key element will be to set rightfully the systems and values.

For instance, the volume should be taken into account. This would help ensuring that the distortions in the calculation of the OTR caused by partial execution can then be controlled and corrected if necessary.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_291>

Q292: Should any other additional elements be taken into account to calibrate OTRs? If yes, please provide an explanation of why these variables are important.

<ESMA_QUESTION_292>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_292>

Q293: Do you agree with the proposed scope of the OTR regime under MiFID II (liquid cash instruments traded on electronic trading systems)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_293>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_293>

Q294: Do you consider that financial instruments which reference a cash instrument(s) as underlying could be excluded from the scope of the OTR regime?

<ESMA_QUESTION_294>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_294>

Q295: Would you make any distinction between instruments which have a single instrument as underlying and those that have as underlying a basket of instruments? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_295>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_295>

Q296: Do you agree with considering within the scope of a future OTR regime only trading venues which have been operational for a sufficient period in the market?

<ESMA_QUESTION_296>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_296>

Q297: If yes, what would be the sufficient period for these purposes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_297>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_297>

Q298: What is your view regarding an activity floor under which the OTR regime would not apply and where could this floor be established?

<ESMA_QUESTION_298>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_298>

Q299: Do you agree with the proposal above as regards the method of determining the OTR threshold?

<ESMA_QUESTION_299>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_299>

Q300: In particular, do you consider the approach to base the OTR regime on the 'average observed OTR of a venue' appropriate in all circumstances? If not, please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_300>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_300>

Q301: Do you believe the multiplier x should be capped at the highest member's OTR observed in the preceding period?

<ESMA_QUESTION_301>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_301>

Q302: In particular, what would be in your opinion an adequate multiplier x? Does this multiplier have to be adapted according to the (group of) instrument(s) traded? If yes, please specify in your response the financial instruments/market segments you refer to.

<ESMA_QUESTION_302>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_302>

Q303: What is your view with respect to the time intervals/frequency for the assessment and review of the OTR threshold (annually, twice a year, other)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_303>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_303>

Q304: What are your views in this regard? Please explain.

<ESMA_QUESTION_304>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_304>

4.6. Co-location (Article 48(8) of MiFID II)

Q305: What factors should ESMA be considering in ensuring that co-location services are provided in a 'transparent', 'fair' and 'non-discriminatory' manner?

<ESMA_QUESTION_305>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_305>

4.7. Fee structures (Article 48 (9) of MiFID II)

Q306: Do you agree with the approach described above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_306>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_306>

Q307: Can you identify any practice that would need regulatory action in terms of transparency or predictability of trading fees?

<ESMA_QUESTION_307>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_307>

Q308: Can you identify any specific difficulties in obtaining adequate information in relation to fees and rebates that would need regulatory action?

<ESMA_QUESTION_308>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_308>

Q309: Can you identify cases of discriminatory access that would need regulatory action?

<ESMA_QUESTION_309>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_309>

Q310: Are there other incentives and disincentives that should be considered?

<ESMA_QUESTION_310>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_310>

Q311: Do any of the parameters referred to above contribute to increasing the probability of trading behaviour that may lead to disorderly and unfair trading conditions?

<ESMA_QUESTION_311>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_311>

Q312: When designing a fee structure, is there any structure that would foster a trading behaviour leading to disorderly trading conditions? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_312>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_312>

Q313: Do you agree that any fee structure where, upon reaching a certain threshold of trading by a trader, a discount is applied on all his trades (including those already done) as opposed to just the marginal trade executed subsequent to reaching the threshold should be banned?

<ESMA_QUESTION_313>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_313>

Q314: Can you identify any potential risks from charging differently the submission of orders to the successive trading phases?

<ESMA_QUESTION_314>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_314>

Q315: Are there any other types of fee structures, including execution fees, ancillary fees and any rebates, that may distort competition by providing certain market participants with more favourable trading conditions than their competitors or pose a risk to orderly trading and that should be considered here?

<ESMA_QUESTION_315>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_315>

Q316: Are there any discount structures which might lead to a situation where the trading cost is borne disproportionately by certain trading participants?

<ESMA_QUESTION_316>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_316>

Q317: For trading venues charging different trading fees for participation in different trading phases (i.e. different fees for opening and closing auctions versus continuous trading period), might this lead to disorderly trading and if so, under which circumstances would such conditions occur?

<ESMA_QUESTION_317>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_317>

Q318: Should conformance testing be charged?

<ESMA_QUESTION_318>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_318>

Q319: Should testing of algorithms in relation to the creation or contribution of disorderly markets be charged?

<ESMA_QUESTION_319>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_319>

Q320: Do you envisage any scenario where charging for conformance testing and/or testing in relation to disorderly trading conditions might discourage firms from investing sufficiently in testing their algorithms?

<ESMA_QUESTION_320>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_320>

Q321: Do you agree with the approach described above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_321>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_321>

Q322: How could the principles described above be further clarified?

<ESMA_QUESTION_322>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_322>

Q323: Do you agree that and OTR must be complemented with a penalty fee?

<ESMA_QUESTION_323>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_323>

Q324: In terms of the approach to determine the penalty fee for breaching the OTR, which approach would you prefer? If neither of them are satisfactory for you, please elaborate what alternative you would envisage.

<ESMA_QUESTION_324>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_324>

Q325: Do you agree that the observation period should be the same as the billing period?

<ESMA_QUESTION_325>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_325>

Q326: Would you apply economic penalties only when the OTR is systematically breached? If yes, how would you define “systematic breaches of the OTR”?

<ESMA_QUESTION_326>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_326>

Q327: Do you consider that market makers should have a less stringent approach in terms of penalties for breaching the OTR?

<ESMA_QUESTION_327>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_327>

Q328: Please indicate which fee structure could incentivise abusive trading behaviour.

<ESMA_QUESTION_328>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_328>

Q329: In your opinion, are there any current fee structures providing these types of incentives? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_329>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_329>

4.8. Tick sizes (Article 48(6) and Article 49 of MiFID II)

Q330: Do you agree with the general approach ESMA has suggested?

<ESMA_QUESTION_330>
We agree with ESMA's view.

We would however like to add some elements that we believe are important to set a tick size regime:

- ESMA should develop standards allowing the trading venues to fine-tune their offer according to their existing structure and products;
- ESMA should be cautious in setting its limits as to reducing liquidity or increasing spreads (in both situations, this would push trading out of trading venues);
- ESMA should provide a regime flexible enough to be able to follow market evolution.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_330>

Q331: Do you agree with adopting the average number of daily trades as an indicator for liquidity to satisfy the liquidity requirement of Article 49 of MiFID II? Are there any other methods/liquidity proxies that allow comparable granularity and that should be considered?

<ESMA_QUESTION_331>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_331>

Q332: In your view, what granularity should be used to determine the liquidity profile of financial instruments? As a result, what would be a proper number of liquidity bands?

<ESMA_QUESTION_332>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_332>

Q333: What is your view on defining the trade-off between constraining the spread without increasing viscosity too much on the basis of a floor-ceiling mechanism?

<ESMA_QUESTION_333>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_333>

Q334: What do you think of the proposed spread to tick ratio range?

<ESMA_QUESTION_334>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_334>

Q335: In your view, for the tick size regime to be efficient and appropriate, should it rely on the spread to tick ratio range, the evolution of liquidity bands, a combination of the two or none of the above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_335>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_335>

Q336: What is your view regarding the common tick size table proposed under Option 1? Do you consider it easy to read, implement and monitor? Does the proposed two dimensional tick size table (based on both the liquidity profile and price) allow applying a tick size to a homogeneous class of stocks given its clear-cut price and liquidity classes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_336>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_336>

Q337: What is your view regarding the determination of the liquidity and price classes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_337>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_337>

Q338: Considering that market microstructure may evolve, would you favour a regime that allows further calibration of the tick size on the basis of the observed market microstructure?

<ESMA_QUESTION_338>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_338>

Q339: In your view, does the tick size regime proposed under Option 1 offer sufficient predictability and certainty to market participants in a context where markets are constantly evolving (notably given its calibration and monitoring mechanisms)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_339>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_339>

Q340: The common tick size table proposed under Option 1 provides for re-calibration while constantly maintaining a control sample. In your view, what frequency would be appropriate for the revision of the figures (e.g., yearly)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_340>

We support the idea of the regular review of the values of the tick sizes.

We believe that the frequency of those revisions should be between 6 months and 1 year.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_340>

Q341: In your view, what is the impact of Option 1 on the activity of market participants, including trading venue operators? To what extent, would it require adjustments?

