

Download date: Tuesday, April 7, 2026 - 19:03



Title	Submission Date
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2829</a>	01-04-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2828</a>	01-04-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2827</a>	01-04-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2826</a>	01-04-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2825</a>	01-04-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2824</a>	01-04-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2823</a>	01-04-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2822</a>	01-04-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2821</a>	01-04-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2811</a>	23-03-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2810</a>	23-03-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2807</a>	18-03-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2806</a>	18-03-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2800</a>	10-03-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2799</a>	10-03-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2794</a>	03-03-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2791</a>	26-02-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2790</a>	26-02-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2785</a>	23-02-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2784</a>	23-02-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2779</a>	16-02-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2778</a>	16-02-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2777</a>	16-02-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2776</a>	16-02-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2775</a>	16-02-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2769</a>	12-02-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2754</a>	22-01-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2753</a>	21-01-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2747</a>	05-01-2026
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2742</a>	19-12-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2741</a>	19-12-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2740</a>	18-12-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2739</a>	18-12-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2738</a>	18-12-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2737</a>	18-12-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2736</a>	18-12-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2734</a>	17-12-2025

<b>Title</b>	<b>Submission Date</b>
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2733</a>	17-12-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2708</a>	03-12-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2689</a>	14-11-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2684</a>	04-11-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2675</a>	28-10-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2663</a>	10-10-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2662</a>	10-10-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2660</a>	08-10-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2655</a>	26-09-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2654</a>	25-09-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2648</a>	19-09-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2646</a>	18-09-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2645</a>	17-09-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2638</a>	10-09-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2630</a>	27-08-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2626</a>	07-08-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2624</a>	01-08-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2618</a>	25-07-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2609</a>	15-07-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2604</a>	08-07-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2601</a>	04-07-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2579</a>	20-06-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2576</a>	19-06-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2575</a>	18-06-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2570</a>	16-06-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2569</a>	16-06-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2568</a>	16-06-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2566</a>	10-06-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2560</a>	03-06-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2559</a>	03-06-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2558</a>	03-06-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2557</a>	03-06-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2552</a>	28-05-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2551</a>	28-05-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2550</a>	28-05-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2547</a>	27-05-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2671</a>	09-05-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2533</a>	24-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2711</a>	15-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2522</a>	07-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2521</a>	07-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2520</a>	07-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2519</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2518</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2517</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2516</a>	04-04-2025

<b>Title</b>	<b>Submission Date</b>
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2515</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2514</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2513</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2512</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2511</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2510</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2509</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2508</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2507</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2506</a>	04-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2502</a>	03-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2501</a>	03-04-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2496</a>	27-03-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2486</a>	18-03-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2482</a>	14-03-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2481</a>	14-03-2025
<a href="#">ESMA_QA_2480</a>	14-03-2025

# **ESMA\_QA\_2829**

**Submission Date**

01/04/2026

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014-  
Secondary Markets

### **Topic**

Data reporting services providers

## **Subject Matter**

Trading status for on halt/suspended instruments

## **Question**

Are MTFs and OTFs required to generate instrument status messages even when the instrument is already on halt / suspended by a primary exchange?

## ESMA Answer

---

01-04-2026

Original language

The instrument status message requires the information of the Market Identifier Code (MIC). Therefore, this information is to be provided per ISIN-MIC-Currency basis.

Hence, MTFs and OTFs should generate the instrument status message whenever they halt / suspend an instrument.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2828**

---

**Submission Date**

01/04/2026

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014-  
Secondary Markets

### **Topic**

Data reporting services providers

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 22 of MiFIR

## **Subject Matter**

Consolidated Tape Provider (CTP)

## Question

Are APAs expected to transmit regulatory data to the CTPs?

## ESMA Answer

---

01-04-2026

Original language

Article 22a of MiFIR requires data contributors to transmit regulatory data (i.e. system?matching?order status and financial?instrument status, as defined in Article 2(1), point (36c) of MiFIR and further detailed in Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2025/1155) to the data centre of the CTP.

However, given that APAs do not operate any trading system and therefore cannot provide system?level or instrument?status information, the transmission of regulatory data is only anticipated to be relevant for trading venues.

Where an APA acts as a DRSP on behalf of a trading venue, the APA should transmit the regulatory data of that trading venue in its capacity as service provider.

The data, however, continues to relate to, and originate from, the trading venue's trading system, not the APA's.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2827**

---

**Submission Date**

01/04/2026

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014-  
Secondary Markets

### **Topic**

Data reporting services providers

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Articles 5, 6 and 12(1) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2025/1155

## **Subject Matter**

Consolidated Tape Provider (CTP)

### Question

For trading venues subject to the obligations in Article 12 (1) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2025/1155, which requires business clocks capable of achieving a granularity of 0.1 microseconds, would the dissemination of timestamps at this level of granularity in their existing market data feeds be considered compliant with the requirements in Articles 5 and 6 of Delegated Regulation (EU) 2025/1155 to provide timestamps to the CTPs with a less granular precision of six decimal places?

### ESMA Answer

---

01-04-2026

Original language

The RTS 2025/1155 specifies that the timestamp fields to be transmitted to the CTP must follow the ISO 8601 date-time format with six decimal places (i.e. ss.dddddd) representing fractions of a second in microseconds, as set out in Table 1 of Annex III, where timestamps must be provided in the format YYYY-MM-DDThh:mm:ss.ddddddZ.

ESMA confirms that a data contributor will be considered compliant with the timestamp requirements of Articles 5 and 6 of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2025/1155 if it transmits timestamps with at least six decimal (microsecond) digits and follows the ISO 8601 format.

# ESMA\_QA\_2826

**Submission Date**

01/04/2026

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014-  
Secondary Markets

### **Topic**

Data reporting services providers

## **Subject Matter**

Consolidated Tape Provider (CTP)

## **Question**

Do trading venues subject to an outage need to provide the consolidated tape provider with a health status message? Are they exempt from generating the input

order matching system status data?

## ESMA Answer

---

01-04-2026

Original language

According to ESMA's Opinion on outages, as per their outage plan, trading venues should clearly identify how information on outages is communicated (for example via the trading venue website) and what information is to be included in the communication. Furthermore, NCAs should ensure that trading venues provide all market participants (i.e. not only its members and participants but also the general public) with a notice of disruption as soon as possible. This notice of disruption should occur via any means which enables the trading venue to communicate simultaneously to market participants. In any case, the notice of disruption should also be published on the trading venue's public website and include a dedicated contact line or person at the affected trading venue allowing market participants to ask questions and share information relating to the ongoing outage. As a result, when there is an outage, a trading venue should promptly communicate this information on its website and to the CTP and it would not need to separately generate the input order matching system status data.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2825**

---

**Submission Date**

01/04/2026

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014-  
Secondary Markets

### **Topic**

Data reporting services providers

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 22 of MiFIR

## **Subject Matter**

Consolidated Tape Provider (CTP)

### Question

Is the opt-in regime in Article 22a of MiFIR applicable to bonds and OTC derivatives?

### ESMA Answer

---

01-04-2026

Original language

No, the opt-in regime in Article 22a of MiFIR is exclusively applicable to the CTP for shares and ETFs. With regard to bonds and OTC derivatives, all data contributors are required to transmit data to the relevant CTP.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2824**

---

**Submission Date**

01/04/2026

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014-  
Secondary Markets

### **Topic**

Data reporting services providers

## **Subject Matter**

Consolidated Tape Provider (CTP)

## **Question**

What status must be reported when an instrument is reported for the first time to the CTP?

## ESMA Answer

01-04-2026

Original language

The initial status of individual financial instruments is reported for the first time from data contributors to the CTP in the following cases:

- (i) when the activities of the CTP start (i.e. the status should be ACTV, unless the instrument is already suspended or halted); and
- (ii) when an instrument is newly admitted to trading (i.e, the status should be ACTV);

In essence, the initial message establishes the baseline status that the CTP will disseminate until a subsequent change is reported. Please find below some examples:

Instrument	Publication venue	Status prior to go live T-1	CTP go live date: T	.../... other phase changes sent throughout T	T+1	T+N
ABC	MIC1	ACTV	MIC1 sends a message with Trading phase set to 'SOAU' and status set to 'ACTV'	MIC1 sends a message with Trading phase set to new values	MIC1 sends a message with Trading phase set to 'SOAU'	MIC1 sends a message with status set to 'RMOV'
	CTP	N/A	CTP sends a message with Trading phase set to 'SOAU' and status set to 'ACTV'	CTP sends a message with Trading phase set to those values and status set to 'ACTV'	CTP sends a message with Trading phase set to 'SOAU' and status set to 'ACTV'	CTP sends a message with status set to 'RMOV'

DEF

MIC2	SUSP	MIC2 sends a message with status set to 'SUSP'	No messages sent	MIC2 sends a message with Trading phase set to 'SOAU' and instrument status set to 'ACTV'
CTP	N/A	CTP sends a message with status set to 'SUSP'	CTP sends a message with status set to 'SUSP'	CTP sends a message with Trading phase set to 'SOAU' and status set to 'ACTV'

# **ESMA\_QA\_2823**

**Submission Date**

01/04/2026

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014-  
Secondary Markets

### **Topic**

Data reporting services providers

## **Subject Matter**

Consolidated Tape Provider (CTP)

## **Question**

At which point in time do data contributors have to submit regulatory data of individual financial instruments to the CTP, and how does the CTP handle and

publish this information?

## ESMA Answer

---

01-04-2026

Original language

Data contributors must submit regulatory data of individual financial instruments only when there is a change in the trading status of an instrument, such as a suspension, halt, resumption or removal. Upon receiving a status update, the CTP should promptly update and disseminate the information as part of its real-time output. The CTP should continuously publish and maintain an up-to date list of all instruments admitted to trading, reflecting their most recent status.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2822**

---

**Submission Date**

01/04/2026

Status: Published Answer Updated

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014-  
Secondary Markets

### **Topic**

Data reporting services providers

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 22 of MiFIR

## **Subject Matter**

Consolidated Tape Provider (CTP)

## Question

What types of transmission protocols may the CTP choose from, according to Article 22a(5) of MiFIR?

## ESMA Answer

---

01-04-2026

Original language

The CTP may select any of the types of transmission protocols that a data contributor makes available to other data users for the dissemination of data as specified in Article 13(1) of MiFIR.

Where a data contributor has outsourced its reporting to the CTP to a third party, the CTP may likewise select from the types of transmission protocols that this third party offers to other data users for the dissemination of data as specified in Article 13(1) of MiFIR.

A data contributor should not outsource CTP reporting for the purpose of intentionally restricting the CTP's choice of transmission protocols.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2821**

---

**Submission Date**

01/04/2026

Status: Published Answer Updated

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014-  
Secondary Markets

### **Topic**

Data reporting services providers

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 22 of MiFIR

## **Subject Matter**

Consolidated Tape Provider (CTP)

## Question

Can a data contributor outsource data reporting to the CTP to a third party, such as another data contributor?

## ESMA Answer

---

01-04-2026

Original language

The legal obligation to report data to the consolidated tape lies with the data contributors themselves (see Article 22a of MiFIR). While data reporting to the CTP may be outsourced – for example, from a trading venue to an APA, or from one trading venue to another – such outsourcing does not relieve the original data contributor of its legal obligations and accountabilities, including those relating to data quality.

In particular, in the light of such legal obligations, outsourcing of CTP reporting should not introduce artificial latency into the reported data, not be undertaken for the purpose of intentionally restricting the CTP's choice of transmission protocols or otherwise undermining the CTP's mission.

# ESMA\_QA\_2811

**Submission Date**

23/03/2026

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

European Market Infrastructure Regulation (EMIR) Regulation (EU) No 648/2012-MDP

### **Topic**

\* EMIR Reporting

## **Subject Matter**

EMIR Article 7d

## **Question**

2. Scope of clients covered by Article 7d(1) EMIR

Article 7d(1) also introduces reporting obligations for clients that clear contracts

through a CCP recognised under Article 25, but does not further specify the level of the client relationship concerned.

In particular, it is unclear whether the term “clients” in Article 7d(1) should be understood as:

- only direct clients of clearing members; or
- both direct clients and indirect clients (i.e. clients accessing clearing services through intermediaries in a client clearing chain).

2. Which clients are covered by the reporting obligation in Article 7d of EMIR?

# ESMA\_QA\_2810

**Submission Date**

23/03/2026

---

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014-MDP

### **Topic**

\* EMIR Reporting

## **Subject Matter**

Reporting under Article 7d of EMIR

## **Question**

Background

Article 7d EMIR (as amended by Regulation (EU) 2024/2987) creates an annual reporting obligation on EU clearing members and on clients that clear through a third country CCP recognised under Article 25 EMIR. Where the reporting entity is established in the Union and not part of a group under consolidated supervision in the Union, it reports to its NCA; where it belongs to a Union consolidated group, the Union parent undertaking reports on a consolidated basis to its NCA, including the information related to entities of the same group which are not established in the EU.

This requirement has given rise to questions regarding the interpretation and practical application of the reporting obligation, in particular in relation to the scope of contracts and of entities covered.

#### 1. Scope of contracts covered by Article 7d(1) EMIR

While recital 17 of EMIR 3 specifically states that the information to be reported (under Article 7d of EMIR) should distinguish between securities transactions, derivative transactions on regulated markets and OTC derivative transactions, Article 7d(1) refers generally to “contracts” cleared at third country CCPs and to “type of financial instruments or non-financial instruments”, without further qualification or cross reference to existing EMIR or MiFID II definitions. Therefore, the provision does not specify whether the reporting obligation should cover:

- OTC derivative contracts within the meaning of Article 2(7) EMIR;
- all derivative contracts, including both OTC derivatives and exchange traded derivatives;
- specific asset classes or all financial instruments as listed in Annex I, Section C of MiFID II;
- commodities and other non-financial instruments cleared in third-country CCPs.

#### 1. Which contracts are referred to in Article 7d(1) EMIR?

# ESMA\_QA\_2807

Submission Date

18/03/2026

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

ESGR - Regulation (EU) 2024/3005

### **Topic**

Scope (including exemptions)

## **Subject Matter**

Exemption for SPO providers

## **Question**

Can a second-party opinion provider producing and using an ESG rating for its second-party opinion, without publishing or distributing it on a standalone basis, benefit from the exemption set out in Article 2(2)(i) of Regulation (EU) 2024/3005?

??

# ESMA\_QA\_2806

Submission Date

18/03/2026

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

ESGR - Regulation (EU) 2024/3005

### **Topic**

Scope (including exemptions)

### **Subject Matter**

Exemption for ESG ratings issued by regulated financial undertakings for internal purposes or in-house/intragroup services

### **Question**

What types of activities are considered “internal purposes” or “in-house” or “intragroup financial services or products” for the purposes of Article 2(2)(b)?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2800**

**Submission Date**

10/03/2026

---

Status: Question Rejected

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Directive 2014/65/EU - Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID II)

### **Level 2 Regulation**

Regulation 2017/565 - MiFID II Delegated Regulation

### **Topic**

Suitability

### **Additional Legal Reference**

MiFID II 2014/65/EU (Art. 16, 25); Deleg. Reg. (EU) 2017/565 (Art. 54; record-keeping).

