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**Responding to this paper**

ESMA invites comments on all matters in this paper and in particular on the specific questions summarised in Annex 1. Comments are most helpful if they:

1. respond to the question stated;
2. indicate the specific question to which the comment relates;
3. contain a clear rationale; and
4. describe any alternatives ESMA should consider.

ESMA will consider all comments received by **4 January 2021.**

All contributions should be submitted online at [www.esma.europa.eu](http://www.esma.europa.eu) under the heading ‘Your input - Consultations’.

**Instructions**

In order to facilitate analysis of responses to the Consultation Paper, respondents are requested to follow the below steps when preparing and submitting their response:

1. Insert your responses to the questions in the Consultation Paper in the present response form.
2. Please do not remove tags of the type <ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_DRFE\_1>. Your response to each question has to be framed by the two tags corresponding to the question.
3. If you do not wish to respond to a given question, please do not delete it but simply leave the text “TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE” between the tags.
4. When you have drafted your response, name your response form according to the following convention: ESMA\_DRFE\_nameofrespondent\_RESPONSEFORM. For example, for a respondent named ABCD, the response form would be entitled ESMA\_ DRFE \_ABCD\_RESPONSEFORM.
5. Upload the form containing your responses, in Word format, to ESMA’s website ([www.esma.europa.eu](http://www.esma.europa.eu) under the heading “Your input – Open Consultations” 🡪 “ Public Consultation on fees for data reporting service providers (DRSP)”).

**Publication of responses**

All contributions received will be published following the close of the consultation, unless you request otherwise. Please clearly and prominently indicate in your submission any part you do not wish to be publicly disclosed. A standard confidentiality statement in an email message will not be treated as a request for non-disclosure. 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 not to disclose the response 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](http://www.esma.europa.eu) under the heading [Legal Notice](http://www.esma.europa.eu/legal-notice).

**Who should read this paper?**

This consultation is looking for feedback from data reporting services providers, market participants and authorities.

**General information about respondent**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the company / organisation | Bloomberg Data Reporting Services B.V. |
| Activity | Data Reporting Services Provider |
| Are you representing an association? |  |
| Country/Region | The Netherlands |

**Introduction**

***Please make your introductory comments below, if any***

<ESMA\_COMMENT\_CP\_DRFE\_1>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_COMMENT\_CP\_DRFE\_1>

**Questions**

1. : Do you agree with the proposed approach for DRSP fees? Please elaborate in detail the reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_1>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_1>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed application fee for ARMs and APAs? Please elaborate on the reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_2>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_2>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed authorisation fee for ARMs and APAs? Please elaborate on the reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_3>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_3>

1. : Do you agree with the reduced additional application and authorisation fee for each additional DRSP type in the case of a simultaneous application? Please elaborate on the reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_4>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_4>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed application and authorisation fee for CTP? Please elaborate on the reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_5>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_5>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed approach to calculate first-year fees for DRSPs authorised by ESMA under MiFIR? Please elaborate on the reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_6>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_6>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed approach for the calculation of annual fees for DRSPs supervised by ESMA? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_7>

We do not object to the overall approach proposed to calculating annual fees based on a DRSP’s APA/ARM and related ancillary services revenues relative to all DRSPs. However, we are concerned that a few DRSPs paying above the minimum fee may end up paying disproportionately high fees given the small number of APAs/ARMs and relatively high ESMA cost base of around EUR 5 million per year. We believe a higher minimum fee (for example, EUR 100,000 per data reporting service) and a maximum fee (for example, EUR 500,000 per data reporting service) would reduce the likelihood of disproportionately high fees for some DRSPs. If fees for DRSP services are disproportionately high, DRSPs will either withdraw from the market or pass their costs on to clients.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_7>

1. : Do you agree with the use of revenues for the purposes of calculation of the applicable turnover? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_8>

Yes, we agree that the proposed use of revenues is appropriate, as long as the minimum and maximum fees are set at a level that does not lead to some DRSPs paying disproportionately high fees, as discussed in our response to Q7.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_8>

1. : With regards to the revenues, do you agree with including both revenues form core and ancillary services? How complex is to identify and report the revenues from ancillary services attributable to each data reporting service separately? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_9>

Yes, we agree that the fee calculations should take into account the DRSP’s revenues from both core APA/ARM and related ancillary services. We do not consider it particularly complex to identify and report these revenues as proposed.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_9>

1. : In those cases, where ancillary services cannot be directly allocated to each data reporting service, do you agree with allocating them in accordance with the revenues from the respective core services? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_10>

Yes, we agree that this approach is reasonable, and consider it relatively straightforward for DRSPs to apply.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_10>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed level of minimum supervisory fee? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_11>

We believe the minimum supervisory fee should be higher, for example EUR 100,000, to avoid disproportionately high fees for DRSPs with higher revenues, as discussed in our response to Q7.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_11>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed level of minimum supervisory fees in case more than one data reporting service is provided? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_12>

We agree that the minimum supervisory fee for APA and ARM services should be set at the same level per data reporting service. We do not see any benefit in unnecessarily complicating the fee model for these services, which we agree are distinct.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_12>

1. : Do you agree with the approach for determining the fees in 2022 for already authorised DRSPs? Are there any difficulties in identifying the revenues from data reporting services provided in 2020? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_13>

Subject to our comments in Q7 on the minimum and maximum fees, we have no objections to the proposed approach. We do not have any particular difficulties in identifying the revenues from APA, ARM and related ancillary services provided in 2020. However, we think it would be reasonable for DRSPs to provide the revenue information for ESMA’s fee calculations outside of the annual audited accounts, if the accounts present the information differently in accordance with applicable accounting standards.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_13>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed approach for the supervisory fees related to preparatory work? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_14>

Subject to our comments in Q7 on the minimum and maximum fees, we agree with the proposed approach. The allocation of the supervisory fees related to the preparatory work should be proportionate to the annual fees paid by the DRSP, as long as the annual fees are subject to a higher minimum fee and a maximum fee as discussed in our response to Q7.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_14>

1. : Do you agree with the proposal for the payment conditions by DRSPs of the fees for application, authorisation or extension of authorisation under MIFIR? Please elaborate on the reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_15>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_15>

1. : Do you agree with the proposal to not reimburse DRSPs in case they decide to withdraw their application for authorisation or extension of authorisation before authorisation is granted? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_16>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_16>

1. : Do you agree with the proposal that DRSPs pay their annual fees by 31 March of the year for which the fees are due? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_17>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_17>

1. : Do you agree with the proposal for the timing of payment of the 2022 fees? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_18>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DRFE\_18>