<ESMA_QUESTION_341>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_341>

Q342: Do you agree that some equity-like instruments require an equivalent regulation of tick sizes as equities so as to ensure the orderly functioning of markets and to avoid the migration of trading across instrument types based on tick size? If not, please outline why this would not be the case.

<ESMA_QUESTION_342>

As stated in previous replies, we believe that a similar regime should be applied to similar instruments, with calibrated values based on the instrument classes.

We would be opposed to the implementation of different valuation models by instruments as it would increase the complexity in the set-up and follow-up of the tick size values.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_342>

Q343: Are there any other similar equity-like instruments that should be added / removed from the scope of tick size regulation? Please outline the reasons why such instruments should be added / removed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_343>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_343>

Q344: Do you agree that depositary receipts require the same tick size regime as equities?

<ESMA_QUESTION_344>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_344>

Q345: If you think that for certain equity-like instruments (e.g. ETFs) the spread-based tick size regime¹ would be more appropriate, please specify your reasons and provide a detailed description of the methodology and technical specifications of this alternative concept.

<ESMA_QUESTION_345>

¹ Please see the description of Option 2 regarding tick sizes below.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_345>

Q346: If you generally (also for liquid and illiquid shares as well as other equity-like financial instruments) prefer a spread-based tick size regime² vis-à-vis the regime as proposed under Option 1 and tested by ESMA, please specify the reasons and provide the following information:

<ESMA_QUESTION_346>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_346>

Q347: Given the different tick sizes currently in operation, please explain what your preferred type of tick size regulation would be, giving reasons why this is the case.

<ESMA_QUESTION_347>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_347>

Q348: Do you see a need to develop a tick size regime for any non-equity financial instrument? If yes, please elaborate, indicating in particular which approach you would follow to determine that regime.

<ESMA_QUESTION_348>
We agree with ESMA's proposal to impose tick size only to equities and equities-like instruments.

From our perspective, we believe that this would not have any added value to treat them differently.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_348>

Q349: Do you agree with assessing the liquidity of a share for the purposes of the tick size regime, using the rule described above? If not, please elaborate what criteria you would apply to distinguish between liquid and illiquid instruments.

<ESMA_QUESTION_349>
We agree with the principle that the tick sizes should be different for illiquid instruments than the ones for liquid instruments.

We refer to the comments made on liquidity for equities and equities-like instruments in our reply to the Consultation Paper and in the above replies of this Discussion Paper

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_349>

Q350: Do you agree with the tick sizes proposed under Option 2? In particular, should a different tick size be used for the largest band, taking into account the size of the tick relative to the price? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_350>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_350>

² Please see the description of Option 2 regarding tick sizes below.

Q351: Should the tick size be calibrated in a more granular manner to that proposed above, namely by shifting a band which results in a large step-wise change?

<ESMA_QUESTION_351>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_351>

Q352: Do you agree with the above treatment for a newly admitted instrument? Would this affect the subsequent trading in a negative way?

<ESMA_QUESTION_352>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_352>

Q353: Do you agree that a period of six weeks is appropriate for the purpose of initial calibration for all instruments admitted to the pan-European tick size regime under Option 2? If not, what would be the appropriate period for the initial calibration?

<ESMA_QUESTION_353>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_353>

Q354: Do you agree with the proposal of factoring the bid-ask spread into tick size regime through SAF? If not, what would you consider as the appropriate method?

<ESMA_QUESTION_354>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_354>

Q355: Do you agree with the proposal to take an average bid-ask spread of less than two ticks as being too narrow? If not, what level of spread to ticks would you consider to be too narrow?

<ESMA_QUESTION_355>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_355>

Q356: Under the current proposal, it is not considered necessary to set an upper ceiling to the bid-ask spread, as the preliminary view under Option 2 is that under normal conditions the risk of the spread widening indefinitely is limited (and in any event a regulator may amend SAF manually if required). Do you agree with this view? If not, how would you propose to set an upper ceiling applicable across markets in the EU?

<ESMA_QUESTION_356>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_356>

Q357: Do you have any concerns of a possible disruption which may materialise in implementing a review cycle as envisioned above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_357>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_357>

Q358: Do you agree that illiquid instruments, excluding illiquid cash equities, should be excluded from the scope of a pan-European tick size regime under Option 2 until such time that definitions for these instruments become available? If not, please explain why. If there are any equity-like instruments per Article 49(3) of MiFID II that you feel should be included in the pan-European tick size regime at the same time as for cash equities, please list these instruments together with a brief reason for doing so.

<ESMA_QUESTION_358>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_358>

Q359: Do you agree that financial instruments, other than those listed in Article 49(3) of MiFID II should be excluded from the scope of the pan-European tick size regime under Option 2 at least for the time being? If not, please explain why and which specific instruments do you consider necessary to be included in the regime.

<ESMA_QUESTION_359>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_359>

Q360: What views do you have on whether tick sizes should be revised on a dynamic or periodic basis? What role do you perceive for an automated mechanism for doing this versus review by the NCA responsible for the instrument in question? If you prefer periodic review, how frequently should reviews be undertaken (e.g. quarterly, annually)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_360>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_360>

5. Data publication and access

5.1. General authorisation and organisational requirements for data reporting services (Article 61(4), MiFID II)

Q361: Do you agree that the guidance produced by CESR in 2010 is broadly appropriate for all three types of DRS providers?

<ESMA_QUESTION_361>

We agree with ESMA views.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_361>

Q362: Do you agree that there should also be a requirement for notification of significant system changes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_362>

We support the idea to have a mandatory notification from DRS to the NCA as those changes might have impact on compliance checks, for instance.

Consequently, we are asking ESMA to provide the market with a definition, some examples and some guidance on what should be understood as “significant system change”.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_362>

Q363: Are there any other general elements that should be considered in the NCAs' assessment of whether to authorise a DRS provider?

<ESMA_QUESTION_363>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_363>

5.2. Additional requirements for particular types of Data Reporting Services Providers

Q364: Do you agree with the identified differences regarding the regulatory treatment of ARMs.

<ESMA_QUESTION_364>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_364>

Q365: What other significant differences will there have to be in the standards for APAs, CTPs and ARMs?

<ESMA_QUESTION_365>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_365>

5.3. Technical arrangements promoting an efficient and consistent dissemination of information – Machine readability Article 64(6), MiFID II

Q366: Do you agree with the proposal to define machine-readability in this way? If not, what would you prefer?

<ESMA_QUESTION_366>

We agree with ESMA's proposed definition for machine readability.

However, we are not confident that reliance on the APA's website information could lead to a sufficient and robust solution.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_366>

5.4. Consolidated tape providers

Q367: Should the tapes be offered to users on an instrument-by-instrument basis, or as a single comprehensive tape, or at some intermediate level of disaggregation? Do you think that transparency information should be available without the need for value-added products to be purchased alongside?

<ESMA_QUESTION_367>

AFG would be in favour of having a single consolidated tape (or a small number of them) that could also be queried by instrument type.

The information on the consolidated tape should be made publically available, unbundled and without extra costs.

We urge ESMA to ensure, in coordination with the relevant competition authorities, that there is no agreement on prices at trading venues' level.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_367>

Q368: Are there other factors or considerations regarding data publication by the CTP that are not covered in the standards for data publication by APAs and trading venues and that should be taken into account by ESMA?

<ESMA_QUESTION_368>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_368>

Q369: Do you agree that CTPs should be able to provide the services listed above? Are there any others that you think should be specified?

<ESMA_QUESTION_369>

We agree with the proposal that CTPs should be allowed to offer all of the listed services mentioned (this list not being exhaustive), provided that there is no conflict of interest in the supply of post-trade information. We would also insist that the provision of those information should be on "reasonable commercial basis" and unbundled from the core transparency data.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_369>

5.5. Data disaggregation

Q370: Do you agree that venues should not be required to disaggregate by individual instrument?

<ESMA_QUESTION_370>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_370>

Q371: Do you agree that venues should be obliged to disaggregate their pre-trade and post-trade data by asset class?

<ESMA_QUESTION_371>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_371>

Q372: Do you believe the list of asset classes proposed in the previous paragraph is appropriate for this purpose? If not, what would you propose?

<ESMA_QUESTION_372>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_372>

Q373: Do you agree that venues should be under an obligation to disaggregate according to the listed criteria unless they can demonstrate that there is insufficient customer interest?

<ESMA_QUESTION_373>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_373>

Q374: Are there any other criteria according to which it would be useful for venues to disaggregate their data, and if so do you think there should be a mandatory or comply-or-explain requirement for them to do so?