## **Subject Matter**

Personal recommendation and suitability statement: documentation nature and staff attribution in split/automated processes

## **Question**

Under MiFID II, investment advice is defined as a personal recommendation to a client in relation to transactions in financial instruments. In practice, the personal recommendation, the suitability assessment, the documentation and the technical generation/transmission of the suitability statement may be performed by different persons and/or partly automated systems.

Could ESMA clarify the following points:

1. For determining whether and by whom investment advice was provided, is it primarily relevant who gave/communicated the personal recommendation to the client, rather than who merely prepared/generated/transmitted the suitability statement through IT systems?
2. Should the suitability statement under MiFID II / Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/565 be understood as documentation and rationale of a recommendation that has already been made, rather than as a constitutive element of “investment advice”?
3. Is it necessary, for the attribution of investment advice to a specific staff member, that the same staff member is technically able to create/approve/transmit the suitability statement, or can these steps be separated without changing the attribution of who “advised”?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2799**

**Submission Date**

10/03/2026

---

Status: Question Rejected

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Directive 2014/65/EU - Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID II)

### **Level 2 Regulation**

Regulation 2017/565 - MiFID II Delegated Regulation

### **Topic**

Suitability

### **Additional Legal Reference**

MiFID II 2014/65/EU (Art. 16, 25); Reg. (EU) 2017/565 (Art. 54); ESMA/2015/1886 (rev.) (paras 4(j), 19, 20(d)-(g)).

## **Subject Matter**

Attribution of investment advice in split or system-supported workflows (personal recommendation vs suitability statement)

## **Question**

In practice, investment firms may apply “tandem” or split workflows where one staff member conducts the client meeting, gathers the client’s circumstances and communicates/explains a concrete course of action to the client, while another staff member and/or a partly automated system performs the suitability assessment, approval and/or generates/transmits the suitability statement.

Against this background, could ESMA clarify, under MiFID II and relevant Level-2 measures, the EU-law criteria for determining whether the staff member who leads the client interaction and explains the recommendation is already providing investment advice, or whether that activity can be regarded as acting under supervision?

In particular:

1. For the attribution of investment advice, is the decisive element who communicates the personal recommendation to the client, rather than who technically generates/approves/transmits the suitability statement?
2. In split workflows, what organisational minimum features are expected to evidence “under supervision” (e.g. explicit assignment of the supervisory role, timely intervention capability, documented review/approval/sign-off), where the supervised staff member communicates the personal recommendation?

# ESMA\_QA\_2794

**Submission Date**

03/03/2026

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Securities Financing Transactions Regulation (SFTR) Regulation (EU) 2015/2365-MDP

### **Topic**

\* SFTR Art. 4

## **Subject Matter**

Updating the Loan Value and Security Price Fields following lifecycle events

## **Question**

For securities lending and borrowing transactions, should Field 2.49 – ‘Security or Commodity Price’ and Field 2.56 – ‘Loan Value’ be updated and reported whenever

mark-to-market adjustments are agreed between counterparties?

## ESMA Answer

---

03-03-2026

Original language

Yes, Field 2.49 – ‘Security or Commodity Price’ and Field 2.56 – ‘Loan Value’ should be updated whenever a lifecycle event occurs, including mark-to-market adjustments agreed between counterparties.

Under SFTR, ‘Cash Marks’ and ‘Fee Marks’ are considered as lifecycle events and must be reported using action type ‘MODI’. When counterparties adjust the loan value to reflect market price movements, the corresponding reports should be amended to reflect the updated values.

This is consistent with ESMA’s guidance in Table 6 of Section 4.10 (*‘Mapping business events to action types and levels’*) of the [Guidelines on reporting under SFTR](#), which identifies cash marks and fee marks (events #22 and #23) as business events which allow a MODI report.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2791**

**Submission Date**

26/02/2026

---

Status: Question Rejected

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Directive 2014/65/EU - Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID II)

### **Level 2 Regulation**

Regulation 2017/565 - MiFID II Delegated Regulation

### **Level 3 Regulation**

ESMA/2015/1886 - Guidelines - Assessment of knowledge and competence (MiFID)

### **Topic**

Suitability

### **Historic Question Reference**

follow-up to ESMA email ref. 26-0343 + Submitted Question (ESMA\_QA\_2790)

### **Additional Legal Reference**

ESMA Guidelines ESMA/2015/1886 (rev.), paras. 4(j), 19, 20(c)-(g); MiFID II (Directive 2014/65/EU), Art. 16(2) and 16(6), Art. 25(1), Art. 25(2), 25(6) and 25(9); Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/565, Art. 54 and Art. 72.

### **Subject Matter**

Records / audit trail / digital workflows / use of user credentials / Record-keeping and audit trail for “under supervision” in digital/segregated advisory workflows

### **Question**

I would like to request a general clarification on the interpretation of the ESMA Guidelines ESMA/2015/1886 (rev.) regarding record-keeping requirements for “under supervision” (in particular paragraphs 19, 20(c) and 20(g)).

In practice, client communication, suitability documentation and system completion are often performed in a segregated and digital manner (e.g. different staff members involved in the client interaction, documentation and approval). This raises, in particular, the following questions:

#### **1. Minimum requirements for records / traceability**

What minimum requirements arise from the Guidelines regarding records to enable the competent authority to verify that supervision actually takes place and is carried out to an appropriate extent?

#### **2. Objective evidence of assumption of responsibility**

Is the mere formal naming of a qualified person in the documentation (e.g. in the suitability statement) sufficient, or do the Guidelines expect objectively verifiable review/approval/sign-off evidence?

#### **3. Digital processes / segregated documentation**

What requirements apply in digital systems and segregated documentation workflows where client communication, suitability documentation and system completion are not carried out by the same person?

4. Use of user credentials / role awareness

How should “under supervision” be assessed under the Guidelines if user credentials of a qualified person are used for system documentation/system completion, but that person does not provide a conscious assumption of responsibility (review/approval/sign-off) or is not aware that they are intended to act as the supervisor?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2790**

**Submission Date**

26/02/2026

---

Status: Question Rejected

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Directive 2014/65/EU - Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID II)

### **Level 2 Regulation**

Regulation 2017/565 - MiFID II Delegated Regulation

### **Level 3 Regulation**

ESMA/2015/1886 - Guidelines - Assessment of knowledge and competence (MiFID)

### **Topic**

Suitability

### **Historic Question Reference**

follow-up to ESMA email ref. 26-0343

### **Additional Legal Reference**

ESMA Guidelines ESMA/2015/1886 (rev.), paras. 4(j), 19, 20(c)-(g); MiFID II (Directive 2014/65/EU), Art. 16(2) and 16(6), Art. 25(1), Art. 25(2), 25(6) and 25(9); Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/565, Art. 54 and Art. 72.

### **Subject Matter**

“Under supervision” – responsibility, role awareness, real-time supervision, sign-off / “Under supervision” in investment advice: responsibility, role assignment and supervisory sign-off

### **Question**

I would like to request a general clarification on the interpretation of the ESMA Guidelines ESMA/2015/1886 (rev.) regarding “under supervision” in the context of investment advice, in particular paragraphs 4(j), 19 and 20(d)–(g).

In practice, investment firms use supervision/tandem models in which a supervised staff member communicates the personal recommendation to the client, while a qualified/experienced person performs supervision and carries out documentation/approval steps.

Against this background, I kindly request clarification on the following points:

#### **1. Real-time supervision vs. ex post review**

Do the Guidelines typically require that, for “under supervision”, the supervisor is able to intervene in real time (e.g. by attending, listening-in/reading along, and having an immediate stop-go capability), or can an exclusively ex post review/approval be sufficient?

#### **2. “Under the responsibility of” / “same responsibility”**

How should the requirement be understood that the activity is performed “under the

responsibility of” a qualified/experienced person (para. 4(j)) and that the supervisor assumes “the same responsibility” (para. 20(g))?

Which organisational minimum features are typically expected where the supervised staff member communicates the personal recommendation to the client?

### 3. Explicit assignment and awareness of the supervisory role

Does “under supervision” require that the supervisory role is explicitly assigned and that both the supervised staff member and the supervisor are aware of their respective role, responsibilities and limits?

### 4. Conscious assumption of responsibility / sign-off

Is the signing of the suitability statement by the supervisor mentioned in para. 20(g) to be understood as a standard expectation (or, in digital processes, a functional equivalent such as a documented review/approval/sign-off)?

Is the mere presence of a qualified person without a conscious assumption of responsibility sufficient?

# ESMA\_QA\_2785

**Submission Date**

23/02/2026

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Directive 2014/65/EU - Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID II)

### **Topic**

Safeguarding of client assets

## **Subject Matter**

Interests earned from client funds deposited at a credit institution?

### **Question**

Does MiFID II permit investment firms to earn interest on client funds deposited in a savings account at a credit institution?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2784**

**Submission Date**

23/02/2026

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Directive 2014/65/EU - Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID II)

### **Level 2 Regulation**

Regulation 2017/565 - MiFID II Delegated Regulation

### **Topic**

Remuneration

## **Subject Matter**

MiFID II remuneration rules applicable to tied agents

## **Question**

1. Does a tied agent have to be remunerated with both a variable component of remuneration (based on the actual activities performed by the tied agent, i.e., dependent on performance) and a fixed component of remuneration, as stipulated in Article 27 of Regulation (EU) 2017/565?

2. Would the answer to the first question change if the tied agent is engaged by a person falling under Article 3 of the MiFID II Directive, i.e., assuming that a Member State adopts this optional exemption under Article 3 of the MiFID II Directive and incorporates it into its national legislation?

## ESMA Answer

---

23-02-2026

Original language

1. Tied agents of investment firms are in scope of the definition of “relevant persons” of Article 2(1) of Delegated Regulation 2017/565 and, as such, the requirement in the second subparagraph of Article 27(4) of the same regulation to maintain for relevant persons a balance between fixed and variable remuneration also applies to them.?

Recital 41 of Delegated Regulation 2017/565 confirms that “*Relevant persons should also include tied agents.*” However, it introduces some flexibility in the application of the remuneration requirements applicable to “relevant persons” due to tied agents’ special status and national specificities applicable to it: “*When determining the remuneration for tied agents, firms should take the tied agents’ special status and the respective national specificities into consideration. However, in such cases, firms’ remuneration policies and practices should still define*

*appropriate criteria to be used to assess the performance of relevant persons, including qualitative criteria encouraging the relevant persons to act in the best interests of the client.”*

This recital should be understood as permitting the variable remuneration of tied agents of investment firms to represent a larger part of the remuneration than other categories of relevant persons, while the fixed component, when compatible with national laws, remains sufficient to ensure that the interests of the investment firm or its relevant persons are not favoured to the detriment of the interests of clients.

2. While ESMA acknowledges that the implementation of the exemption under Article 3 of MiFID II is a national discretion, it notes that Member States making use of this exemption shall submit the “exempted” persons to requirements which are at least analogous with the requirement in paragraph 2 which includes the requirements on remuneration of tied agents under Article 27 of Regulation (EU) 2017/565.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2779**

---

**Submission Date**

16/02/2026

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 7a

## **Subject Matter**

AAR threshold calculation

### Question

In calculating the second AAR condition under Article 7a(1) of EMIR, should only cleared interest rate derivatives be included, or both cleared and uncleared?

### ESMA Answer

---

27-02-2026

Original language

In accordance with Article 7a(2) of EMIR, for the purpose of calculating the second condition under Article 7a(1), a counterparty belonging to a group subject to consolidated supervision in the Union shall only consider derivatives contracts cleared by that counterparty or by other entities within the group, with the exception of intragroup transactions.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2778**

---

**Submission Date**

16/02/2026

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 7a(3)

### **Subject Matter**

AAR stress testing

## Question

In accordance with Article 7a(4) of EMIR, the AAR requirements set out under points (a), (b), and (c) of Article 7a(3) shall be “regularly stress-tested at least once a year”. In relation to the stress-testing referred to under Article 7a(4) of EMIR:

- Should the stress testing apply to three times the trade count or to the gross notional value cleared?
- Should the stress testing apply for each type of products under Article 6 of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2026/305, or at subcategories or account level ?
- What is the timeline for the first annual stress test?

## ESMA Answer

---

27-02-2026

Original language

In accordance with Article 7a(4) of EMIR, the AAR operational requirements should be "stress-tested at least once a year". Accordingly, Article 3(2) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2026/305 requires the tests to take place annually.

On this basis, it is understood that the active accounts should be stress tested for the first time no later than one year following the entry into application of the active account requirement, hence before 24 June 2026.

The first reporting including the results of these stress tests is expected in July 2026.

Furthermore, Article 2 of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2026/305 clearly specifies that stress testing must consider a three-fold increase of the gross notional

value cleared respectively:

- By the CCP (point (c) of Article 2(1) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2026/305)
- In the active account by the counterparty (point (d) of Article 2(1) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2026/305)

Finally, Article 2(1)(d) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2026/305 further requires demonstrating that the counterparty or clearing service provider has the operational capacity to clear up to “*three times the gross notional value cleared in the account by the counterparty*”.

It is therefore understood that where a counterparty has three different accounts (e.g. for EUR OTC IRD, PLN OTC IRD and EUR STIR), the three accounts should be stress tested separately.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2777**

**Submission Date**

16/02/2026

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 7a

## **Subject Matter**

AAR representativeness obligation

## Question

When and how should a counterparty comply with the representativeness obligation and subsequent reporting when it reaches the EUR 6 billion threshold for the first time?

## ESMA Answer

---

27-02-2026

Original language

Counterparties must monitor their positions on a continuous basis against the relevant thresholds. Therefore, a counterparty subject to the AAR becomes subject to the representativeness obligation as soon as it reaches the EUR 6 billion threshold in the relevant categories referred to in Article 7a(6) of EMIR.

As a result, the first reporting is expected to be submitted at the next reporting date (either January or July, whichever is sooner).

However, it is recognised that full compliance with the representativeness obligation (i.e. clearing 5 trades on a yearly average in the account) can only be demonstrated once a complete year has passed.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2776**

---

**Submission Date**

16/02/2026

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 7a

## **Subject Matter**

AAR representativeness obligation

### Question

Are counterparties immediately relieved from the representativeness obligation, including reporting, when they no longer meet the EUR 6 billion threshold set out under Article 7a(4) of EMIR?

### ESMA Answer

---

27-02-2026

Original language

The representativeness obligation, including reporting, ceases to apply as soon as a counterparty no longer meets the EUR 6 billion threshold set out under Article 7a(4) of EMIR.

However, to enable NCAs to verify compliance, a counterparty must still submit the reporting covering the last period during which it was subject to the representativeness obligation.

Counterparties must keep monitoring their positions on a continuous basis against the relevant thresholds.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2775**

**Submission Date**

16/02/2026

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Transparency Directive (TD) Directive 2004/109/EC

### **Level 3 Regulation**

Guidelines on Alternative Performance Measures

### **Topic**

Alternative Performance Measures (APM)

## **Subject Matter**

Interaction of the APM Guidelines with IFRS 18 Presentation and Disclosure in Financial Statements; APM Guidelines and paragraphs 117 to 125 of IFRS 18

## Question

How should an issuer present alternative performance measures in light of the IFRS 18 Presentation and Disclosures in Financial Statements? Which are the main differences between the scope and requirements of the APM Guidelines and IFRS 18?

## ESMA Answer

---

16-02-2026

Original language

While it is expected that IFRS 18 impacts primarily the financial statements of issuers, this Q&A focuses solely on the interaction between the IFRS 18 requirements and the ESMA Guidelines on Alternative Performance Measures (APM Guidelines). In particular, it provides insights into the main differences in concepts, scope and principles between 'Management-defined Performance Measures (MPMs)' under IFRS 18 and alternative performance measures (APMs) as defined in the APM Guidelines. This Q&A also provides guidance on how issuers may ensure compliance with the APM Guidelines in light of the new requirements introduced by IFRS 18 **(effective on 1 January 2027)**.

ESMA notes that the APM Guidelines are still fit for purpose and will continue to fully apply after IFRS 18 enters into force. In the following sections, ESMA highlights the most relevant similarities and differences that issuers should take into account when complying with the APM Guidelines, considering the requirements arising from IFRS 18.


### 1.1. Measure location (where the measures are disclosed):

ESMA highlights that the application scope of the APM Guidelines and IFRS 18 requirements is different:

- **The APM Guidelines** apply to regulated information[1] (e.g. ad-hoc disclosures published under Article 17 of MAR[2] and management reports published pursuant to the Transparency Directive) and prospectuses drawn up in accordance with the Prospectus Regulation[3].
- **IFRS 18** requires issuers to disclose, inside the financial statements, subtotals of income and expenses that are, among other criteria[4], used in public communications.

The concept of public communications included in IFRS 18 is generally broader than the scope of application of the APM Guidelines, as it may also include measures contained in documents that are not covered by MAR, TD or PR[5] (e.g. websites of the issuer and other communication documents) [6]. Hence, when assessing the application of IFRS 18 and its interaction with the APM Guidelines, issuers may need to consider if all measures used in the different communication documents meet the definition of an MPM.

The following flow-chart illustrates the different compliance scenarios that apply based on the location[7] of the measure:



<sup>1</sup> Exclude written transcripts of oral communications and social media posts (paragraph B119 of IFRS 18)

\* MPMs as defined in paragraph 117 of IFRS 18

## 1.2. Definition of APM vs MPM

Both IFRS 18 as well as the APM Guidelines include broad definitions of APMs and MPMs. These definitions are intended to capture a broad range of measures that are (i) in the case of IFRS 18, not specifically required to be presented or defined by

IFRS Accounting Standards; and (ii) in the case of the APM Guidelines, not defined or specified by the applicable financial reporting framework or by any other legislation. ESMA highlights, however, the following:

### APMs under the APM Guidelines

### MPMs under IFRS 18

The APM Guidelines apply to measures calculated based on figures determined by any financial reporting framework, including national GAAPs and IFRS. They cover performance, position, and cash-flow measures (e.g. ratios, net debt, segment data) that:

- are not defined or specified in the applicable financial framework or other legislation,
- are presented outside the financial statements, and
- are disclosed within regulated information documents and/or prospectuses.

IFRS 18 defines MPMs as a subtotal of income and expenses that is used to communicate to investors management's view of an aspect of the financial performance of the company **as whole** and it is **not listed in IFRS 18** or **specifically required** by IFRSs.

These may include measures that are presented on the face of the statement of the profit or loss.

Based on the above types of measures covered, generally MPMs represent a subset of APMs as defined by the APM Guidelines. When assessing which principles and requirements are applicable, issuers should verify where the performance measure is disclosed and whether it meets the definitions of MPMs and/or APMs. Depending on this assessment, issuers may need to assess where

the applicable disclosures should be included. Notably:

1. if measures are MPMs but are not disclosed within regulated information documents, all the applicable disclosures **should be included inside financial statements** as required by IFRS 18 (in a single note), or
2. if measures are MPMs, fall within the scope of the definition of an APM and are included in regulated information documents and/or prospectus, the principles of the APM Guidelines and IFRS 18 apply. **Please refer to section 1.3 of this Q&A and to Q&A #1868 on the APM Guidelines, regarding the location of the applicable disclosures and other principles, or**
3. if measures fall within the definition of an APM pursuant to the APM Guidelines, are disclosed in documents under the scope of the APM Guidelines and are not MPMs - the applicable disclosures should be provided **outside financial statements.**

Finally, ESMA notes that **IFRS 18 does not define ‘earnings before interest, tax, depreciation and amortisation’ (EBITDA)**. However, the Standard specifically lists ‘operating profit or loss before depreciation, amortisation and impairments’ within the scope of IAS 36’ (OPDAI) which may provide similar information to many of the EBITDA measures currently used. Therefore, if EBITDA does not accurately describe the corresponding measure (e.g., an issuer, applying classification requirements of IFRS 18 correctly, has no income and expenses in the investing category and no interest income in the operating category)[8], this measure is both MPM and APM and issuers should comply with the relevant principles in IFRS 18 and the APM Guidelines.


### **1.2.1 Measures specified (listed) in IFRS 18**

Subtotals of income and expenses that are specifically required to be presented or disclosed by IFRS Accounting Standards as well as those listed in paragraph 118 or

B123 of IFRS 18 do not meet the definition of an MPM. Generally, these measures also do not fall within the scope of the APM Guidelines as they are defined or specified in the applicable financial reporting framework (i.e., IFRS Accounting Standards). Totals and subtotals specified by IFRS 18 (i.e. not meeting the definition of MPMs and APMs) include: operating profit, profit before financing and income taxes, operating profit or loss and all income and expenses classified in the investing category, profit or loss before income taxes, profit or loss from continuing operations.

Issuers should, however, be cautious as **any deviation from** the application of IFRS 18 requirements regarding the calculation of such measures (e.g. excluding or including any expenses or income items that are not in line with paragraphs 118 or B123 of IFRS 18) may lead to the application of the APM Guidelines (if these measures are presented outside financial statements and within regulated information documents or prospectuses).

The following flow-chart illustrates different scenarios where the financial measure may be in the scope (definitions) of the APM Guidelines only, IFRS 18 only or both:



¹ Please refer to section 1.3 of this Q&A

\*AFRF- the Applicable Financial Reporting Framework

\*MPMs as defined in paragraph 117 of IFRS 18

### 1.3. Application of the APM Guidelines to MPMs (What to disclose)

ESMA acknowledges that the principles included in IFRS 18 requiring additional disclosure of information in relation to MPMs are generally consistent with the principles included in the APM Guidelines requiring additional disclosure of information in the context of APMs. Therefore, it is not expected that the introduction of IFRS 18 will increase the reporting burden related to the measures that are currently in scope of the APM Guidelines. However, ESMA highlights key differences to consider:

- 1. Timing:** IFRS 18 requires issuers to disclose information such as reconciliations, explanations, definitions concerning MPMs in IFRS financial statements when the financial statements are published. Conversely, the APM Guidelines require similar disclosures when these measures are disclosed to the public, i.e., the disclosures required by the APM Guidelines **should generally be provided at the same time and in the same document where the APM is disclosed** (regulated information documents and/or prospectuses). Please refer to **d)** below regarding compliance by reference principle.
- 2. Reconciliations:** the principles included in the APM Guidelines **do not require** the disclosure of the income tax effect and the effect on non-controlling interests for each item included in the reconciliation between APMs and figures included inside financial statements. IFRS 18 requires such disclosure when a given measure meets the definition of an MPM. Furthermore, IFRS 18 requires a reconciliation between the MPM and the most directly comparable subtotal listed in paragraph 118 or total or subtotal specifically required to be presented or disclosed by IFRS. While this requirement is not fully aligned with the principle included in the APM Guidelines in paragraph 26, if issuers apply the reconciliation requirements in IFRS 18, they will also comply with the reconciliation requirements in the APM Guidelines.
- 3. Prominence:** According to the APM Guidelines, APMs should not be displayed with more prominence, emphasis or authority than measures directly stemming from financial statements. Considering IFRS 18's entry into force and the new concept of MPMs (which requires certain information to be included in the notes to IFRS Financial Statements), ESMA highlights that issuers **should not display any APMs** (including measures that meet the definition of an MPM) with more prominence, emphasis or authority **than**

**measures defined or specifically required by IFRS.** I.e., if issuers disclose APMs (including MPMs) in regulated information documents and prospectuses, issuers should also include in these documents, measures defined by IFRS with, at least, equal prominence.

4. **Compliance by reference:** while IFRS 18 requires issuers to disclose all information on MPMs in one note to the financial statements, the APM Guidelines do not set specific requirements as to where and how such disclosures should be provided, allowing issuers to comply by reference<sup>[9]</sup> (i.e., issuers are not required to include all the information prescribed in the APM Guidelines in the same document where an APM is disclosed provided that the **issuer includes a direct reference to other documents previously published** which contain this information and are readily and easily accessible to users).

Where APMs are simultaneously MPMs, issuers may use the compliance by reference principle to direct users to the information included in a specific note to the published IFRS financial statements (where these disclosures - e.g. reconciliations, explanations - are included). This procedure may avoid repetition of (some of) the information (i.e. issuers may not need to disclose twice the same information e.g. in the financial statements and in the regulated information documents). However, ESMA notes that there are limits for the compliance by reference, in this respect, please refer to [Q&A #1876 on the APM Guidelines](#).

Finally, ESMA notes that prospectuses are covered by a separate regime for incorporation by reference as provided under Article 19 of Regulation (EU) 2017/1129, which includes a specific list of the types of documents (which includes financial statements) from which information can be incorporated by reference into a prospectus.

To the extent that the relevant disclosures (e.g., reconciliations and explanations) are included in a document from which information can be incorporated by reference into a prospectus, ESMA considers that this information should be incorporated by reference into the issuer's prospectus in accordance with Article 19.

---

[1] As defined in Article 2 (k) of Directive 2004/109/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 2004 on the harmonisation of transparency requirements in relation to information about issuers whose securities are admitted to trading on a regulated market (Transparency Directive or TD).

[2] Regulation (EU) No 596/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 on market abuse (Market Abuse Regulation or MAR).

[3] Regulation (EU) 2017/1129 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 June 2017 on the prospectus to be published when securities are offered to the public or admitted to trading on a regulated market, and repealing Directive 2003/71/EC (Prospectus Regulation)

[4] See paragraph 117 of IFRS 18 for further div.

[5] See paragraphs B119 – B122 of IFRS 18 for further div.

[6] Please note that measures disclosed in social media posts are outside the scope of IFRS 18.

[7] This flow-chart does not address the differences in the definitions of APM & MPM (please refer section 1.2).

[8] See paragraphs BC363-365 of Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 18.

[9] Where compliance by reference is permitted or possible (Paragraph 45 of the APM Guidelines).

# ESMA\_QA\_2769

**Submission Date**

12/02/2026

---

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

MiCA

### **Topic**

Market abuse in crypto-asset market

## **Subject Matter**

Personal scope of persons professionally arranging or executing transactions under MiCA

## **Question**

What entities should be considered as Persons Professionally Arranging or Executing Transactions (PPAETs) for the obligation to prevent, detect and report

market abuse or attempted market abuse under Article 92(1) of MiCA?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2754**

**Submission Date**

22/01/2026

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Transparency Directive (TD) Directive 2004/109/EC

### **Topic**

Notifications of major shareholdings

### **Historic Question Reference**

Relates to Question 2684

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 13, 13 (a) and Article 10

## **Subject Matter**

## Major holdings notification – definition of indirect holding

### **Question**

The question refers to the interpretation of the meaning of indirect holdings of other financial instruments (Article 13) for the purpose of aggregated notification (Article 13a).

National Competent Authorities request that the European Commission clarify the meaning of ‘indirect holding’ in the context of financial instruments other than shares (i.e., securities providing voting rights).

The TD explicitly specifies, under Article 10, the different cases of indirect holdings of voting rights that are subject to notification.

In the case of financial instruments not granting voting rights (Article 13 and its reference in Article 13a) there is, however, no explicit definition of those cases of indirect holdings; and no explicit link to Article 10.

National Competent Authorities have raised questions about the precise definition of indirect holdings in this context—specifically, whether a full “look-through” approach must always be applied, or whether the limitation to the look-through approach set out in paragraph 10(e) also applies to financial instruments. In particular, it is unclear whether financial instruments held by a third party in its own name but on behalf of the person or entity concerned—such as those described in paragraph 10(g)—should be excluded.

# ESMA\_QA\_2753

**Submission Date**

21/01/2026

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Prospectus Regulation 2017/1129

### **Topic**

Public offer

## **Subject Matter**

Prospectus exemption

### **Question**

Is a prospectus required under Article 1(5)(ba) of the Prospectus Regulation (PR) for reverse acquisitions?

Unlike Article 1(6b) of the PR, which requires a prospectus for reverse acquisitions within the meaning of paragraph B19 of IFRS 3, Business Combinations, Article 1(5)(ba) of the PR does not explicitly address this issue.

# ESMA\_QA\_2747

**Submission Date**

05/01/2026

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 2020/1503 - European crowdfunding service providers for business

### **Topic**

Control functions (Compliance, Risk and Audit)

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 5

## **Subject Matter**

Due diligence

## **Question**

How should the due diligence requirements set out in Article 5(2) of the ESCPR be applied by CSPs?

## ESMA Answer

---

05-01-2026

Original language

Article 5 of the ECSPR requires CSPs to undertake at least a minimum level of due diligence in respect of project owners proposing their projects to be funded through their crowdfunding platform.

Points (a) and (b) of Article 5(2) of the ECSPR provide a list of evidence that a CSP needs to obtain from project owners as part of its minimum due diligence requirements.

ESMA believes that CSPs should comply with the provisions set out in point (a) and point (b) mentioned above with regard to all project owners who propose their projects to be funded through their crowdfunding platform regardless of whether a project owner is in the form of natural or legal person.

For point (b)(\*), the provisions of Directive 2015/849, and especially Recital 29, support an application of the provision to project owners both in the form of a legal person or a natural person.

In relation to point (a) of Article 5(2) of the ECSPR, the same approach shall be followed. CSPs are therefore expected to ensure that, if the project owner is a legal person, the evidence of the lack of criminal records is provided in relation to the legal person, as well as in relation to shareholders who directly or indirectly hold 20% or more of the legal person's share capital or voting rights, each member of the legal person's management body (\*\*), including persons who effectively direct its business (\*\*\*)).