<ESMA_QUESTION_374>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_374>

Q375: What impact do you think greater disaggregation will have in practice for overall costs faced by customers?

<ESMA_QUESTION_375>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_375>

5.6. Identification of the investment firm responsible for making public the volume and price transparency of a transaction (Articles 20(3) (c) and 21(5)(c), MiFIR)

Q376: Please describe your views about how to improve the current trade reporting system under Article 27(4) of MiFID Implementing Regulation.

<ESMA_QUESTION_376>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_376>

5.7. Access to CCPs and trading venues (Articles 35-36, MiFIR)

Q377: Do you agree that exceeding the planned capacity of the CCP is grounds to deny access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_377>
We agree with ESMA's proposal.

However, it should be possible for a CCP to deny access if the volume in excess could be already dealt with by the CCP.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_377>

Q378: How would a CCP assess that the anticipated volume of transactions would exceed its capacity planning?

<ESMA_QUESTION_378>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_378>

Q379: Are there other risks related to the anticipated volume of transactions that should be considered? If so, how would such risks arise from the provision of access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_379>
The risk that we see is the need for a CCP to build additional redundant capacity for future access requests.

We also consider that ESMA should take into account the situation when a CCP is allowed to deny access request based on justification of the risk increase related to e.g. the risk management of the trading venues.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_379>

Q380: Do you agree that exceeding the planned capacity of the CCP is grounds to deny access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_380>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_380>

Q381: How would a CCP assess that the number of users expected to access its systems would exceed its capacity planning?

<ESMA_QUESTION_381>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_381>

Q382: Are there other risks related to number of users that should be considered? If so, how would such risks arise from the provision of access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_382>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_382>

Q383: In what way could granting access to a trading venue expose a CCP to risks associated with a change in the type of users accessing the CCP? Are there any additional risks that could be relevant in this situation?

<ESMA_QUESTION_383>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_383>

Q384: How would a CCP establish that the anticipated operational risk would exceed its operational risk management design?

<ESMA_QUESTION_384>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_384>

Q385: Are there other risks related to arrangements for managing operational risk that should be considered? If so, how would such risks arise from the provision of access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_385>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_385>

Q386: Given there will be costs to meeting an access request, what regard should be given to those costs that would create significant undue risk?

<ESMA_QUESTION_386>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_386>

Q387: To what extent could a lack of harmonization in certain areas of law constitute a relevant risk in the context of granting or denying access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_387>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_387>

Q388: Do you agree with the risks identified above in relation to complexity and other factors creating significant undue risks?

<ESMA_QUESTION_388>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_388>

Q389: Q: Are there other risks related to complexity and other factors creating significant undue risks that should be considered? If so, how would such risks arise from the provision of access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_389>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_389>

Q390: Do you agree with the analysis above and the conclusion specified in the previous paragraph?

<ESMA_QUESTION_390>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_390>

Q391: To what extent would a trading venue granting access give rise to material risks because of anticipated volume of transactions and the number of users? Can you evidence that access will materially change volumes and the number of users?

<ESMA_QUESTION_391>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_391>

Q392: To what extent would a trading venue granting access give rise to material risks because of arrangements for managing operational risk?

<ESMA_QUESTION_392>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_392>

Q393: Given there will be costs to meeting an access request, what regard should be given to those costs that would create significant undue risk?

<ESMA_QUESTION_393>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_393>

Q394: Do you believe a CCP's model regarding the acceptance of trades may create risks to a trading venue if access is provided? If so, please explain in which cases and how.

<ESMA_QUESTION_394>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_394>

Q395: Could granting access create unmanageable risks for trading venues due to conflicts of law arising from the involvement of different legal regimes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_395>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_395>

Q396: Are there other risks related to complexity and other factors creating significant undue risks that should be considered? If so, how would such risks arise from the provision of access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_396>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_396>

Q397: Do you agree with the conditions set out above? If you do not, please state why not.

<ESMA_QUESTION_397>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_397>

Q398: Are there any are other conditions CCPs and trading venues should include in their terms for agreeing access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_398>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_398>

Q399: Are there any other fees that are relevant in the context of Articles 35 and 36 of MiFIR that should be analysed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_399>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_399>

Q400: Are there other considerations that need to be made in respect of transparent and non-discriminatory fees?

<ESMA_QUESTION_400>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_400>

Q401: Do you consider that the proposed approach adequately reflects the need to ensure that the CCP does not apply discriminatory collateral requirements? What alternative approach would you consider?

<ESMA_QUESTION_401>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_401>

Q402: Do you see other conditions under which netting of economically equivalent contracts would be enforceable and ensure non-discriminatory treatment for the prospective trading venue in line with all the conditions of Article 35(1)(a)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_402>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_402>

Q403: The approach above relies on the CCP's model compliance with Article 27 of Regulation (EU) No 153/2013, do you see any other circumstances for a CCP to cross margin correlated contracts? Do you see other conditions under which cross margining of correlated contracts would be enforceable and ensure non-discriminatory treatment for the prospective trading venue?

<ESMA_QUESTION_403>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_403>

Q404: Do you agree with ESMA that the two considerations that could justify a national competent authority in denying access are (a) knowledge it has about the trading venue or CCP being at risk of not meeting its legal obligations, and (b) liquidity fragmentation? If not, please explain why.

<ESMA_QUESTION_404>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_404>

Q405: How could the above mentioned considerations be further specified?

<ESMA_QUESTION_405>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_405>

Q406: Are there other conditions that may threaten the smooth and orderly functioning of the markets or adversely affect systemic risk? If so, how would such risks arise from the provision of access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_406>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_406>

Q407: Do you agree with ESMA's proposed approach that where there are equally accepted alternative approaches to calculating notional amount, but there are notable differences in the value to which these calculation methods give rise, ESMA should specify the method that should be used?

<ESMA_QUESTION_407>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_407>

Q408: Do you agree that the examples provided above are appropriate for ESMA to adopt given the purpose for which the opt-out mechanism was introduced? If not, why, and what alternative(s) would you propose?

<ESMA_QUESTION_408>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_408>

Q409: For which types of exchange traded derivative instruments do you consider there to be notable differences in the way the notional amount is calculated? How should the notional amount for these particular instruments be calculated?

<ESMA_QUESTION_409>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_409>

Q410: Are there any other considerations ESMA should take into account when further specifying how notional amount should be calculated? In particular, how should technical transactions be treated for the purposes of Article 36(5), MiFIR?

<ESMA_QUESTION_410>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_410>

5.8. Non-discriminatory access to and obligation to license benchmarks

Q411: Do you agree that trading venues require the relevant information mentioned above? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_411>
A. General remarks on Section 5.8 of the Discussion Paper

The requirements of this Title of the Discussion Paper are covering the information to be provided to CCPs and trading venues as well as to their users in order to safeguard that the appropriate information is made available to them for trading and clearing purposes. Therefore, the right to access to such information is not covering any other user of the benchmarks.

Asset managers, as users of benchmarks, are in principle in favour of an efficient transparency regime as to the setting of indices and their input data. This can play a key role in restoring market credibility and re-establishing confidence in benchmarks, but also allow transparency on the costs and fees for the end investor and a level playing field for all market participants. As long as risks for arbitrage are duly taken into account, the access to information to users of benchmarks when this is necessary to comply with their regulatory requirements, should in every case be made possible.

In that context, AFG welcomes the information requirements foreseen in MiFIR concerning the CCPs, trading venues and their users.

The requirements are covering an efficient extent of information. Additional information might be necessary in some cases such as on benchmarks values and values in all components, rates, constituent or structure parts and their weightings (if appropriate), as well as details as to any changes made to the composition of a benchmark.

B. Specific answer to Question 411

Yes, AFG agrees that the information mentioned above should be made available to trading venues.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_411>

Q412: Is there any other additional information in respect of price and data feeds that a trading venue would need for the purposes of trading?

<ESMA_QUESTION_412>

A trading venue would need a sufficiently broad level of information that will enable its monitoring of the function of the market on a regular basis. The relevant feed should include benchmark values plus values on all components based on or including their weightings within an index.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_412>

Q413: Do you agree that CCPs require the relevant information mentioned above? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_413>

Yes, AFG agrees that CCPs require that the information mentioned above be made available to them.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_413>

Q414: Is there any other additional information in respect of price and data feeds that a CCP would need for the purposes of clearing?