---

---

### *Footnotes*

(\*) According to which CSPs shall obtain evidence that the project owner is not established in a non-cooperative jurisdiction, as recognised by the relevant Union policy, or in a high-risk third country pursuant to Article 9(2) of Directive (EU) 2015/849 (AML Directive).

(\*\*) In line with what is established under other EU legislative acts (such as MiFID II (directive 2014/65/EU), and CRD (Directive 2013/36/EU)), 'management body' should be intended as the body or bodies of an entity, which are appointed in accordance with national law, which are empowered to set the entity's strategy, objectives and overall direction, and which oversee and monitor management decision-making and include persons who effectively direct the business of the entity.

(\*\*\*) This reference should be intended as concerning those persons who effectively direct the business of a project owner, irrespective of whether or not they are members of the management or administrative organ appointed in accordance with national company law.

# ESMA\_QA\_2742

**Submission Date**

19/12/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Prospectus Regulation 2017/1129

### **Topic**

Public offer

## **Subject Matter**

Prospectus QA exemption

### **Question**

Do subscription rights fall under the exemptions in Article 1(5)(a) and (ba) of the Prospectus Regulation?

## ESMA Answer

---

19-12-2025

Original language

Yes, subscription rights fall under these exemptions provided they relate to shares which themselves qualify under these exemptions.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2741**

---

**Submission Date**

19/12/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Prospectus Regulation 2017/1129

### **Topic**

Public offer

## **Subject Matter**

Prospectus Q&A exemption

### **Question**

Is there an obligation to update a document drawn up in accordance with Annex IX of the Prospectus Regulation (PR) in relation to a significant new factor, material mistake or material inaccuracy relating to the information included in a document?

## ESMA Answer

---

19-12-2025

Original language

No. Documents drawn up in accordance with Annex IX PR are not prospectuses. Therefore, Article 23 of the Prospectus Regulation on supplements does not apply.

# ESMA\_QA\_2740

**Submission Date**

18/12/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

ESGR - Regulation (EU) 2024/3005

### **Topic**

Temporary regime for small providers

## **Subject Matter**

Small ESG rating provider no longer meeting temporary regime size requirements

### **Question**

If an ESG rating provider established in the Union registered under the temporary regime ceases to meet the criteria in order to be categorised as a small undertaking, can it continue operating until it is authorised pursuant to Article 8?

## ESMA Answer

---

18-12-2025

Original language

If a small ESG rating provider ceases to meet the criteria for the temporary regime, Article 5(3) of the Regulation applies, i.e. the ESG rating provider becomes subject to all provisions of the Regulation and must apply to ESMA for authorisation under Article 6 within six months.

The ESG rating provider remains listed in the register referred to in Article 14 and may continue providing services in the EU until its application has been examined by ESMA and a decision to grant authorisation adopted. In this instance, the register is updated to reflect that the ESG rating provider has become authorised in accordance with Article 8 and is no longer registered under the temporary regime for small ESG rating providers.

If it does not apply for authorisation within the six-month period or if ESMA decides to refuse authorisation, the ESG rating provider must immediately cease all activities and will be removed from the register of ESG rating providers.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2739**

**Submission Date**

18/12/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

ESGR - Regulation (EU) 2024/3005

### **Topic**

Temporary regime for small providers

## **Subject Matter**

Content of temporary regime notification

## **Question**

What information should a small ESG rating provider submit to ESMA for its assessment to determine whether to register a small ESG rating provider for the purposes of the temporary regime pursuant to Article 5(2)?

## ESMA Answer

---

18-12-2025

Original language

ESMA will need to review, as a minimum, the annual audited financial statements and employment records of the notifying entity.

In the case of a newly established legal entity, projected figures may be used provisionally for ESMA's assessment. This may include founding accounts, business projections and “bona fide” estimates accompanied by managerial sign-off.

# ESMA\_QA\_2738

**Submission Date**

18/12/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

ESGR - Regulation (EU) 2024/3005

### **Topic**

Temporary regime for small providers

## **Subject Matter**

ESMA assessment of temporary regime notification

## **Question**

Does ESMA's assessment to determine whether to register a small ESG rating provider for the purposes of the temporary regime pursuant to Article 5(2) of Regulation (EU) 2024/3005 include the assessment of the notifying entity's

compliance with the requirements of Article 15(1), (5) and (7), Articles 23 and 24 and Articles 32 to 37 of the Regulation?

## ESMA Answer

---

18-12-2025

Original language

No. ESMA's assessment is limited to verifying whether the notifier qualifies as a small undertaking or as a small group through the fulfilment of the quantitative criteria listed in Article 3(2), first subparagraph, or Article 3(5), first subparagraph of Directive 2013/34/EU, notably balance sheet total, net turnover and number of employees during the financial year.

# ESMA\_QA\_2737

**Submission Date**

18/12/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

ESGR - Regulation (EU) 2024/3005

### **Topic**

Temporary regime for small providers

## **Subject Matter**

Group-affiliated small ESG rating providers

### **Question**

Is a small ESG rating provider that is part of a medium-sized or large group eligible for the temporary regime under Article 5 of Regulation (EU) 2024/3005 when it is operating independently of the group's resources and consolidated capacity?

## ESMA Answer

---

18-12-2025

Original language

No. Particular attention must be paid to Recital 48, according to which ESMA should ensure that risks of circumvention of the Regulation are avoided, “particularly by preventing small undertakings within medium-sized or large groups according to the criteria laid down in Directive 2013/34/EU from benefitting from the temporary regime”.

The temporary regime was introduced to facilitate the market entry of smaller ESG rating providers by allowing them to benefit from more proportionate requirements for a three-year period.

# ESMA\_QA\_2736

**Submission Date**

18/12/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive (AIFMD) Directive 2011/61/EU

### **Level 3 Regulation**

Liquidity stress testing - Guidelines on liquidity stress testing in UCITS and AIFs - ESMA34-39-882

### **Topic**

AIFMD scope

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Directive [EU] 2024/927 amending UCITS Directive and AIFM Directive with regard to the new liquidity management tools (LMTs) requirements for UCITS and open-ended AIFs coming into effect on 16 April 2026

### **Subject Matter**

NEW LIQUIDITY MANAGEMENT TOOLS REQUIREMENTS FOR UCITS AND OPEN ENDED AIFS COMING INTO EFFECT ON 16 APRIL 2026: DOES THE SCOPE OF LMTs EXTEND TO NON-EU OPEN ENDED AIFs?

### **Question**

The AIFMD II (Directive (EU) 2024/927), which will enter into effect on 16 April 2026 imposes a requirement on EU open ended alternative investment funds (EU AIFs) and UCITS to specify/include in their rules or instruments of incorporation two (2) liquidity management tools (LMTs), which are defined in the Annex V of the AIFMD II.

The AIFMD II is silent when it comes of the requirement of LMTs for non-EU open-ended AIFs such as Cayman Islands domiciled open-ended unit trusts. Can the ESMA provide clarifications on whether the requirement to choose two (2) liquidity management tools (LMTs) for open-ended EU AIFs apply also to non-EU open ended AIFs managed by an EU AIFM, even if those non-EU AIFs are not marketed in the Union?

### **ESMA Answer**

---

18-12-2025

Original language

Dear Mr Biguma,

According to Article 2 of the AIFMD, the AIFMD applies to:

*(a) EU AIFMs which manage one or more AIFs irrespective of whether such AIFs are EU AIFs or non-EU AIFs;*

*(b) non-EU AIFMs which manage one or more EU AIFs; and*

*(c) non-EU AIFMs which market one or more AIFs in the Union irrespective of whether such AIFs are EU AIFs or non-EU AIFs.*

Therefore, following letter a), the AIFMD applies also to EU AIFMs that manage non-EU AIFs. This means that the obligation to select at least two LMTs also applies to EU AIFMs that manage non-EU AIFs, as these AIFMs are subject to the AIFMD.

We draw your attention to the fact that Article 16(2b) refers to 'AIFs' and not to 'EU AIFs'.

Thank you,

ESMA

# **ESMA\_QA\_2734**

**Submission Date**

17/12/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive (AIFMD) Directive 2011/61/EU

### **Level 2 Regulation**

AIFMD - Regulation 231/2013 with regard to exemptions, general operating conditions, depositaries, leverage, transparency and supervision

### **Level 3 Regulation**

ESMA Guidelines on funds' names using ESG or sustainability-related terms (ESMA34-1592494965-657)

### **Topic**

Funds' names

## Subject Matter

Exclusion related to UNGC/OECD Guidelines

## Question

For the purposes of applying the exclusions in the Guidelines, how should fund managers apply the exclusion referred to in Article 12(1)(c) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1818 (i.e. “companies that benchmark administrators find in violation of the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC) principles or the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises”)?

## ESMA Answer

---

19-12-2025

Original language

For the purposes of applying the exclusions referred to in paragraphs 16-18 of the Guidelines, the exclusion referred to in Article 12(1)(c) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1818 should be considered to be applied by the fund manager itself, not by a benchmark administrator. Therefore, for the purposes of applying the Guidelines, the exclusion should be understood as follows: “companies that fund managers finds in violation of the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC) principles or the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises”.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2733**

**Submission Date**

17/12/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Undertakings for Collective Investment in Transferable Securities Directive (UCITS) Directive 2009/65/EC

### **Level 2 Regulation**

UCITS - Directive 2010/43/EU on organisational requirements, conflicts of interest, conduct of business, risk management and content of the agreement between a depositary and a management company

### **Level 3 Regulation**

ESMA Guidelines on funds' names using ESG or sustainability-related terms (ESMA34-1592494965-657)

### **Topic**

Funds' names

## Subject Matter

Exclusion related to UNGC/OECD Guidelines

## Question

For the purposes of applying the exclusions in the Guidelines, how should fund managers apply the exclusion referred to in Article 12(1)(c) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1818 (i.e. “companies that benchmark administrators find in violation of the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC) principles or the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises”)?

## ESMA Answer

---

19-12-2025

Original language

For the purposes of applying the exclusions referred to in paragraphs 16-18 of the Guidelines, the exclusion referred to in Article 12(1)(c) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1818 should be considered to be applied by the fund manager itself, not by a benchmark administrator. Therefore, for the purposes of applying the Guidelines, the exclusion should be understood as follows: “companies that fund managers finds in violation of the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC) principles or the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises”.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2708**

**Submission Date**

03/12/2025

Status: Question Rejected

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Directive 2014/65/EU - Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID II)

### **Level 2 Regulation**

Directive 2017/593 - MiFID II Delegated Directive

### **Topic**

Inducements

### **Additional Legal Reference**

ESMA 35-43-349 Q&A

## **Subject Matter**

## Inducements

### **Question**

When an investment firm pays a third party (e.g law firms, accounting firms) any commission in connection with the provision of an investment service or ancillary service to the client must ensure that all the conditions set out in Article 24(9) of Directive 2014/65/EU and requirements set out in paragraphs 2-5 are met at all times. One of the requirements is that the fee and commission shall be considered to be designed to enhance the quality of the relevant service to the client if it is justified by the provision of an additional or higher level service to the relevant client, proportional to the level of inducements received. Which is responsible to enhance the quality of the relevant service to the client? The investment firm or the third party (e.g the law firms, the accounting firms)

# **ESMA\_QA\_2689**

**Submission Date**

14/11/2025

---

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

CCP / clearing-like activities

## **Question**

In EMIR, a CCP is defined as a legal person that interposes itself between the counterparties to the contracts traded on one or more financial markets, becoming

the buyer to every seller and the seller to every buyer. EMIR defines clearing as the process of establishing positions, including the calculation of net obligations, and ensuring that financial instruments, cash, or both, are available to secure the exposures arising from those positions. The definition of a CCP, however, seems to be fulfilled also by entities that are not authorised as CCPs, e.g. by firms acting as prime brokers. Prime brokers typically interpose themselves between the counterparties on a matched principal trading (MPT) basis. When they do this for markets for which it is customary to margin positions, they determine a net position on the basis of which they ask margin from their counterparties. With these activities it could be argued that prime brokers fulfil the definition of a CCP under EMIR. Another example of this are investment firms that operate an OTF offering MPT for derivatives (explicitly allowed under Article 20(2) of MiFID II).

Questions:

1. Is an authorisation as a CCP pursuant to Article 14 of EMIR mandatory for any legal person established in the Union meeting the definition of a “CCP” and providing “clearing services” in respect of financial instruments, or is it limited to entities offering clearing in OTC derivatives subject to the EMIR clearing obligation and/or in exchange-traded financial instruments? In this regard, is the intent of the legal entity (to offer clearing services as a CCP) relevant?

2. Are there other constitutive elements (e.g. intent, type of clients (retail/wholesale), loss mutualisation, unilateral margin) of the definition of “CCP”, apart from the “interposition”, i.e. becoming the buyer to every seller and the seller to every buyer, element (Article 2, point (1) of EMIR)?

3. What constitutes a “clearing service” in this context; should it be understood as “clearing” just as defined in Article 2, point (3) of EMIR or are there additional constitutive elements to be taken into account?

4. As regards the “interposition” element, where an investment firm (e.g. an OTF operator) executes transactions via matched principal trading (e.g. in accordance with Article 4(1), point (38), of MiFID II), do such matched principal trading transactions qualify as “interposition” (by the investment firm) for the purpose of the definition of a “CCP” pursuant to Article 2, point (1), of EMIR? If so, how would an investment firm (e.g. an OTF operator) using matched principal trading for the execution of transactions differ from a CCP?

5. Do CCP clearing services need to be performed by a separate legal entity from

other regulated functions (e.g. the investment firm function), or can one legal entity perform CCP clearing services together with other activities (not linked to clearing) such as investment firm services?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2684**

**Submission Date**

04/11/2025

---

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Transparency Directive (TD) Directive 2004/109/EC

### **Level 2 Regulation**

Regulation 2015/761 on major holdings

### **Level 3 Regulation**

The Transparency Directive

### **Topic**

Notifications of major shareholdings

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 13a Transparency Directive

## **Subject Matter**

Major holdings notification - aggregation

### **Question**

It is not clear whether a parent undertaking is required to aggregate an Entitlement to Acquire and/or Financial Instrument with Similar Economic Effect (collectively the “Article 13 Financial Instruments”) which its subsidiary undertaking holds indirectly. For instance, where a subsidiary owns share options having voting rights (i.e. an Article 13 Financial Instrument - article 13(1)(a)) in an issuer, but holds those share options through a trustee (therefore falling under article 10(g)), would the subsidiary’s ‘indirect’ control over the voting rights pursuant to the share options (registered in the name of the trustee) need to be aggregated by the parent?

The doubt arises because article 10 of the Transparency Directive which creates a list of cases where an indirect holding is said to arise cross-refers only to article 9 (i.e. to holdings of voting rights), and not to Article 13 Financial Instruments. Accordingly, there is doubt, whether the reference to “indirect” holdings of Article 13 Financial Instruments in article 13a(1) (regarding aggregation) should be interpreted with the plain English meaning of “indirect” which refers to a parent-sub relationship, or whether it should be extended to include all the forms of indirect ownership under article 10 of the Transparency Directive.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2675**

**Submission Date**

28/10/2025

---

Status: Question Rejected

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation (EU) 2022/2554 - The Digital Operational Resilience Act (DORA)

### **Topic**

ICT third-party risk management

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Art. 30, DORA

## **Subject Matter**

Contractual agreement with ICT service providers

## **Question**

Art. 30 (1) & (2) of DORA demand that financial institutions have signed contractual agreements with all their ICT service providers, in particular in Art. 30(2) &(3) the elements that shall be included in the contractual arrangements are listed.

Are ICT service providers permitted under DORA to charge the financial institutions "merely for signing" a DORA addendum or updated contractual arrangements in the framework of Art. 30, DORA?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2663**

**Submission Date**

10/10/2025

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 - Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR)

### **Topic**

Disclosures

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 9(3) - Joint SFDR Q&A II.1

## **Subject Matter**

Disclosure obligations under Article 9(3)

## **Question**

The European Commission clarified in Q&A II.1 that, pursuant to Article 9(3) of SFDR, financial products tracking a Paris-aligned Benchmark (PAB) or a Climate Transition Benchmark (CTB) are deemed to make sustainable investments. Based on this clarification, can such financial products hold investments eligible under PAB/CTB requirements, which may, however, not qualify as sustainable investments within the meaning of Article 2(17) of SFDR under the relevant financial market participant's own methodology?

Can the clarification provided by Q&A II.1 also be extended to:

- Financial products disclosing under Article 9(3) of SFDR that apply all requirements of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1818 for PABs/CTBs, but that do not passively track such indices?
- Other types of financial products that have a reduction in carbon emissions as their objective and disclose under Article 9(3) of SFDR (i.e. without tracking a PAB/CTB or applying the requirements applicable to these indices)?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2662**

**Submission Date**

10/10/2025

---

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 - Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR)

### **Topic**

Disclosures

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Art 2.1(b)

## **Subject Matter**

Investment firms' SFDR disclosure obligations

## **Question**

In the case where a financial market participant, such as a fund manager (delegator), delegates the portfolio management of a fund to an investment firm (delegatee), is the delegatee investment firm subject to the same SFDR disclosure obligations for the portfolio management it performs for that fund as when it deals with discretionary portfolio management mandates with end investors?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2660**

---

**Submission Date**

08/10/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

European Market Infrastructure Regulation (EMIR) Regulation (EU) No 648/2012-MDP

### **Topic**

\* EMIR Art.9 reporting

## **Subject Matter**

Notification of Errors and Omissions related to exchange-traded derivatives involving multiple Entities Responsible for Reporting ('ERRs') managed by the same Management Company/AIFM

## **Question**

In the case of exchange-traded derivatives ('ETDs'), can reporting counterparties (which are in this case, their own ERRs) submit a single consolidated Errors and Omissions Notification?

## ESMA Answer

---

08-10-2025

Original language

Yes. Where multiple ERRs are affected and these ERRs correspond to sub-funds or entities managed by the same Management Company/AIFM, a single consolidated Errors and Omissions Notification may be submitted for ETDs.

The updated Errors and Omissions Notification includes a Boolean indicator allowing reporting counterparties to specify whether the issue relates to ETDs involving multiple ERRs. Where this field is marked as 'yes', the notification should include the relevant div of all affected ERRs.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2655**

**Submission Date**

26/09/2025

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Directive II (MiFID II) Directive 2014/65/EU-  
Investor Protection and Intermediaries

### **Topic**

Best Execution

## **Subject Matter**

Derivatives settled in stablecoins

## **Question**

Can derivatives settled in stablecoins—namely asset-referenced tokens or electronic money tokens as defined in Article 3(6) and (7) of Regulation (EU)

2023/1114 on markets in crypto-assets (MiCA) - be classified as financial instruments under Section C of Annex I to Directive 2014/65/EU? More specifically, can such instruments be deemed to meet the criterion of derivatives settled in cash?

In addition, does EU legislation permit the use of unauthorised stablecoins – namely asset-referenced tokens and electronic money tokens that do not comply with Titles III and IV of MiCA – for the settlement of derivatives?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2654**

---

**Submission Date**

25/09/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

MiCA

### **Topic**

White paper

### **Additional Legal Reference**

143(2)

## **Subject Matter**

Offerors and CASPs' responsibilities with regards to white papers for Title II tokens admitted to trading prior to 30 December 2024

## Question

What are the respective responsibilities of offerors, persons seeking admission to trading, operators of trading platforms and other CASPs mentioned in Article 66(3) of MiCA with regard to white papers for crypto-assets other than ARTs and EMTs that were admitted to trading prior to 30 December 2024?

## ESMA Answer

---

14-10-2025

Original language

Article 143(2) of MiCA provides that *“by way of derogation from Title II, only the following requirements shall apply in relation to crypto-assets other than asset-referenced tokens and e-money tokens that were admitted to trading before 30 December 2024:*

- a. Articles 7 and 9 shall apply to marketing communications published after 30 December 2024;*
- b. Operators of trading platforms shall ensure by 31 December 2027 that a crypto-asset white paper, in the cases required by this Regulation, is drawn up, notified and published in accordance with Articles 6, 8 and 9 and updated in accordance with Article 12”*

For Title II crypto-assets admitted to trading prior to 30 December 2024, offerors and persons seeking admission to trading must therefore only comply with marketing rules. There is no white paper requirement.

Operators of trading platforms must, by 31 December 2027, ensure there is a white paper. In line with Article 66(3) of MiCA, they must also publish hyperlinks to any existing (registered) white papers.

Finally, the other CASPs referenced in Article 66(3) must only publish hyperlinks to any existing (registered) white papers. Where there are no such white papers, they do not have the responsibility to ensure they are produced.

If the crypto-asset is not available on a trading platform, there might not be a white paper for it even after 31 December 2027.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2648**

**Submission Date**

19/09/2025

---

Status: Question Rejected

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Directive II (MiFID II) Directive 2014/65/EU-  
Investor Protection and Intermediaries

### **Level 2 Regulation**

Regulation 2017/565 - MiFID II Delegated Regulation

### **Level 3 Regulation**

ESMA/2012/188 - Guidelines - Compliance function (MiFID)

### **Topic**

Outsourcing

### **Additional Legal Reference**

EBA/GL/2019/02 (EBA Guidelines)

## **Subject Matter**

Outsourcing; Critical and important functions; Principle of Proportionality

## **Question**

In light of the first subparagraph of Article 16(5) of Directive 2014/65/EU (MiFID II), as well as Article 2(3) and Article 30(1) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/565, can it be affirmed that where a management company has delegated to an entity the performance of crucial elements of the marketing of UCITS funds, including their registration and listing for marketing purposes, the activity of that entity in entering into brokerage and distribution agreements with third-party intermediaries for the purpose of marketing such funds constitutes outsourcing of a critical and important function?

Furthermore, and in the light of the EBA Guidelines on Outsourcing Arrangements (EBA/GL/2019/02), to what extent does the principle of proportionality guide the assessment carried out during the risk evaluation of such outsourcing arrangements? In particular, do factors such as the continuity and duration of the agreement with third-party intermediaries, the scope and materiality of the delegated tasks, and the frequency and regularity of such delegation have an impact on whether the relationship should be qualified as the outsourcing of a critical or important function under the above-mentioned instruments?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2646**

**Submission Date**

18/09/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation (EU) 2022/2554 - The Digital Operational Resilience Act (DORA)

### **Topic**

ICT third-party risk management

### **Additional Legal Reference**

28(6), 30(3)(e)

## **Subject Matter**

Audit frequency limitations

## **Question**

As DORA requires financial entities to pre-determine the frequency of audits and inspections on the basis of a risk-based approach, are financial entities not permitted to agree on a maximum audit frequency (e.g. once per year) with their ICT third-party service providers?

## ESMA Answer

---

18-09-2025

Original language

DORA does not limit the financial entities in the way to implement the relevant audit requirements, including regarding the audit frequency. In case the contracts between the financial entities and their ICT third-party service providers would refer to a (maximum) audit frequency, the frequency shall be agreed by the financial entities (i.e., not imposed by the ICT third-party service providers) and shall not prevent the financial entities to implement the DORA audit requirements on a risk-based approach.

Therefore, financial entities shall also ensure that the contractual arrangements grant them the ability to carry out an audit on an ad-hoc basis when they find it necessary to comply with the DORA requirements (for example, in the event of doubts regarding the proper performance of the contract), without the clause on the audit frequency preventing it. If such conditions are met, the financial entities and their ICT third-party service providers may agree on an audit frequency in their contracts.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2645**

**Submission Date**

17/09/2025

---

Status: Question Rejected

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Packaged Retail and Insurance-based Investment Products Regulation (PRIIPS) Regulation (EU) No 1286/2014

### **Level 2 Regulation**

PRIIPS - Regulation 2017/653 on the presentation, content, review and revision of key information documents and the conditions for fulfilling the requirement to provide such documents

### **Topic**

Disclosures

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Additionally MiFID 2 - article 44

## **Subject Matter**

Intent to Present Future Performance in Percentage Terms in Robo-Advisory App – Compliance with MiFID II (incl. Article 44) and PRIIPs

## **Question**

We are currently exploring the possibility of presenting future performance in percentage terms within our robo-advisory application. The app provides automated investment recommendations based on client profiling and risk tolerance, and may in the future include visual projections of potential returns.

These projections would be expressed as percentages, clearly labeled as hypothetical, and accompanied by appropriate disclaimers and risk warnings. The format would follow the structure and methodology of performance scenarios as outlined in Annex IV of the PRIIPs Regulation.

In this context, we would like to clarify:

Is it permissible to present future performance in percentage terms if the format aligns with the performance scenarios described in PRIIPs Annex IV?

Would such a presentation be compliant with Article 44 of MiFID II, particularly in digital interfaces?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2638**

**Submission Date**

10/09/2025

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive (AIFMD) Directive 2011/61/EU

### **Topic**

AIFMD scope

## **Subject Matter**

Application of the delegation requirements foreseen under Article 1(9)(b) AIFMD II, respectively, Article 2(4)(b) AIFMD II

## **Question**

It follows from Article 1(9)(b) and Article 2(4)(b) AIFMD II that the AIFM or UCITS management company shall ensure that the performance of the functions in Annex

I or II of the respective directives, as well as the provision of the services referred to in Articles 6(4) or 6(3), complies with the requirements of AIFMD II. Considering that portfolio management and risk management may be delegated to entities located in the EU or to regulated entities located in third countries, to which extent are delegates or subdelegates of AIFMs or UCITS management companies subject to the AIFMD and UCITS Directive?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2630**

**Submission Date**

27/08/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

EMIR 3.0 Active Account Requirement and Reporting Obligation

## **Question**

Should counterparties that clear 100% of their relevant derivatives contracts in the EU still be required to comply with the representativeness obligation under Article

7a(3)(d) of EMIR, the reporting obligation under Article 7b(1), and the representativeness reporting requirements outlined in the RTS?

## ESMA Answer

---

13-10-2025

Original language

As clarified by ESMA\_QA\_2517, counterparties that clear 85% of the relevant derivatives contracts in a CCP authorised under Article 14 of EMIR are exempted from the operational, stress testing and reporting requirements referred under Article 7a and 7b of EMIR. They are not exempted from the representativeness obligation under Article 7a(3), point (d), of EMIR

However, the representativeness requirement requires counterparties to clear trades representative of the trades "that are cleared at a clearing service of substantial systemic importance". Therefore, where is no activity at a clearing service of substantial systemic importance, the representativeness requirement should not apply.

# ESMA\_QA\_2626

**Submission Date**

07/08/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Reporting of the representativeness obligation

## **Question**

Does the 85% exemption from reporting for entities under Article 7b also apply to the reporting of the representativeness obligation, or does it only apply to the

reporting of activities, risk exposures, and operational conditions?

## ESMA Answer

---

13-10-2025

Original language

A counterparty can benefit from the exemption mentioned in Article 7a(5) of EMIR at any point in time by demonstrating that it clears at least 85 % of its derivative contracts belonging to the categories referred to in Article 7a(6) of EMIR at a CCP authorised under Article 14 of EMIR.

As confirmed by Q&A 2517, entities that clear 85% or more of the relevant derivatives contracts in a CCP authorised under Article 14 of EMIR are exempted from:

- the operational requirements referred to in Article 7a(3), points (a), (b) and (c), of EMIR;
- the stress-testing requirement referred to in Article 7a(4), fourth subparagraph, of EMIR;
- the reporting requirements referred to in Article 7b of EMIR.

Article 7b(1) of EMIR 3 states: “*A financial counterparty or a non-financial counterparty that is subject to the obligation referred to in Article 7a shall (...) report every six months to its competent authority the information necessary to assess compliance with that obligation.*”

Article 7b(1) refers broadly to “the obligation referred to in Article 7a”, which includes: operational conditions (legal, IT, and internal processes) and the representativeness obligation (Article 7a(3)(d)). Therefore, entities benefitting from the exemption mentioned in Article 7a(5) are exempted from reporting requirements necessary to demonstrate compliance with the representativeness obligation.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2624**

**Submission Date**

01/08/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Market Abuse Regulation (MAR) Regulation (EU) No 596/2014 - Market Integrity

### **Topic**

Managers' transactions

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 19 of MAR as amended and integrated by the Listing Act

## **Subject Matter**

Scope of the exception in Article 19(12a) of MAR to PDMRs' general prohibition to trade during the closed period

## Question

Shall a PDMR be allowed to adhere to a takeover bid, a share capital increase, a subscription of shares arising from stock splits, a merger, a rights issue or a spin-off during a closed period pursuant to Article 19(12a) of MAR?

## ESMA Answer

---

01-08-2025

Original language

Recital (76) of Regulation (EU) 2024/2809 amending MAR, provides examples of transactions and activities that might be covered by the exemption for PDMRs to trade during the closed period under Article 19(12a) of MAR. Among the examples provided, the text refers to the transactions and activities that might result from “duly authorised corporate actions not implying advantageous treatment for the [PDMR]”. Considering that a takeover bid, as well as the other mentioned transactions, should in principle grant PDMRs an equivalent treatment to that of any other shareholder, a PDMR should be allowed to adhere to these transactions during a closed period provided that the corporate action has been authorized or approved by the issuer’s governing body or the competent authority.