<ESMA_QUESTION_414>

A CCP would need a sufficiently broad level of information that will enable its monitoring of the function of the market on a regular basis. The relevant feed should include benchmark values plus values on all components based on or including their weightings within an index.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_414>

Q415: Do you agree that trading venues should have access to benchmark values as soon as they are calculated? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_415>

AFG agrees with trading venues having access to benchmark values in a prompt manner, based on the nature of the index and the frequency of calculation.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_415>

Q416: Do you agree that CCPs should have access to benchmark values as soon as they are calculated? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_416>

AFG agrees with CCPs having access to benchmark values in a prompt manner, based on the nature of the index and the frequency of calculation.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_416>

Q417: Do you agree that trading venues require the relevant information mentioned above? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_417>

Yes, we agree.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_417>

Q418: Is there any other additional information in respect of composition that a trading venue would need for the purposes of trading?

<ESMA_QUESTION_418>

For the possibility of a trading venue to make the assessment of the index' characteristics, information on the previous constituents or weightings might also be necessary.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_418>

Q419: Do you agree that CCPs require the relevant information mentioned above? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_419>

Yes, we agree.

<ESMA_QUESTION_419>

Q420: Is there any other additional information in respect of composition that a CCP would need for the purposes of clearing?

<ESMA_QUESTION_420>

For the possibility of a CCP to make the assessment of the index' characteristics, information on the previous constituents or weightings might also be necessary.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_420>

Q421: Do you agree that trading venues and CCPs should be notified of any planned changes to the composition of the benchmark in advance? And that where this is not possible, notification should be given as soon as the change is made? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_421>

Yes, we agree.

<ESMA_QUESTION_421>

Q422: Do you agree that trading venues need the relevant information mentioned above? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_422>

Yes, we agree that the information mentioned above are reasonable and necessary.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_422>

Q423: Is there any other additional information in respect of methodology that a trading venue would need for the purposes of trading?

<ESMA_QUESTION_423>

Full visibility on the methodology used to make benchmark determinations and the rationale for adopting a methodology is necessary for the trading purposes of a trading venue. Benchmark providers should additionally disclose information as to the concentration level of an index (i.e. individual constituents in excess of 10% of a whole, or 5% constituents collectively in excess of 40% of a whole).

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_423>

Q424: Do you agree that CCPs require the relevant information mentioned above? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_424>

Yes, we agree that the information mentioned above are reasonable and necessary.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_424>

Q425: Is there any other additional information in respect of methodology that a CCP would need for the purposes of clearing?

<ESMA_QUESTION_425>

Full visibility on the methodology used to make benchmark determinations and the rationale for adopting a methodology is necessary for the clearing purposes of a CCP. Benchmark providers should additionally disclose information as to the concentration level of an index (i.e. individual constituents in excess of 10% of a whole, or 5% constituents collectively in excess of 40% of a whole).

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_425>

Q426: Is there any information in respect of the methodology of a benchmark that a person with proprietary rights to a benchmark should not be required to provide to a trading venue or a CCP?

<ESMA_QUESTION_426>

AFG sees no valid reason for a benchmark provider to withhold part of the information in respect of the methodology of a benchmark.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_426>

Q427: Do you agree that trading venues require the relevant information mentioned above (values, types and sources of inputs, used to develop benchmark values)? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_427>

Yes, AFG agrees that trading venues and their clients need the values, constituents and actual weightings that are used to develop benchmark values, in order to perform their regulatory obligations, in particular in relation to risk management.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_427>

Q428: Is there any other additional information in respect of pricing that a trading venue would need for the purposes of trading?

<ESMA_QUESTION_428>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_428>

Q429: In what other circumstances should a trading venue not be able to require the values of the constituents of a benchmark?

<ESMA_QUESTION_429>

AFG does not see any circumstance under which a trading venue should not be able to require the values of the constituents of a benchmark.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_429>

Q430: Do you agree that CCPs require the relevant information mentioned above? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_430>

Yes, AFG agrees that CCPs and their clients need the values, constituents and actual weightings that are used to develop benchmark values, in order to perform their regulatory obligations, in particular in relation to risk management.

<ESMA_QUESTION_430>

Q431: Is there any other additional information in respect of pricing that a CCP would need for the purposes of clearing?

<ESMA_QUESTION_431>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_431>

Q432: In what other circumstances should a CCP not be able to require the values of the constituents of a benchmark?

<ESMA_QUESTION_432>

AFG does not see any circumstance under which a CCP should not be able to require the values of the constituents of a benchmark.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_432>

Q433: Do you agree that trading venues require the additional information mentioned above? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_433>

AFG agrees with trading venues requiring the additional information. Information on inaccuracies or the calculation of a benchmark value and the updated/corrected value is vital for them to properly perform their duties.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_433>

Q434: Do you agree that CCPs require the additional information mentioned above? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_434>

AFG agrees with CCPs requiring the additional information. Information on inaccuracies or the calculation of a benchmark value and the updated/corrected value is vital for them to properly perform their duties.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_434>

Q435: Is there any other information that a trading venue would need for the purposes of trading?

<ESMA_QUESTION_435>

Information on the performance history in terms of the value of the index on a daily basis for liquid markets or at least on a monthly basis as well as historic data on turnover rates as a result of market moves which end up in the deletion or addition of securities in benchmark composition, should also be required by trading venues and their users.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_435>

Q436: Is there any other information that a CCP would need for the purposes of clearing?

<ESMA_QUESTION_436>

Information on the performance history in terms of the value of the index on a daily basis for liquid markets or at least on a monthly basis as well as historic data on turnover rates as a result of market moves which end up in the deletion or addition of securities in benchmark composition, should also be required by CCPs and their users.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_436>

Q437: Do you agree with the principles described above? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_437>

AFG agrees with the principle of making the information available also to the users of trading venues and CCPs. At the same time we need to stress that in order to safeguard a non-discriminatory access to information, the pricing and the conditions of the license agreements need to be non-discriminatory as well.

In the case of the pricing that means that the same pricing policy should apply for all trading venues, CCPs and their users based on objective and comparable criteria such as the quantity of the data and not on custom made criteria applicable only to one type of users, for example assets under benchmark management.

In the case of the conditions of the license agreements, non-discriminatory access means equal treatment of all trading venues, CCPs and their users and no customized conditions in the license agreement that require multiple licenses for the use of the same data, based for instance on the regulatory requirements that a trading venue, a CCP or a user has (which will then mean that every time the same index is being used in order to meet different regulatory requirements a new license will be necessary).

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_437>

Q438: Do users of trading venues need non-publicly disclosed information on benchmarks?

<ESMA_QUESTION_438>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_438>

Q439: Do users of CCPs need non-publicly disclosed information on benchmarks?

<ESMA_QUESTION_439>

The users of trading venues need the non-publicly disclosed information to perform their obligations, in particular concerning risk management duties.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_439>

Q440: Where information is not available publicly should users be provided with the relevant information through agreements with the person with proprietary rights to the benchmark or with its trading venue / CCP?

<ESMA_QUESTION_440>

The agreement of the trading venue or a CCP should also cover the transmission of the data to their users. It would be inefficient to foresee individual agreements of each of the users of the trading venue or of the CCP with the index providers being required on top of the existing agreements of the same index providers

with the trading venue or the CCP. This would lead to a duplication of the same set of terms and conditions with no added value but with additional legal costs of millions of euros.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_440>

Q441: Do you agree with the conditions set out above? If not, please state why not.

<ESMA_QUESTION_441>

The conditions set above are reasonable. It should moreover be clear that termination of the license agreements and the delivery of data input should not be triggered during the time of dispute resolution as this would disrupt the trading and clearing activities of trading venues, CCPs and their clients and could be used by one side as a way to impose license terms.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_441>

Q442: Are there any are other conditions persons with proprietary rights to a benchmark and trading venues should include in their terms for agreeing access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_442>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_442>

Q443: Are there any are other conditions persons with proprietary rights to a benchmark and CCPs should include in their terms for agreeing access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_443>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_443>

Q444: Which specific terms/conditions currently included in licensing agreements might be discriminatory/give rise to preventing access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_444>

In order to safeguard a non-discriminatory access to information, the pricing and the conditions of the license agreements need to be non-discriminatory as well.

In the case of the pricing that means that the same pricing policy should apply for all trading venues, CCPs and their users based on objective and comparable criteria such as the quantity of the data and not on custom made criteria applicable only to one type of users, for example assets under benchmark management.

In the case of the conditions of the license agreements, non-discriminatory access means equal treatment of all trading venues, CCPs and their users and no customized conditions in the license agreement that require multiple licenses for the use of the same data, based for instance on the regulatory requirements that a trading venue, a CCP or a user has (which will then mean that every time the same index is being used in order to meet different regulatory requirements a new license will be necessary).