A case-by-case assessment remains necessary to verify that the relevant conditions are met. It should be recalled that the prohibition of insider dealing remains applicable during closed periods.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2618**

**Submission Date**

25/07/2025

Status: Question Rejected

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Directive 2014/65/EU - Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID II)

### **Level 2 Regulation**

Regulation 2017/565 - MiFID II Delegated Regulation

### **Level 3 Regulation**

ESMA35-43-869 - Guidelines - Suitability (MiFID)

### **Topic**

Suitability

## **Subject Matter**

## Arrangements necessary to understand clients

### **Question**

In order to comply with the duty to obtain the necessary information regarding the client's knowledge and experience, financial situation, and investment objectives, shall the Investment firms questionnaire/approach follow this exact sequence, i.e., shall the investment firm inquire the client, in a first moment, about its Knowledge and Experience on a specific instrument/ service, and then about the client's financial situation and his investment objectives ?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2609**

---

**Submission Date**

15/07/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Undertakings for Collective Investment in Transferable Securities Directive (UCITS) Directive 2009/65/EC

### **Level 3 Regulation**

Performance Fees - Guidelines on performance fees in UCITS and certain types of AIFs - ESMA34-39-968

### **Topic**

Costs and fees

## **Subject Matter**

Performance fees for feeder funds

## Question

Can the manager of a feeder fund within the meaning of Article 58 of the UCITS Directive charge a performance fee?

## ESMA Answer

---

15-07-2025

Original language

Under Article 58 of the UCITS Directive, a feeder fund is a fund which has been approved to invest at least 85 % of its assets in units of another fund (master funds). Paragraph 18 of the Guidelines states that a manager “should always be able to demonstrate how the performance fee model of a fund it manages constitutes a reasonable incentive for the manager and is aligned with investors’ interests”.

Against this background, the feeder manager does not exercise sufficient discretion over the asset allocation, selection and fund strategy to warrant the charging of a performance fee and as such, the charging of a performance fee to investors should not be considered as appropriate and justified in such cases. Therefore, performance fees, if any, should only be charged at the level of the master fund.

This is unless:

a) the master fund and the feeder fund are managed by the same manager or by managers belonging to the same group; and

b) the only investor(s) of the master fund is(are) feeder fund(s);

in which case performance fees could be paid at the level of the feeder fund(s), and not at the level of the master fund, provided that this approach applies consistently to all feeder funds, if more than one.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2604**

---

**Submission Date**

08/07/2025

Status: Question Rejected

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Directive 2014/65/EU - Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID II)

### **Level 2 Regulation**

Regulation 2017/565 - MiFID II Delegated Regulation

### **Level 3 Regulation**

ESMA/2012/188 - Guidelines - Compliance function (MiFID)

### **Topic**

Product governance

## **Subject Matter**

## Clarification as regards to Perpetual features

### **Question**

We are writing to request clarification regarding the regulatory treatment of perpetual futures. Specifically, we would like to confirm whether, in cases where a Cyprus Investment Firm (CIF) offers listed futures contracts through a Multilateral Trading Facility (MTF) operating in Europe, the perpetual futures offered by the CIF would fall within the scope of Category 10 – Other Derivatives, as defined in the First Appendix, Part III of Law 87(I)/2017, as amended from time to time.

In addition, we would appreciate your confirmation on whether any leverage restrictions apply to perpetual futures, either under CySEC's national rules or under EU-level requirements, particularly in the context of investor protection measures.

# ESMA\_QA\_2601

**Submission Date**

04/07/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 2020/1503 - European crowdfunding service providers for business

### **Topic**

Underwriting and placing

### **Subject Matter**

Use of fiduciary (nominee) structures in equity crowdfunding

### **Question**

Can CSPs use nominee structures as part of their operations in relation to transferable securities or admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes? (Edited)

## ESMA Answer

---

04-07-2025

Original language

The terms “nominee structure”, “nominee service”, or “nominee” are used by market participants in the field of crowdfunding to refer to a wide range of practices often aiming at aggregating investors. ESMA notes that the concept of “nominee” is not defined in the ECSPR.

ESMA further notes that the ECSPR does not explicitly prohibit ‘nominee entities’ from offering ‘nominee services’ related to the operation of a crowdfunding platform, the ‘nominee’ entity being involved at the initiative of the crowdfunding service provider or of the project owner.

ESMA is nevertheless of the view that the provision of such ‘nominee’ services’, being part of the “*operation of the crowdfunding platform*” within the meaning of Article 1(1) of the ECSPR should (i) be described in the application submitted to the authorising competent authority under Article 12 of the ECSPR and (ii) comply with the provisions of the ECSPR.

ESMA underlines that CSPs shall inform the authorising competent authority – at the time of the authorisation or, if the authorisation has already been granted, prior to implementation of their intention use a nominee structure. Information should include a detailed description about the ‘nominee’ structure that they intend to use, as well as the div of the nominee agreement between the nominee structure and investors with specific consideration of the arrangements concerning ownership, voting and exit rights, costs and implications in terms of applicable national laws, as

requested by the authorising competent authority. The information provided shall enable the competent authority to perform a comprehensive assessment of the legal features of the nominee entity, the nominee agreement, and to determine whether the suggested 'nominee structure' is compliant with the ECSPR, notably, but not limited to, with the provisions listed below.

- Point (a)(ii) of Article 2(1):

Point (a)(ii) of Article 2(1) of the ECSPR and Recital 22 make clear that, pursuant to the ECSPR, the investment by an investor in a crowdfunding project shall be direct, in the sense that only transferable securities and admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes issued by project owners or a special purpose vehicle can be purchased by crowdfunding investors on a crowdfunding platform authorised in accordance with the ECSPR. This means that the decision as to which crowdfunding project should be financed should always be left to investors. ESMA therefore considers that nominee structures may provide their services in the context of crowdfunding services only once the relevant investor has taken an investment decision in respect of the specific project in which it intends to invest.

CSPs wishing to use a nominee structure should also carefully assess any structure in which investors' funds are not used by the nominee structure to purchase the transferable securities or the admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes issued by a project owner or an SPV as indicated by the relevant investor in their investment decision, as such arrangements are unlikely to comply with Point (a)(ii) of Article 2(1) of the ECSPR.

Likewise, CSPs wishing to approve a new crowdfunding project on its platform are expected to ensure that no such arrangements have been set up by said project owner.

- Article 10(3) of the ECSPR

When nominee services are performed in relation to transferable securities or admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes offered on a crowdfunding platform in accordance with the ECSPR, and these services include the provision of custody services, the CSPs shall ensure that the ‘nominee structure’ complies with Article 10(3) of the ECSPR:

*“Transferable securities or admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes offered on a crowdfunding platform, and which can be registered in a financial instruments account opened in the name of an investor or which can be physically delivered to a custodian, shall be held in custody by the crowdfunding service provider or by a third party. An entity providing custody services shall hold an authorisation in accordance with Directive 2013/36/EU or 2014/65/EU”.*

CSPs are expected to provide the authorising competent authority with relevant information, as requested by the authorising competent authority, about the ‘nominee structure’ they wish to set up, be it at the time of the initial authorisation or after such authorisation is delivered. The information provided shall enable the competent authority to perform a case-by-case basis assessment aiming at determining whether the suggested ‘nominee structure’ involves the holding in custody, by the ‘nominee entity’, of transferable securities or admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes. Indeed, while it is acknowledged that ‘nominee’ service and custody are usually considered as two distinct concepts, they may, in practice, overlap.

If the national competent authority concludes that the suggested nominee arrangement is structured in a way that the transferable securities or admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes offered on the crowdfunding platform are

held in custody by the entity acting as 'nominee', then this entity will be required to be authorised in accordance with Directive 2013/36/EU or 2014/65/EU as per Article 10(3) of the ECSPR.

This assessment will be performed by competent authorities based on applicable European and national law. The following elements may, *inter alia*, be considered for the purpose of this assessment.

1. Holding of assets/Safekeeping: CSPs will be required to provide relevant information enabling competent authorities to assess whether or not the 'nominee' entity holds the client's assets and whether or not the 'nominee' entity appears as the legal owner of the assets (with the investor being the beneficial owner).
2. Administration/Ownership record keeping: CSPs will be required to provide relevant information enabling competent authorities to assess whether or not the 'nominee' entity keeps accurate records of ownership and/or perform administrative tasks in relation to the ownership of the transferable securities or admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes.
3. Asset-Segregation: CSPs will be required to provide relevant information enabling competent authorities to assess whether or not the 'nominee' keeps track of the respective ownership of investors into the various crowdfunding projects offered on the crowdfunding platform through segregated accounts.

ESMA Q&A\_801 may also be taken into account for the purpose of understanding the mentioned requirements with regard to the custody services<sup>1</sup>.

- Article 19(1) of the ECSPR

When investing in a crowdfunding project implies for investors the entry into a specific 'nominee' agreement, ESMA is of the view that investors should be duly informed of this feature. ESMA also believes that the information concerning the use of nominee structures in the provision of crowdfunding services are included in the information that CSPs provide to clients and shall thus be fair, clear and not misleading, as indicated in Article 19(1) of the ECSPR.

Article 19(1) of the ECSPR states that “*All information ... from crowdfunding service providers to clients about themselves, about the costs, financial risks and charges related to crowdfunding services or investments, about the crowdfunding project selection criteria, and about the nature of, and risks associated with, their crowdfunding services shall be fair, clear and not misleading.*”.

- Article 23 of the ECSPR

When investing in a crowdfunding project implies for investors to enter into a specific 'nominee' agreement, ESMA is also of the view that this information should be clearly disclosed to investors in the KIIS.

ESMA believes that the information provided to investors should include, where applicable, (i) the key features of the nominee agreement (including its purpose, the div on the ownership of the instruments, the exercise of investor rights etc. and how they comply with national law requirements), (ii) the costs of entering into such agreement as well as the main risks (e.g., with regard to the possible consequences of the nominee's bankruptcy) and (iii) information about the entity performing the

service.

In particular, and in line with Article 23 of the ECSPR and Delegated Regulation 2022/2119<sup>2</sup>:

- When the nominee structure is deemed by the competent authority to provide custody services as referred to in Article 10(3) of the ECSPR, the relevant information on the div of the authorised entity performing the custody services shall be provided in the section “*Custody and delivery of [transferable securities] or [admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes] to investors*” of the KIIS as referred to in Annex 1 (point (e) of Part D) of the ECSPR and as further explained in point (e) of Part D of the Annex to Delegated Regulation 2022/2119.
- Part D of the KIIS on *Information related to the offer of transferable securities and admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes* as well as Part F of the KIIS on *Investor rights* should be duly reviewed and adapted to the case in which the legal ownership of financial instruments and admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes is assigned to a nominee structure (and investors remain beneficial owners). ESMA believes that at least the following information should be provided in the KIIS:
- Clear indication that the decision to subscribe transferable securities and admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes encompasses the entry into a ‘nominee’ agreement.

1. Concise explanation of the purpose of the ‘nominee’ agreement and of its functioning during the subscription, holding and sale and re-sale (exit) phases.

- Explanation of how the rights (ownership and voting) attached to the transferable securities and admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes offered by the project owner or the SPV will be exercised and protected where legal ownership of the securities rests with the nominee entity, including a clear outline of the procedures by which investors may assert their rights, participate in decision-making, receive distributions, and address potential disputes. This disclosure should clarify any limitations or special processes that apply in such structures, ensuring investors understand how their beneficial interests are represented and safeguarded when a nominee acts on their behalf as the legal holder of the securities.

2. If the entry into a nominee agreement is not mandatory (i.e. if investors are able to subscribe for shares of the crowdfunding project without entering into a nominee agreement) or not.

- Part H of the KIIS on *Fees, information and legal redress of the KIIS* should provide information on the costs for investors associated with the provision of the nominee services.

-----

## *Endnotes*

1. Please see [ESMA\\_QA\\_801](#)
2. [Commission Delegated Regulation \(EU\) 2022/2119](#) of 13 July 2022 supplementing Regulation (EU) 2020/1503 of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to regulatory technical standards for the key investment information sheet.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2579**

**Submission Date**

20/06/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

MiCA

### **Topic**

Crypto assets

## **Subject Matter**

Shared order book model

## **Question**

Under the Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCA), is it permissible for an EU trading platform for crypto-assets that is operated by a crypto-asset service provider (CASP) authorised under MiCA to pool its order book with that of one or more non-

EU trading platforms operated by an entity or entities that are not authorised as CASPs under MiCA?

## ESMA Answer

---

20-06-2025

Original language

No, this model would be in breach of the authorization requirements under Article 59 of MiCA and would constitute the unauthorized provision of the crypto-asset service of operation of a trading platform for crypto-assets in the Union by the unauthorized entities whose platform(s) share the order book with the EU-authorized CASP.

Reference is made to the model where two or more crypto-asset platforms merge their individual order books into a single, unified order book from which orders are matched. This model involves - as operators of said shared order book - one or more entities that are not authorised as CASPs under MiCA.

ESMA understand that this integrated model enables buy and sell orders from different platforms to be combined into one aggregated order book so that multiple trading platforms (including non-EU ones) can access the same liquidity pool, allowing orders from clients across different platforms to be matched.

According to Article 3(18) of MiCA, the service of operation of a trading platform for crypto-assets means '*the management of one or more multilateral systems, which*

*bring together or facilitate the bringing together of multiple third-party purchasing and selling interests in crypto-assets, in the system and in accordance with its rules, in a way that results in a contract, either by exchanging crypto-assets for funds or by the exchange of crypto-assets for other crypto-assets*'. In the view of ESMA, the management of an order book is one of the fundamental parts of the management of multilateral systems bringing together or facilitating the bringing together of multiple third-party purchasing or selling interests in crypto-assets.

On this basis, ESMA is of the view that it should be regarded as falling within the scope of the crypto-asset service defined in Article 3(1)(18) of MiCA. Hence, the service should be regarded as being carried out by each entity operating the different order books that are being shared.

It ensues that, in accordance with Article 59 of MiCA, any person managing said order book should be authorised to do so under Article 63 of MiCA (or should have notified its intention to operate a trading platform for crypto-assets in accordance with Article 60 of MiCA).

Thus, in ESMA's view, Articles 59, 60 and 63 of MiCA prohibit an order book managed with entities that are not authorised as crypto-asset service providers (CASPs) under MiCA.

This Q&A does not assess whether other types of shared order books would fully comply with all provisions of MiCA.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2576**

**Submission Date**

19/06/2025

---

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Prospectus Regulation 2017/1129

### **Topic**

Publication of prospectus

### **Historic Question Reference**

ESMA, Questions and Answers on the Prospectus Regulation, version 12 (the “ESMA Prospectus Q&A”), Qs 4.2 and 15.7.

### **Additional Legal Reference**

The (Swedish) Act (2019:414) with supplementary provisions to the EU Prospectus Regulation (the “Swedish Supplementary Act”), Ch. 2, Sec. 1.; Regulation (EU) 2024/2809 (the “Listing Act”)

## **Subject Matter**

The calculation of offers of warrants and/or units consisting of warrants and shares in relation to exemptions from the prospectus obligation in the Prospectus Regulation.

## **Question**

1. Member State incorporated exemptions in accordance with Article 3(2) item (b) of the Prospectus Regulation. Should a rule, incorporated by a Member State in accordance with Article 3(2) item (b) of the Prospectus Regulation, granting an exemption from the prospectus obligation be interpreted so that the “total consideration” of an offer of warrants only includes the consideration paid in conjunction with the initial offer, and not the strike price of the underlying securities?;

2. Offers of warrants as a part of units. How should the phrase “total consideration” be interpreted in relation to offers of units consisting of shares (offered against consideration) and warrants (offered free of charge)? Should the “total consideration” only include the consideration for the shares and thus exclude the strike price of the underlying securities?; and

3. The warrants’ exercise period. Does the date of the occurrence of the warrants’ exercise period, in relation to the date of the initial offer, affect this interpretation and how the calculation of the “total consideration” is to be conducted? Specifically, does it have an impact on how the calculation is to be conducted if the exercise period occurs within the 12-month period? Is there any difference in how you should perform the calculation if the exercise period occurs within either 3, 6, 9 or 12 months from the date of the initial offer? Does it make any difference whether the warrants are offered in the form of a unit?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2575**

---

**Submission Date**

18/06/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Undertakings for Collective Investment in Transferable Securities Directive (UCITS)  
Directive 2009/65/EC

### **Topic**

Disclosures

## **Subject Matter**

Updates of notification letters for the cross-border marketing of UCITS

## **Question**

When, pursuant to Article 93(8) of Directive 2009/65/EC, a UCITS gives written notice to the competent authorities of both the UCITS home Member State and the

UCITS host Member States, of a change to the information in the notification letter submitted in accordance with Article 93(1) of Directive 2009/65/EC, or a change regarding share classes to be marketed, should the documents referred to in Article 93(2) of Directive 2009/65/EC be included?

## ESMA Answer

---

18-06-2025

Original language

No, the documents referred to in Article 93(2) of Directive 2009/65/EC, should not be included. The obligation of UCITS to give written notice of amendments to information already provided in a notification letter of cross-border marketing should be understood as covering only the updated information in Annex 1 of the [Commission Implementing Regulation \(EU\) 2024/910](#) compared to the previous notification. Amendments to fund documents should not be covered by the obligation of written notice of Article 93(8) of Directive 2009/65/EC.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2570**

**Submission Date**

16/06/2025

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 - Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR)

### **Topic**

Leverage

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Articles 2(4)(e), 2(13), 7(1) and 9(2)

### **Subject Matter**

Article 9 financial products

### **Question**

Further to joint SFDR Q&A V.1, can the European Commission specify for financial products disclosing under Article 9 SFDR what investments count as “investments for certain specific purposes such as hedging and liquidity”, including whether investments in Money Market Funds (MMFs) count as such investments?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2569**

**Submission Date**

16/06/2025

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 - Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR)

### **Topic**

Disclosures

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Articles 2(4)(e), 2(13), 7(1) and 9(2)

## **Subject Matter**

Status of PAI consideration under Article 7 SFDR as a promotion of an environmental/social characteristic under Article 8 SFDR

**Question**

Does the disclosure of the consideration of principal adverse impacts of investment decisions on sustainability factors under Article 7(1) SFDR automatically qualify as the promotion of an environmental or social characteristic under Article 8 SFDR?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2568**

**Submission Date**

16/06/2025

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 - Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR)

### **Topic**

AIFMD scope

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Articles 2(4)(e), 2(13), 7(1) and 9(2)

## **Subject Matter**

Financial products' PAI disclosures

## **Question**

What financial product disclosures are required from a non-EU AIF where it is only marketed outside the EU by either (1) an EU AIFM or (2) non-EU AIFM? Would a non-EU or EU AIFM acting as a delegated portfolio manager for the non-EU AIF make any difference in either scenario?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2566**

---

**Submission Date**

10/06/2025

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Central Securities Depositories Regulation (CSDR) Regulation (EU) No 909/2014-PTR- CSDR

### **Topic**

Settlement discipline - Cash penalties: process

### **Subject Matter**

Passing on of cash penalties throughout the settlement chain

### **Question**

Should cash penalties be passed on throughout the settlement chain?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2560**

---

**Submission Date**

03/06/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014 - Investor Protection and Intermediaries

### **Topic**

Inducements

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 39a, Paragraph 1

## **Subject Matter**

Payment for order flow (PFOF) prohibition: scope for rebates or discounts on transaction fees or any other benefits for investment firms acting on behalf of retail

clients or opt-in professional clients

### Question

Which type of rebates or discounts on transaction fees or any other benefits for investment firms acting on behalf of retail clients or opt-in professional clients are out of the scope of the prohibition to receive payment for order flow specified in Article 39a MiFIR?

### ESMA Answer

---

03-03-2026

Original language

#### Answer provided by the European Commission

According to Article 39a (1), second subparagraph of MiFIR, rebates or discounts on the transaction fees of execution venues, which are permitted under the approved and public tariff structure of a trading venue in the Union or of a third-country trading venue, which exclusively benefit the client, and which do not result in a monetary benefit to the investment firm, are out-of-the scope of the prohibition to receive PFOF. Those tariff structures should however comply with Article 5 of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/573, which sets out requirements to ensure fair and non-discriminatory fee structures<sup>2</sup>.

---

(2) Trading venues shall not offer their members, participants or clients a fee structure whereby, once their trades exceed a given threshold, all of their trades benefit from a lower fee for a set period, including those trades that were executed prior to reaching that threshold.” Article 5 of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/573 of 6 June 2016 supplementing Directive 2014/65/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on markets in financial instruments with regard to regulatory technical standards on requirements to ensure fair and non-discriminatory co-location services and fee structure“.

**Disclaimer:**

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2559**

---

**Submission Date**

03/06/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014 - Investor Protection and Intermediaries

### **Topic**

Inducements

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 39a

## **Subject Matter**

Payment for order flow (PFOF) prohibition and OTC execution of client orders

## Question

Does the prohibition of receiving payment for order flow (PFOF) apply to situations where the order is not executed on a trading venue, for instance for products traded over the counter (OTC)?

## ESMA Answer

---

03-03-2026

Original language

### Answer provided by the European Commission

The scope of application of Article 39a of MiFIR should be considered taking into account the core policy objectives of MiFIR, including:

- (a) investor protection;
- (b) execution of orders in the best interest of clients.

Since those objectives support the broadest possible coverage of execution venues, the prohibition should be understood as applying not only to transactions executed on a trading venue, but also to transactions executed over the counter (OTC).

That interpretation would also be consistent with the definition of an “execution venue” set out in Article 64(1), second subparagraph, of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/565.<sup>1</sup>

---

(1) Execution venue’ includes a regulated market, an MTF, an OTF, a systematic internaliser, or a market maker or other liquidity provider or an entity that performs a

similar function in a third country to the functions performed by any of the foregoing.” (Article 64(1) Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/565).

**Disclaimer:**

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2558**

---

**Submission Date**

03/06/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014 - Investor Protection and Intermediaries

### **Topic**

Inducements

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 39a

## **Subject Matter**

Payment for order flow (PFOF) prohibition and client instructions for order executions

## Question

Does the prohibition of receiving payment for order flow (PFOF) apply to situations where the client provided a specific instruction to the investment firm to execute the order on a particular execution venue?

## ESMA Answer

---

03-03-2026

Original language

### Answer provided by the European Commission

Yes, Article 39a of MiFIR does not make any distinction between orders executed with or without specific instructions from clients. Therefore, the prohibition of PFOF also applies where the client instructed the investment firm to execute the order on a specific execution venue.

### Disclaimer:

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2557**

**Submission Date**

03/06/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014 - Investor Protection and Intermediaries

### **Topic**

Inducements

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 39a, Paragraph 1

## **Subject Matter**

Investment firms' use of rebates and discounts to lower fees for clients under the payment for order flow (PFOF) prohibition

## Question

Under Article 39a of Regulation (EU) 2014/600/EU (MIFIR), are investment firms allowed to use rebates and discounts on the transaction fees of execution venues to lower fees for clients?

## ESMA Answer

---

03-03-2026

Original language

### Answer provided by the European Commission

Yes, investment firms are allowed to use rebates and discounts to lower fees for clients but only where they comply and are able to demonstrate their compliance with all of the following conditions set out in Article 39a(1) of MiFIR:

- (a) the rebate or discount on the transaction fees of execution venues is permitted under the approved and public tariff structure of the relevant trading venue in the Union or of the relevant third-country trading venue;
- (b) the rebate or the discount exclusively benefits the client and not the firm;
- (c) they do not result in a monetary benefit to the investment firm

### Disclaimer:

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities.*

*The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudge the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2552**

**Submission Date**

28/05/2025

---

Status: Published Answer Updated

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

MiCA

### **Topic**

White paper

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 5(2) of MiCA

## **Subject Matter**

Application of Title II requirements to CASPs operating a trading platform for crypto-assets

## Question

Article 5(2) of MiCA states that “when a crypto-asset is admitted to trading on the initiative of a trading platform and a crypto-asset white paper has not been published in accordance with Article 9 in the cases required by this Regulation [emphasis added], the operator of that trading platform for crypto-assets shall comply with the requirements set out in paragraph 1 of this Article”.

In turn, Article 9 requires offerors and persons seeking admission to trading of crypto-assets other than ARTs or EMTs to publish their crypto-asset white papers and any marketing materials.

However, recital 22 of MiCA states that “Where crypto-assets have no identifiable issuer, they should not fall within the scope of Title II, III or IV of this Regulation”.

Does the expression “in the cases required by this Regulation” mean that Article 5(2) exempts operators of trading platforms from the requirements of Article 5 for crypto-assets without an identifiable issuer?

## ESMA Answer

---

18-02-2026

Original language

### Answer provided by the European Commission

Yes. Article 5(2) MiCA is not conceptualized to cover cases where crypto-assets have no identifiable issuer and are therefore not subject to Title II of MiCA. The Article requires CASPs operating a trading platform to comply with the requirements set out in Article 5(1) MiCA, where they initiate the admission of crypto-assets to trading and no white paper has been published ‘in the cases required by this

Regulation'. Hence, this provision is specifically and exclusively limited to cases, where a white paper is required by MiCA. However, as clarified by recital 22, crypto-assets without an identifiable issuer do not fall within the scope of Title II. It follows that no white paper is required for these crypto-assets under MiCA and that, consequently, Article 5(2) MiCA does not apply to them. Nevertheless, in accordance with the wording in recital 22 that CASPs 'providing services in respect of such crypto-assets should be covered by this Regulation', CASPs operating a trading platform are not relieved from obtaining authorisation and complying with their general obligations, including a suitability assessment of any admitted crypto-assets and determination of whether an identifiable issuer exists, i.e. whether a white paper is required. Similarly, and in line with the above, Articles 76(1)(2) and 143(2)(b) MiCA impose requirements on CASPs operating a trading platform and specifically reference to 'cases required by this Regulation'. Finally, Article 66(3) shall be interpreted as meaning that operators of trading platforms must provide clients with hyperlinks to any white papers for the crypto-assets in relation to which they are providing services, provided that a white paper is required under MiCA.

**Disclaimer:**

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# ESMA\_QA\_2551

**Submission Date**

28/05/2025

Status: Published Answer Updated

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

MiCA

### **Topic**

Crypto-Asset Service Provider (CASP)

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 3(1)(22) of MiCA

### **Subject Matter**

Overlap between offers of crypto-assets and placing

### **Question**

Can persons who are authorized in writing by the issuer to offer crypto-assets to the public conduct this activity on a commercial basis, continuously, repeatedly, and possibly for different issuers (whether concurrently or consecutively) without having a MiCA CASP license for the crypto-asset service 'placing of crypto-assets'?

## ESMA Answer

---

18-02-2026

Original language

### Answer provided by the European Commission

Yes, where a person offers to the public crypto assets upon the written consent of the issuer, for instance, under the conditions set out in Article 16(1) MiCA, second sub paragraph, that person acts on behalf of the issuer and no CASP license is to be required, where that activity is not exercised in the context of the provision of the crypto-services. However, where the person offering crypto-assets to the public engages in the placing of crypto assets or in any other crypto-asset service covered by MiCA carried out on a professional basis, it is to be considered as a crypto-service provider as defined under Article 3(22) MiCA, and that person must obtain a CASP license for the relevant services. In cases where a person is offering crypto-assets to the public on behalf of the issuer, that person must comply with provisions relating to the offer and marketing of the crypto-assets as specified under MiCA (for instance, for ARTs, the person is to comply with Articles 27, 29 and 40, - without prejudice to the provisions relating to CASPs if that person provides crypto-asset services on a professional basis).

**Disclaimer:**

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# ESMA\_QA\_2550

**Submission Date**

28/05/2025

Status: Published Answer Updated

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

MiCA

### **Topic**

Crypto-Asset Service Provider (CASP)

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 75 of MiCA

## **Subject Matter**

Payouts in fiat currency by CASPs in the context of exchange services

## **Question**

Should the business model whereby a crypto-asset service provider (CASP) provides exchange services but only ever allows clients to collect their balance in fiat currency be allowed?

## ESMA Answer

---

18-02-2026

Original language

### Answer provided by the European Commission

No, business model whereby a crypto-asset service provider (CASP) provides exchange services where clients are only allowed to collect their balance in fiat currency, without having the possibility to have their crypto-asset transferred is not permitted under MiCA.

Under MiCA, "exchange services" refer to the professional activity of exchanging crypto-assets for fiat currency (which falls within the definition of 'funds') or for other crypto-assets. This service is one of several defined crypto-asset services that require a CASP, to obtain authorization.

It is possible for CASPs to propose to their clients that their balance is collected in fiat currencies instead of in crypto assets.

However, where a client purchases a crypto asset, it gives rise to an obligation on the CASP to transfer the purchased crypto-asset to the client. In that respect, the white paper to be drawn under MiCA must indicate «information on the method and time schedule of transferring the purchased asset-referenced token to the holders».

A service whereby an entity offers clients to “buy” a crypto-asset that is never delivered, and the client can only and exclusively receive the fiat currency value of such crypto-asset, is not to be allowed as a crypto-asset exchange service.

**Disclaimer:**

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudge the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# ESMA\_QA\_2547

**Submission Date**

27/05/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation (EU) 2022/2554 - The Digital Operational Resilience Act (DORA)

### **Topic**

Other DORA topics

## **Subject Matter**

Does DORA also apply to non-EU AIFM?

### **Question**

The regulation applies to managers of alternative investment funds according to Article 2, point (k) of DORA. According to Article 3, (point 44), of DORA a manager of alternative investment funds is defined as “a manager of alternative investment

funds as defined in Article 4(1), point (b), of Directive 2011/61/EU". According to Article 4(1), point (b), of Directive 2011/61/EU (AIFM Directive) "AIFMs' means legal persons whose regular business is managing one or more AIFs". We are of the understanding that Article 4(1), point (b), does not exclude non-EU AIFM. EU AIFM and non-EU AIFM are defined in Article 4(1), point (L) and point (ab). Since DORA only refers to article 4(1), point (b), of the AIFM Directive and not to article 4(1), point (L), we are wondering if DORA applies to both EU and non-EU AIFM as the definition implies.