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_444>

Q445: Do you have views on how termination should be handled in relation to outstanding/significant cases of breach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_445>

The standard procedure should be that the termination provisions in the license agreements provide a transition period, i.e. that the termination of the license will not terminate the permissions granted for any Exchange Traded Products already in use. Therefore full termination will take place once the last of the derivatives expire.

At the same time AFG wishes to stress that termination of the license agreements and the delivery of data input should not be triggered during the time of dispute resolution as this would disrupt the trading and clearing activities of trading venues, CCPs and their clients and could be used by one side as a way to impose license terms.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_445>

Q446: Do you agree with the approach ESMA has taken regarding the assessment of a benchmark's novelty, i.e., to balance/weight certain factors against one another? If not, how do you think the assessment should be carried out?

<ESMA_QUESTION_446>
AFG agrees that a different type of criteria and factors should apply as to the assessment of a benchmark's novelty and with the set of criteria proposed by ESMA.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_446>

Q447: Do you agree that each newly released series of a benchmark should not be considered a new benchmark?

<ESMA_QUESTION_447>
We agree that this can be considered as a continuation of the previous benchmark.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_447>

Q448: Do you agree that the factors mentioned above could be considered when assessing whether a benchmark is new? If not, why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_448>
AFG agrees with the set of criteria/factors set above for the assessment of a benchmark's novelty that should apply based on the features and specifics of a benchmark.
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_448>

Q449: Are there any factors that would determine that a benchmark is not new?

<ESMA_QUESTION_449>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_449>

6. Requirements applying on and to trading venues

6.1. Admission to Trading

Q450: What are your views regarding the conditions that have to be satisfied in order for a financial instrument to be admitted to trading?

<ESMA_QUESTION_450>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_450>

Q451: In your experience, do you consider that the requirements being in place since 2007 have worked satisfactorily or do they require updating? If the latter, which additional requirements should be imposed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_451>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_451>

Q452: More specifically, do you think that the requirements for transferable securities, units in collective investment undertakings and/or derivatives need to be amended or updated? What is your proposal?

<ESMA_QUESTION_452>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_452>

Q453: How do you assess the proposal in respect of requiring ETFs to offer market making arrangements and direct redemption facilities at least in cases where the regulated market value of units or shares significantly varies from the net asset value?

<ESMA_QUESTION_453>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_453>

Q454: Which arrangements are currently in place at European markets to verify compliance of issuers with initial, on-going and ad hoc disclosure obligations?

<ESMA_QUESTION_454>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_454>

Q455: What are your experiences in respect of such arrangements?

<ESMA_QUESTION_455>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_455>

Q456: What is your view on how effective these arrangements are in performing verification checks?

<ESMA_QUESTION_456>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_456>

Q457: What arrangements are currently in place on European regulated markets to facilitate access of members or participants to information being made public under Union law?

<ESMA_QUESTION_457>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_457>

Q458: What are your experiences in respect of such arrangements?

<ESMA_QUESTION_458>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_458>

Q459: How do you assess the effectiveness of these arrangements in achieving their goals?

<ESMA_QUESTION_459>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_459>

Q460: Do you agree with that, for the purpose of Article 51 (3) (2) of MiFID II, the arrangements for facilitating access to information shall encompass the Prospectus, Transparency and Market Abuse Directives (in the future the Market Abuse Regulation)? Do you consider that this should also include MiFIR trade transparency obligations?

<ESMA_QUESTION_460>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_460>

6.2. Suspension and Removal of Financial Instruments from Trading - connection between a derivative and the underlying financial instrument and standards for determining formats and timings of communications and publications

Q461: Do you agree with the specifications outlined above for the suspension or removal from trading of derivatives which are related to financial instruments that are suspended or removed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_461>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_461>

Q462: Do you think that any derivatives with indices or a basket of financial instruments as an underlying the pricing of which depends on multiple price inputs should be suspended if one or more of the instruments composing the index or the basket are suspended on the basis that they are sufficiently related? If so, what methodology would you propose for determining whether they are “sufficiently related”? Please explain.

<ESMA_QUESTION_462>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_462>



Q463: Do you agree with the principles outlined above for the timing and format of communications and publications to be effected by trading venue operators?

<ESMA_QUESTION_463>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_463>

7. Commodity derivatives

7.1. Ancillary Activity

Q464: Do you see any difficulties in defining the term 'group' as proposed above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_464>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_464>

Q465: What are the advantages and disadvantages of the two alternative approaches mentioned above (taking into account non-EU activities versus taking into account only EU activities of a group)? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA_QUESTION_465>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_465>

Q466: What are the main challenges in relation to both approaches and how could they be addressed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_466>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_466>

Q467: Do you consider there are any difficulties concerning the suggested approach for assessing whether the ancillary activities constitute a minority of activities at group level? Do you consider that the proposed calculations appropriately factor in activity which is subject to the permitted exemptions under Article 2(4) MiFID II? If no, please explain why and provide an alternative proposal.

<ESMA_QUESTION_467>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_467>

Q468: Are there other approaches for assessing whether the ancillary activities constitute a minority of activities at group level that you would like to suggest? Please provide details and reasons.

<ESMA_QUESTION_468>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_468>

Q469: How should "minority of activities" be defined? Should minority be less than 50% or less (50 - x)%? Please provide reasons.

<ESMA_QUESTION_469>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_469>

Q470: Do you have a view on whether economic or accounting capital should be used in order to define the elements triggering the exemption from authorisation under MiFID II, available under Article 2(1)(j)? Please provide reasons.

<ESMA_QUESTION_470>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_470>

Q471: If economic capital were to be used as a measure, what do you understand to be encompassed by this term?

<ESMA_QUESTION_471>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_471>

Q472: Do you agree with the above assessment that the data available in the TRs will enable entities to perform the necessary calculations?

<ESMA_QUESTION_472>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_472>

Q473: What difficulties do you consider entities may encounter in obtaining the information that is necessary to define the size of their own trading activity and the size of the overall market trading activity from TRs? How could the identified difficulties be addressed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_473>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_473>

Q474: What do you consider to be the difficulties in defining the volume of the transactions entered into to fulfil liquidity obligations?

<ESMA_QUESTION_474>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_474>

Q475: How should the volume of the overall trading activity of the firm at group level and the volume of the transactions entered into in order to hedge physical activities be measured? (Number of contracts or nominal value? Period of time to be considered?)

<ESMA_QUESTION_475>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_475>

Q476: Do you agree with the level of granularity of asset classes suggested in order to provide for relative comparison between market participants?

<ESMA_QUESTION_476>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_476>

Q477: What difficulties could there be regarding the aggregation of TR data in order to obtain information on the size of the overall market trading activity? How could these difficulties be addressed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_477>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_477>

Q478: How should ESMA set the threshold above which persons fall within MiFID II's scope? At what percentage should the threshold be set? Please provide reasons for your response.

<ESMA_QUESTION_478>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_478>

Q479: Are there other approaches for determining the size of the trading activity that you would like to suggest?

<ESMA_QUESTION_479>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_479>

Q480: Are there other elements apart from the need for ancillary activities to constitute a minority of activities and the comparison between the size of the trading activity and size of the overall market trading activity that ESMA should take into account when defining whether an activity is ancillary to the main business?

<ESMA_QUESTION_480>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_480>

Q481: Do you see any difficulties with the interpretation of the hedging exemptions mentioned above under Article 2(4)(a) and (c) of MiFID II? How could potential difficulties be addressed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_481>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_481>

Q482: Do you agree with ESMA's proposal to take into account Article 10 of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 149/2013 supplementing EMIR in specifying the application of the hedging exemption under Article 2(4)(b) of MiFID II? How could any potential difficulties be addressed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_482>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_482>

Q483: Do you agree that the obligations to provide liquidity under Article 17(3) and Article 57(8)(d) of MiFID II should not be taken into account as an obligation triggering the hedging exemption mentioned above under Article 2(4)(c)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_483>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_483>

Q484: Could you provide any other specific examples of obligations of "transactions in commodity derivatives and emission allowances entered into to fulfil obligations to provide liquidity on a trading venue" which ESMA should take into account?

<ESMA_QUESTION_484>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_484>

Q485: Should the (timeframe for) assessment be linked to audit processes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_485>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_485>

Q486: How should seasonal variations be taken into account (for instance, if a firm puts on a maximum position at one point in the year and sells that down through the following twelve months should the calculation be taken at the maximum point or on average)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_486>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_486>

Q487: Which approach would be practical in relation to firms that may fall within the scope of MiFID in one year but qualify for exemption in another year?

<ESMA_QUESTION_487>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_487>

Q488: Do you see difficulties with regard to the two approaches suggested above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_488>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_488>

Q489: How could a possible interim approach be defined with regard to the suggestion mentioned above (i.e. annual notification but calculation on a three years rolling basis)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_489>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_489>

Q490: Do you agree that the competent authority to which the notification has to be made should be the one of the place of incorporation?

<ESMA_QUESTION_490>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_490>

7.2. Position Limits

Q491: Do you agree with ESMA's proposal to link the definition of a risk-reducing trade under MiFID II to the definition applicable under EMIR? If you do not agree, what alternative definition do you believe is appropriate?

<ESMA_QUESTION_491>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_491>

Q492: Do you agree with ESMA's proposed definition of a non-financial entity? If you do not agree, what alternative definition do you believe is appropriate?

<ESMA_QUESTION_492>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_492>

Q493: Should the regime for subsidiaries of a person other than entities that are wholly owned look to aggregate on the basis of a discrete percentage threshold or on a more subjective basis? What are the advantages and risks of either approach? Do you agree with the proposal that where the positions of an entity that is subject to substantial control by a person are aggregated, they are included in their entirety?

<ESMA_QUESTION_493>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_493>

Q494: Should the regime apply to the positions held by unconnected persons where they are acting together with a common purpose (for example, “concert party” arrangements where different market participants collude to act for common purpose)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_494>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_494>

Q495: Do you agree with the approach to link the definition of economically equivalent OTC contract, for the purpose of position limits, with the definitions used in other parts of MiFID II? If you do not agree, what alternative definition do you believe is appropriate?

<ESMA_QUESTION_495>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_495>

Q496: Do you agree that even where a contract is, or may be, cash-settled it is appropriate to base its equivalence on the substitutability of the underlying physical commodity that it is referenced to? If you do not agree, what alternative measures of equivalence could be used?

<ESMA_QUESTION_496>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_496>

Q497: Do you believe that the definition of “economically equivalent” that is used by the CFTC is appropriate for the purpose of defining the contracts that are not traded on a trading venue for the position limits regime of MiFID II? Give reasons to support your views as well as any suggested amendments or additions to this definition.

<ESMA_QUESTION_497>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_497>

Q498: What arrangements could be put in place to support competent authorities identifying what OTC contracts are considered to be economically equivalent to listed contracts traded on a trading venue? ?

<ESMA_QUESTION_498>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_498>

Q499: Do you agree with ESMA's proposal that the "same" derivative contract occurs where an identical contract is listed independently on two or more different trading venues? What other alternative definitions of "same" could be applied to commodity derivatives?

<ESMA_QUESTION_499>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_499>

Q500: Do you agree with ESMA's proposals on aggregation and netting? How should ESMA address the practical obstacles to including within the assessment positions entered into OTC or on third country venues? Should ESMA adopt a model for pooling related contracts and should this extend to closely correlated contracts? How should equivalent contracts be converted into a similar metric to the exchange traded contract they are deemed equivalent to?

<ESMA_QUESTION_500>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_500>

Q501: Do you agree with ESMA's approach to defining market size for physically settled contracts? Is it appropriate for cash settled contracts to set position limits without taking into account the underlying physical market?

<ESMA_QUESTION_501>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_501>

Q502: Do you agree that it is preferable to set the position limit on a contract for a fixed (excluding exceptional circumstances) period rather than amending it on a real-time basis? What period do you believe is appropriate, considering in particular the factors of market evolution and operational efficiency?

<ESMA_QUESTION_502>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_502>

Q503: Once the position limits regime is implemented, what period do you feel is appropriate to give sufficient notice to persons of the subsequent adjustment of position limits?

<ESMA_QUESTION_503>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_503>

Q504: Should positions based on contracts entered into before the revision of position limits be grandfathered and if so how?

<ESMA_QUESTION_504>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_504>

Q505: Do you agree with ESMA's proposals for the determination of a central or primary trading venue for the purpose of establishing position limits in the same derivative contracts? If you do not agree, what practical alternative method should be used?

<ESMA_QUESTION_505>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_505>

Q506: Should the level of “significant volume” be set at a different level to that proposed above? If yes, please explain what level should be applied, and how it may be determined on an ongoing basis?

<ESMA_QUESTION_506>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_506>

Q507: In using the maturity of commodity contracts as a factor, do you agree that competent authorities apply the methodology in a different way for the spot month and for the aggregate of all other months along the curve?

<ESMA_QUESTION_507>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_507>

Q508: What factors do you believe should be applied to reflect the differences in the nature of trading activity between the spot month and the forward months?

<ESMA_QUESTION_508>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_508>

Q509: Do you agree with ESMA’s proposal for trading venues to provide data on the deliverable supply underlying their contracts? If you do not agree, what considerations should be given to determining the deliverable supply for a contract?

<ESMA_QUESTION_509>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_509>

Q510: In the light of the fact that some commodity markets are truly global, do you consider that open interest in similar or identical contracts in non-EEA jurisdictions should be taken into account? If so, how do you propose doing this, given that data from some trading venues may not be available on the same basis or in the same timeframe as that from other trading venues?

<ESMA_QUESTION_510>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_510>

Q511: In the absence of published or easily obtained information on volatility in derivative and physical commodity markets, in what ways should ESMA reflect this factor in its methodology? Are there any alternative measures that may be obtained by ESMA for use in the methodology?

<ESMA_QUESTION_511>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_511>

Q512: Are there any other considerations related to the number and size of market participants that ESMA should consider in its methodology?

<ESMA_QUESTION_512>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_512>

Q513: Are there any other considerations related to the characteristics of the underlying commodity market that ESMA should consider in its methodology?

<ESMA_QUESTION_513>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_513>

Q514: For new contracts, what approach should ESMA take in establishing a regime that facilitates continued market evolution within the framework of Article 57?

<ESMA_QUESTION_514>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_514>

Q515: The interpretation of the factors in the paragraphs above will be significant in applying ESMA's methodology; do you agree with ESMA's interpretation? If you do not agree with ESMA's interpretation, what aspects require amendment?

<ESMA_QUESTION_515>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_515>

Q516: Are there any other factors which should be included in the methodology for determining position limits? If so, state in which way (with reference to the proposed methodology explained below) they should be incorporated.

<ESMA_QUESTION_516>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_516>

Q517: What do you consider to be the risks and/or the advantages of applying a different methodology for determining position limits for prompt reference contracts compared to the methodology used for the position limit on forward maturities?

<ESMA_QUESTION_517>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_517>

Q518: How should the position limits regime reflect the specific risks present in the run up to contract expiry?

<ESMA_QUESTION_518>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_518>

Q519: If a different methodology is set for the prompt reference contract, would it be appropriate to make an exception where a contract other than the prompt is the key benchmark used by the market?

<ESMA_QUESTION_519>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_519>

Q520: Do you agree that the baseline for the methodology of setting a position limit should be the deliverable supply? What concrete examples of issues do you foresee in obtaining or using the measure?

<ESMA_QUESTION_520>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_520>

Q521: If you consider that a more appropriate measure exists to form the baseline of the methodology, please explain the measure and why it is more appropriate. Consideration should be given to the reliability and availability of such a measure in order to provide certainty to market participants.

<ESMA_QUESTION_521>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_521>

Q522: Do you agree with this approach for the proposed methodology? If you do not agree, what alternative methodology do you propose, considering the full scope of the requirements of Article 57 MiFID II?

<ESMA_QUESTION_522>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_522>

Q523: Do you have any views on the level at which the baseline (if relevant, for each different asset class) should be set, and the size of the adjustment numbers for each separate factor that ESMA must consider in the methodology defined by Article 57 MiFID II?

<ESMA_QUESTION_523>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_523>

Q524: Does the approach to asset classes have the right level of granularity to take into account market characteristics? Are the key characteristics the right ones to take into account? Are the conclusions by asset class appropriate?

<ESMA_QUESTION_524>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_524>

Q525: What trading venues or jurisdictions should ESMA take into consideration in defining its position limits methodology? What particular aspects of these experiences should be included within ESMA's work?

<ESMA_QUESTION_525>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_525>

Q526: Do you agree that the RTS should accommodate the flexibility to express position limits in the units appropriate to the individual market? Are there any other alternative measures or mechanisms by which position limits could be expressed?

<ESMA_QUESTION_526>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_526>

Q527: How should the methodology for setting limits take account of a daily contract structure, where this exists?

<ESMA_QUESTION_527>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_527>

Q528: Do you agree that limits for option positions should be set on the basis of delta equivalent values? What processes should be put in place to avoid manipulation of the process?

<ESMA_QUESTION_528>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_528>

Q529: Do you agree that the preferred methodology for the calculation of delta-equivalent futures positions is the use of the delta value that is published by trading venues? If you do not, please explain what methodology you prefer, and the reasons in favour of it?

<ESMA_QUESTION_529>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_529>

Q530: Do you agree that the description of the approach outlined above, combined with the publication of limits under Article 57(9), would fulfil the requirement to be transparent and non-discriminatory?

<ESMA_QUESTION_530>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_530>

Q531: What challenges are posed by transition and what areas of guidance should be provided on implementation? What transitional arrangements would be considered to be appropriate?

<ESMA_QUESTION_531>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_531>

7.3. Position Reporting

Q532: Do you agree that, in the interest of efficient reporting, the data requirements for position reporting required by Article 58 should contain elements to enable competent authorities and ESMA to monitor effectively position limits? If you do not agree, what alternative approach do you propose for the collection of information in order to efficiently and with the minimum of duplication meet the requirements of Article 57?

<ESMA_QUESTION_532>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_532>

Q533: Do you agree with ESMA's definition of a “position” for the purpose of Article 58? Do you agree that the same definition of position should be used for the purpose of Article 57? If you do not agree with either proposition, please provide details of a viable alternative definition.

<ESMA_QUESTION_533>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_533>

Q534: Do you agree with ESMA's approach to the reporting of spread and other strategy trades? If you do not agree, what approach can be practically implemented for the definition and reporting of these trades?

<ESMA_QUESTION_534>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_534>

Q535: Do you agree with ESMA's proposed approach to use reporting protocols used by other market and regulatory initiatives, in particular, those being considered for transaction reporting under MiFID II?

<ESMA_QUESTION_535>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_535>

Q536: Do you have any specific comments on the proposed identification of legal persons and/or natural persons? Do you consider there are any practical challenges to ESMA's proposals? If yes, please explain them and propose solutions to resolve them.

<ESMA_QUESTION_536>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_536>

Q537: What are your views on these three alternative approaches for reporting the positions of an end client where there are multiple parties involved in the transaction chain? Do you have a preferred solution from the three alternatives that are described?

<ESMA_QUESTION_537>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_537>

Q538: What alternative structures or solutions are possible to meet the obligations under Article 58 to identify the positions of end clients? What are the advantages or disadvantages of these structures?

<ESMA_QUESTION_538>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_538>

Q539: Do you agree with ESMA's proposal that only volumes traded on-exchange should be used to determine the central competent authority to which reports are made? If you do not agree, what alternative structure may be used to determine the destination of position reports?

<ESMA_QUESTION_539>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_539>

Q540: Do you agree that position reporting requirements should seek to use reporting formats from other market or regulatory initiatives? If not mentioned above, what formats and initiatives should ESMA consider?

<ESMA_QUESTION_540>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_540>

Q541: Do you agree that ESMA should require reference data from trading venues and investment firms on commodity derivatives, emission allowances, and derivatives thereof in order to increase the efficiency of trade reporting?

<ESMA_QUESTION_541>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_541>

Q542: What is your view on the use of existing elements of the market infrastructure for position reporting of both on-venue and economically equivalent OTC contracts? If you have any comments on how firms and trading venues may efficiently create a reporting infrastructure, please give details in your explanation.

<ESMA_QUESTION_542>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_542>

Q543: For what reasons may it be appropriate to require the reporting of option positions on a delta-equivalent basis? If an additional requirement to report delta-equivalent positions is established, how should the relevant delta value be determined?

<ESMA_QUESTION_543>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_543>

Q544: Does the proposed set of data fields capture all necessary information to meet the requirements of Article 58(1)(b) MiFID II? If not, do you have any proposals for amendments, deletions or additional data fields to add the list above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_544>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_544>

Q545: Are there any other fields that should be included in the Commitment of Traders Report published each week by trading venues other than those shown above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_545>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_545>

8. Market data reporting

8.1. Obligation to report transactions

Q546: Do you agree with ESMA's proposal for what constitutes a 'transaction' and 'execution of a transaction' for the purposes of Article 26 of MiFIR? If not, please provide reasons.

<ESMA_QUESTION_546>
AFG agree with ESMA's proposal.

We would however suggest several elements that ESMA might wish to take into account:

- ESMA should ensure that give-up and novation of derivatives contracts for clearing are not reportable under Art. 26 of MiFIR;
- ESMA should also ensure that both increase and decrease in notional are both to be reported;
- ESMA should reconsider its position on securities financing transactions ("SFT") as the lender or collateral taker does not abandon its interest in the security that is lent or sold.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_546>

Q547: Do you anticipate any difficulties in identifying when your investment firm has executed a transaction in accordance with the above principles?

<ESMA_QUESTION_547>

Provided the RTS are clear and unambiguous with regard to the actions that constitute a transaction for the purposes of Article 26, taking into account of our responses to questions 546 and 548, we do not believe firms will have difficulty in determining when they have executed a transaction.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_547>

Q548: Is there any other activity that should not be reportable under Article 26 of MiFIR?

<ESMA_QUESTION_548>

From an AFG perspective we believe that the following activities should not be reported under Article 26 rules:

- Repo and securities lending transactions as there is no give-up of interest in the securities;
- The exercise of rights such as entitlement ; and

The carrying out of instructions from a client that should be relying on the asset manager's role.

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_548>

Q549: Do you foresee any difficulties with the suggested approach? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_549>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_549>

Q550: We invite your comments on the proposed fields and population of the fields. Please provide specific references to the fields which you are discussing in your response.

<ESMA_QUESTION_550>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_550>

Q551: Do you have any comments on the designation to identify the client and the client information and details that are to be included in transaction reports?

<ESMA_QUESTION_551>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_551>

Q552: What are your views on the general approach to determining the relevant trader to be identified?

<ESMA_QUESTION_552>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_552>

Q553: In particular, do you agree with ESMA's proposed approach to assigning a trader ID designation for committee decisions? If not, what do you think is the best way for NCAs to obtain accurate information about committee decisions?

<ESMA_QUESTION_553>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_553>

Q554: Do you have any views on how to identify the relevant trader in the cases of Direct Market Access and Sponsored Access?

<ESMA_QUESTION_554>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_554>

Q555: Do you believe that the approach outlined above is appropriate for identifying the 'computer algorithm within the investment firm responsible for the investment decision and the execution of the transaction'? If not, what difficulties do you see with the approach and what do you believe should be an alternative approach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_555>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_555>

Q556: Do you foresee any problem with identifying the specific waiver(s) under which the trade took place in a transaction report? If so, please provide details.

<ESMA_QUESTION_556>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_556>

Q557: Do you agree with ESMA's proposed approach to adopt a simple short sale flagging approach for transaction reports? If not, what other approaches do you believe ESMA should consider and why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_557>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_557>

Q558: Which option do you believe is most appropriate for flagging short sales? Alternatively, what other approaches do you think ESMA should consider and why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_558>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_558>

Q559: What are your views regarding the two options above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_559>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_559>

Q560: Do you agree with ESMA's proposed approach in relation to reporting aggregated transactions? If not, what other alternative approaches do you think ESMA should consider and why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_560>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_560>

Q561: Are there any other particular issues or trading scenarios that ESMA should consider in light of the short selling flag?

<ESMA_QUESTION_561>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_561>

Q562: Do you agree with ESMA's proposed approach for reporting financial instruments over baskets? If not, what other approaches do you believe ESMA should consider and why?

<ESMA_QUESTION_562>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_562>

Q563: Which option is preferable for reporting financial instruments over indices? Would you have any difficulty in applying any of the three approaches, such as determining the weighting of the index or determining whether the index is the underlying in another financial instrument? Alternatively, are there any other approaches which you believe ESMA should consider?

<ESMA_QUESTION_563>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_563>

Q564: Do you think the current MiFID approach to branch reporting should be maintained?

<ESMA_QUESTION_564>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_564>

Q565: Do you anticipate any difficulties in implementing the branch reporting requirement proposed above?

<ESMA_QUESTION_565>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_565>

Q566: Is the proposed list of criteria sufficient, or should ESMA consider other/extra criteria?

<ESMA_QUESTION_566>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_566>

Q567: Which format, not limited to the ones above, do you think is most suitable for the purposes of transaction reporting under Article 26 of MiFIR? Please provide a detailed explanation including cost-benefit considerations.

<ESMA_QUESTION_567>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_567>

8.2. Obligation to supply financial instrument reference data

Q568: Do you anticipate any difficulties in providing, at least daily, a delta file which only includes updates?

<ESMA_QUESTION_568>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_568>

Q569: Do you anticipate any difficulties in providing, at least daily, a full file containing all the financial instruments?

<ESMA_QUESTION_569>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_569>

Q570: Do you anticipate any difficulties in providing a combination of delta files and full files?

<ESMA_QUESTION_570>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_570>

Q571: Do you anticipate any difficulties in providing details of financial instruments twice per day?

<ESMA_QUESTION_571>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_571>

Q572: What other aspects should ESMA consider when determining a suitable solution for the timeframes of the notifications? Please include in your response any foreseen technical limitations.

<ESMA_QUESTION_572>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_572>

Q573: Do you agree with the proposed fields? Do trading venues and investment firms have access to the specified reference data elements in order to populate the proposed fields?

<ESMA_QUESTION_573>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_573>

Q574: Are you aware of any available industry classification standards you would consider appropriate?

<ESMA_QUESTION_574>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_574>

Q575: For both MiFID and MAR (OTC) derivatives based on indexes are in scope. Therefore it could be helpful to publish a list of relevant indexes. Do you foresee any difficulties in providing reference data for indexes listed on your trading venue? Furthermore, what reference data could you provide on indexes?

<ESMA_QUESTION_575>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_575>

Q576: Do you agree with ESMA's intention to maintain the current RCA determination rules?

<ESMA_QUESTION_576>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_576>

Q577: What criteria would you consider appropriate to establish the RCA for instruments that are currently not covered by the RCA rule?

<ESMA_QUESTION_577>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_577>

<ESMA_QUESTION_1>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_1>

8.3. Obligation to maintain records of orders

Q578: In your view, which option (and, where relevant, methodology) is more appropriate for implementation? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_578>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_578>

Q579: In your view, what are the data elements that cannot be harmonised? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_579>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_579>

Q580: For those elements that would have to be harmonised under Option 2 or under Option 3, do you think industry standards/protocols could be utilised? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_580>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_580>

Q581: Do you foresee any difficulties with the proposed approach for the use of LEI?

<ESMA_QUESTION_581>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_581>

Q582: Do you foresee any difficulties maintaining records of the Client IDs related with the orders submitted by their members/participants? If so, please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_582>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_582>

Q583: Are there any other solutions you would consider as appropriate to track clients' order flows through member firms/participants of trading venues and to link orders and transactions coming from the same member firm/participant?

<ESMA_QUESTION_583>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_583>

Q584: Do you believe that this approach allows the order to be uniquely identified If not, please elaborate

<ESMA_QUESTION_584>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_584>

Q585: Do you foresee any difficulties with the implementation of this approach? Please elaborate

<ESMA_QUESTION_585>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_585>

Q586: Do you foresee any difficulties with the proposed approach? Please elaborate

<ESMA_QUESTION_586>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_586>

Q587: Do you foresee any difficulties with the proposed approach? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_587>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_587>

Q588: Would the breakdown in the two categories of order types create major issues in terms of mapping of the orders by the Trading Venues and IT developments? Please elaborate

<ESMA_QUESTION_588>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_588>

Q589: Do you foresee any problems with the proposed approach?

<ESMA_QUESTION_589>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_589>

Q590: Are the proposed validity periods relevant and complete? Should additional validity period(s) be provided? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_590>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_590>

Q591: Do you agree that standardised default time stamps regarding the date and time at which the order shall automatically and ultimately be removed from the order book relevantly supplements the validity period flags?

<ESMA_QUESTION_591>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_591>

Q592: Do venues use a priority number to determine execution priority or a combination of priority time stamp and sequence number?

<ESMA_QUESTION_592>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_592>

Q593: Do you foresee any difficulties with the three options described above? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_593>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_593>

Q594: Is the list of specific order instructions provided above relevant? Should this list be supplemented? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_594>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_594>

Q595: Are there any other type of events that should be considered?

<ESMA_QUESTION_595>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_595>

Q596: Do you foresee any difficulties with the proposed approach? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_596>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_596>

Q597: Do you foresee any problems with the proposed approach? Do you consider any other alternative in order to inform about orders placed by market makers and other liquidity providers?

<ESMA_QUESTION_597>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_597>

Q598: Do you foresee any difficulties in generating a transaction ID code that links the order with the executed transaction that stems from that order in the information that has to be kept at the disposal of the CAs? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_598>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_598>

Q599: Do you foresee any difficulties with maintaining this information? Please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_599>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_599>

8.4. Requirement to maintain records of orders for firms engaging in high-frequency algorithmic trading techniques (Art. 17(7) of MiFID II)³

Q600: Do you foresee any difficulties with the elements of data to be stored proposed in the above paragraph? If so, please elaborate.

<ESMA_QUESTION_600>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_600>

Q601: Do you foresee any difficulties in complying with the proposed timeframe?

<ESMA_QUESTION_601>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_601>

8.5. Synchronisation of business clocks

³ Please note that this section has to be read in conjunction with the section on the “Record keeping and co-operation with national competent authorities” in this DP.

Q602: Would you prefer a synchronisation at a national or at a pan-European level? Please elaborate. If you would prefer synchronisation to a single source, please indicate which would be the reference clock for those purposes.

<ESMA_QUESTION_602>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_602>

Q603: Do you agree with the requirement to synchronise clocks to the microsecond level?

<ESMA_QUESTION_603>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_603>

Q604: Which would be the maximum divergence that should be permitted with respect to the reference clock? How often should any divergence be corrected?

<ESMA_QUESTION_604>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA_QUESTION_604>

9. Post-trading issues

9.1. Obligation to clear derivatives traded on regulated markets and timing of acceptance for clearing (STP)

Q605: What are your views generally on (1) the systems, procedures, arrangements supporting the flow of information to the CCP, (2) the operational process that should be in place to perform the transfer of margins, (3) the relevant parties involved these processes and the time required for each of the steps?

<ESMA_QUESTION_605>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_605>

Q606: In particular, who are currently responsible, in the ETD and OTC context, for obtaining the information required for clearing and for submitting the transaction to a CCP for clearing? Do you consider that anything should be changed in this respect? What are the current timeframes, in the ETD and OTC context, between the conclusion of the contract and the exchange of information required for clearing on one hand and on the other hand between the exchange of information and the submission of the transaction to the CPP?

<ESMA_QUESTION_606>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_606>

Q607: What are your views on the balance of these risks against the benefits of STP for the derivatives market and on the manner to mitigate such risks at the different levels of the clearing chain?

<ESMA_QUESTION_607>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_607>

Q608: When does the CM assume the responsibility of the transactions? At the time when the CCP accepts the transaction or at a different moment in time?

<ESMA_QUESTION_608>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_608>

Q609: What are your views on how practicable it would be for CM to validate the transaction before their submission to the CCP? What would the CM require for this purpose and the timeframe required? How would this validation process fit with STP?

<ESMA_QUESTION_609>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_609>

Q610: What are your views on the manner to determine the timeframe for (1) the exchange of information required for clearing, (2) the submission of a transaction to the CCP, and the constraints and requirements to consider for parties involved in both the ETD and OTC contexts?

<ESMA_QUESTION_610>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_610>

Q611: What are your views on the systems, procedures, arrangements and timeframe for (1) the submission of a transaction to the CCP and (2) the acceptance or rejection of a transaction by the CCP in view of the operational process required for a strong product validation in the context of ETD and OTC? How should it compare with the current process and timeframe? Does the current practice envisage a product validation?

<ESMA_QUESTION_611>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_611>

Q612: What should be the degree of flexibility for CM, its timeframe, and the characteristics of the systems, procedures and arrangements required to supporting that flexibility? How should it compare to the current practices and timeframe?

<ESMA_QUESTION_612>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_612>

Q613: What are your views on the treatment of rejected transactions for transactions subject to the clearing requirement and those cleared on a voluntary basis? Do you agree that the framework should be set in advance?

<ESMA_QUESTION_613>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_613>

9.2. Indirect Clearing Arrangements

Q614: Is there any reason for ESMA to adopt a different approach (1) from the one under EMIR, (2) for OTC and ETD? If so, please explain your reasons.

<ESMA_QUESTION_614>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_614>

Q615: In your view, how should it compare with current practice?

<ESMA_QUESTION_615>
TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE
<ESMA_QUESTION_615>