## ESMA Answer

---

27-05-2025

Original language

DORA applies to managers of alternative investment funds according to Article 2, point (k) of DORA, except for those managers of alternative investment funds referred to in Article 3(2) of Directive 2011/61/EU. According to Article 3, (point 44), of DORA, a manager of alternative investment funds is defined as "a manager of alternative investment funds as defined in Article 4(1), point (b), of Directive 2011/61/EU".

However, the definition of the managers included in Article 4(1), point (b), of Directive 2011/61/EU should be read in conjunction with the scope of application of Directive 2011/61/EU, contained in Article 2 of that Directive.

Hence, in general terms - and provided that this answer is not carrying out a detailed recollection of all the criteria referred to in Article 2 of Directive 2011/61/EU - Article 4(1), point (b), in conjunction with Article 2 of Directive 2011/61/EU implies that DORA applies to EU AIFMs and also to non-EU AIFMs, which manage one or

more EU AIFs, and to non-EU AIFMs which market one or more AIFs in the Union irrespective of whether such AIFs are EU AIFs or non-EU AIFs, to the extent that they benefit from the management and marketing passport in accordance with Articles 39, 40 and 41 AIFMD. Non-EU AIFMs will only be subject to DORA obligations once the European Commission adopts Delegated Acts extending the marketing and management passport to them.

# ESMA\_QA\_2671

**Submission Date**

09/05/2025

---

Status: Question Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

MiCA

### **Topic**

White paper

## **Subject Matter**

Exemption from white paper requirements when offering a crypto-asset other than an ART or EMT

## **Question**

Is the preparation of a white paper under MiCA mandatory for crypto-asset offerings that fall under the exceptions in Article 4(2) and 4(3) of MiCA, where the offeror only

intends to have the token traded on DEX platforms or CEXs in other jurisdictions (i.e. outside the European Union)?

# **ESMA\_QA\_2533**

---

**Submission Date**

24/04/2025

Status: Question Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR) Regulation (EU) No 600/2014-  
Secondary Markets

### **Level 2 Regulation**

Regulation 2017/583 - RTS on transparency requirements in respect of non-equity  
financial instruments (RTS 2)

### **Topic**

Non-equity transparency

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Draft RTS 2 as published by ESMA on 16 December 2024

### **Subject Matter**

Post-trade deferral regime for bonds, ETCs, ETNs and SFPs under the draft RTS 2 published by ESMA on 16 December 2024

### **Question**

a. Regarding the new post-trade deferral regime categories 3 and 4 for bonds: Which of the following publications (i.e., price-deferred trade, volume-deferred trade or both) will be required to contain the flags 'LLF3' and 'LIF4'? (Please see Draft RTS 2, paragraph 78 on page 29 and Annex II, Table III on page 160).

b. Regarding the new post-trade deferral regime for ETCs, ETNs and SFPs: Which of the following publications (i.e., price-deferred trade, volume-deferred trade or both) will be required to contain the flag 'DEFF'? (Please see Draft RTS 2, Annex II, Table III on page 161).

# ESMA\_QA\_2711

---

**Submission Date**

15/04/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

MiCA

### **Topic**

Crypto-Asset Service Provider (CASP)

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 78(5)

### **Subject Matter**

Scope of the term “trading platform for crypto-assets” in Article 78(5) of MiCA (executing client orders outside of a trading platform)

## Question

Where a crypto-asset service provider (CASP) provides execution of orders for crypto-assets on behalf of clients (as defined in Article 3(1)(21) of MiCA), does the obligation under Article 78(5) of MiCA for the CASP to inform their clients about the possibility that their orders “might be executed outside a trading platform” and to obtain “the prior express consent of their clients before proceeding to execute their orders outside a trading platform” apply whenever a CASP’s order execution policy provides for the possibility that client orders might be executed outside of CASPs that are authorized in accordance with Article 59 of MiCA to provide the service of ‘operation of a trading platform for crypto-assets’ as defined in Article 3(1)(18) of MiCA?

## ESMA Answer

---

08-12-2025

Original language

Yes. The term “trading platform” used in Article 78(5) of MiCA should be interpreted as exclusively referring to entities that are authorized in accordance with Article 59 of MiCA to provide the service of ‘operation of a trading platform for crypto-assets’ as defined in Article 3(1)(18) of MiCA. This interpretation is in line with the purpose of Article 78(5) of MiCA and aims to ensure that clients of CASPs are informed about, and provide their express consent to, the execution of their orders within arrangements that may be subject to lesser regulatory scrutiny or offer a lower level of protection compared to trading platforms authorised under MiCA.

Whenever the execution policy of an entity authorized in accordance with Article 59 of MiCA to provide the service of ‘execution of order for crypto-assets on behalf of clients’ as defined in Article 3(1)(21) of MiCA provides for the possibility that client

orders might be executed outside of CASPs authorized in accordance with Article 59 of MiCA to provide the service of 'operation of a trading platform for crypto-assets' as defined in Article 3(1)(18) of MiCA (e.g., OTC venues, third-country trading platforms, decentralized exchanges), such a CASP *"shall inform their clients about that possibility and shall obtain the prior express consent of their clients before proceeding to execute their orders outside a trading platform, either in the form of a general agreement or with respect to individual transactions"*.

# **ESMA\_QA\_2522**

**Submission Date**

07/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Prospectus Regulation 2017/1129

### **Topic**

Initial Public Offer/IPO

## **Subject Matter**

New exemptions for fungible securities in Prospectus Regulation.

## **Question**

In relation to the statement of continuous compliance with reporting and disclosure obligations as referred to in Annex IX, point IV, of Regulation (EU) 2017/1129, when is an issuer considered to have 'continuous compliance' and to which time period

should the statement pertain (i.e. does the statement need to cover the entire period that the issuer's securities have been admitted to trading)?

## ESMA Answer

---

07-04-2025

Original language

Answer provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation

Issuers are considered to be compliant with reporting and disclosure obligations as referred to in Annex IX, point IV, of Regulation (EU) 2017/1129 for the purpose of the statement of continuous compliance if they are compliant with those obligation at the moment when an offer of securities to the public in scope of the exemption under Article 1(4), point (da) or (db) is made, or when admission to trading on a regulated market in scope of the exemption under Article 1(5), point (ba), is sought.

*Disclaimer:*

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot*

*prejudge the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# ESMA\_QA\_2521

**Submission Date**

07/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Prospectus Regulation 2017/1129

### **Topic**

Initial Public Offer/IPO

## **Subject Matter**

New exemptions for fungible securities in Prospectus Regulation.

## **Question**

To qualify for the exemption set out in Article 1(5), point (ba), of Regulation (EU) 2017/1129, one condition is that the securities to be admitted to trading on a regulated market must not be issued in connection with a takeover by means of an

exchange offer, a merger, or a division. Does that exemption refer to a takeover by means of an exchange offer that falls within the scope of Directive 2004/25/EC?

## ESMA Answer

---

07-04-2025

Original language

Answer provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation

Yes, the exemption set out in Article 1(5), point (ba) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1129, specifically refers to a takeover by means of an exchange offer that falls within the scope of Directive 2004/25/EC.

*Disclaimer:*

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# ESMA\_QA\_2520

**Submission Date**

07/04/2025

---

Status: Forwarded to EC/Public Consultation/Other

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Prospectus Regulation 2017/1129

### **Topic**

Public offer

## **Subject Matter**

New exemptions for fungible securities in Prospectus Regulation.

### **Question**

When applying the exemptions in Article 1(4)(da) and (db) as well as Article 1(5)(ba), when is an issuer considered to be subject to a restructuring or to insolvency proceedings?

# ESMA\_QA\_2519

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

### **Question**

Could non-EU entities, which are subject to the clearing obligation, be subject to the active account requirement?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

No. Article 7a of EMIR only applies to financial counterparties and non-financial counterparties, which are clearly defined under Article 2, points (8) and (9), of EMIR, respectively.

***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2518**

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

## **Question**

How should the calculation mentioned in the second sentence of Article 7a(4), fifth subparagraph, of EMIR, be done, in order for counterparties to establish whether

they can benefit from the derogation regarding the number of trades in each of the most relevant categories to fulfil the representativeness obligation?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

First, the counterparty shall determine the number of trades it should clear on an annual average basis in each of the most relevant subcategories per class of derivative contracts and per reference period defined in accordance with Article 7a(8) of EMIR.

Second, where, all subcategories taken together, the resulting number of trades to be cleared exceeds half of the total number of trades of that counterparty cleared over the preceding 12 months, the representativeness obligation referred to in Article 7a(3), point (d), of EMIR, shall be considered fulfilled where that counterparty clears at least one trade in each of the most relevant subcategories per class of derivative contracts per reference period.

### ***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the*

*Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# ESMA\_QA\_2517

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

## **Question**

Should counterparties that clear more than 85% of the relevant derivatives contracts in the EU still comply with the representativeness obligation under Article

7a(3), point d, of EMIR and the related reporting obligation under Article 7b(1) of EMIR?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

Counterparties that already clear 85% of the relevant derivatives contracts in a CCP authorised under Article 14 of EMIR, are not exempted from the representativeness obligation under Article 7a(3), point (d), of EMIR.

In accordance with Article 7a(5) of EMIR, such counterparties are exempted from all of the following:

- the operational requirements referred to in Article 7a(3), points (a), (b) and (c), of EMIR;
- the stress-testing requirement referred to in Article 7a(4), fourth subparagraph, of EMIR;
- the reporting requirements referred to in Article 7b of EMIR.

***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in*

*clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2516**

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

### **Question**

Could counterparties that are subject to the active account requirements (i.e. to hold an active account, clear at least a representative number of trades in this

active account and the subsequent reporting requirements) and that are part of a group subject to consolidated supervision in the Union, outsource these obligations to another entity of the group?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

Yes.

However, where an entity chooses to outsource the tasks related to the requirements to which it is subject to according to Article 7a of EMIR, that entity remains legally responsible for the performance of such tasks.

***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2515**

---

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

## **Question**

Could counterparties that are subject to the active account requirements and that are part of a group, outsource the notification to the relevant competent authority

and ESMA, as mentioned in the second subparagraph of Article 7a(1) of EMIR, to another entity of the group subject to consolidated supervision in the Union that it belongs to ?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

Yes.

However, where an entity chooses to outsource the submission of the notification under Article 7a(1) of EMIR, that entity remains responsible for the timely submission as well as the accuracy of the information transmitted to the relevant competent authority and ESMA in such notification.

***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union*

*and national courts.*

# ESMA\_QA\_2514

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

## **Question**

Should the requirement to clear at least a representative number of trades in an active account held at an EU CCP be performed at individual level or group level for

the counterparties belonging to a group?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

As clarified in Recital 12 of Regulation (EU) 2024/2987, the representativeness requirement referred to in Article 7a(3), point (d), of EMIR applies at entity level and should be fulfilled by the entity that has been determined to be subject to the active account requirements in accordance with Article 7a(1) of EMIR.

As such, should the entity have outstanding contracts only for a subset of categories of derivatives referred to in Article 7a(6) of EMIR, that entity would be required to meet the representativeness requirement only for those contracts regardless of the activity of the other entities in the group. Relatedly, should the entity not have any outstanding derivative contracts belonging to the categories referred to in Article 7a(6) of EMIR, that entity would not be required to conclude such contracts or to meet any of the related requirements under Article 7a of EMIR.

### ***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the*

*Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2513**

---

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

## **Question**

Regarding the requirement to clear at least a representative number of trades, should the trades be representative of the activity of the group or of the activity of

the individual entities within the group?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

As clarified in Recital 12 of Regulation (EU) 2024/2987, the representativeness requirement referred to in Article 7a(3), point (d), of EMIR applies at entity level and should be fulfilled by the entity that has been determined to be subject to the active account requirements in accordance with Article 7a(1) of EMIR.

The overall activity of the group as referred to in Article 7a(2) should only be taken into account to determine whether the entity that is part of that group is subject to the obligations in relation to Article 7a(2) of EMIR. An entity subject to the representativeness requirement should determine the number of transactions it needs to clear – directly or indirectly, in an EU CCP on the basis of all its own activity in derivative contracts belonging to the categories referred to in Article 7a(6) of EMIR.

***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the*

*Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudge the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# ESMA\_QA\_2512

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

### **Question**

Should the requirement to hold at least one active account at an EU CCP be performed at individual level or at group level?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

The requirement under Article 7a(1) of EMIR to establish clearing arrangements, whether directly or indirectly, at a CCP authorised under Article 14 of EMIR, should be performed at individual level, provided that such entity does have outstanding derivative contracts belonging to the categories referred to in Article 7a(6) of EMIR.

***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# ESMA\_QA\_2511

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

## **Question**

Should the group level treatment mentioned in Article 7a(2) of EMIR apply to the calculation of the notional clearing volume outstanding mentioned in fourth

subparagraph of Article 7a(8) of EMIR?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

Yes. For the purpose of setting the duration of the reference period, which is also referred to in Article 7a(3), point (d), of EMIR, the calculation of the notional clearing volume outstanding mentioned in Article 7a(8), fourth subparagraph, of EMIR should apply the calculation method set out in Article 7a(2) of EMIR.

The representativeness obligation referred to in Article 7a(3), point (d), of EMIR nonetheless applies at entity level, as clarified in Recital 12 of Regulation (EU) 2024/2987.

***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudge the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# ESMA\_QA\_2510

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

## **Question**

Should the group level treatment mentioned in Article 7a(2) of EMIR apply to the calculation of the notional clearing volume outstanding mentioned in the second

subparagraph of Article 7a(4) of EMIR ?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

Yes. The calculation of the notional clearing volume outstanding mentioned in the second subparagraph of Article 7a(4) of EMIR should apply the calculation method set out in Article 7a(2) of EMIR.

The representativeness obligation to which the second subparagraph of Article 7a(4) of EMIR refers to nonetheless applies at entity level, as clarified in Recital 12 of Regulation (EU) 2024/2987.

***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2509**

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

### **Question**

Should the group level treatment mentioned in Article 7a(2) of EMIR apply to the calculation of both conditions mentioned in Article 7a(1)?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

The methodology to determine the fulfilment of the first condition of Article 7a(1) of EMIR, i.e. whether a counterparty is subject to the clearing obligation, is specified under Articles 4a and 10 of EMIR, respectively. There is therefore no need to perform a new calculation under Article 7a(2) of EMIR to establish whether that condition is met.

The group level calculation method set out in Article 7a(2) of EMIR shall apply to the second condition mentioned in Article 7a(1) of EMIR.

### ***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudge the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2508**

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

## **Question**

Does the group level treatment mentioned in Article 7a(2) of EMIR apply only to groups included in a consolidation in accordance with Directive 2013/36/EU (CRD

IV) or should it also include other groups, e.g. entities included in a consolidation in accordance with Directive 2013/34/EU ?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

The group level treatment referred to in Article 7a(2) of EMIR applies to any EU entity that is part of a group subject to consolidated supervision in the Union. This means that the group level treatment cannot be limited to groups included in a consolidation in accordance with Directive 2013/36/EU.

### ***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2507**

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

## **Question**

How should the percentage of derivative contracts belonging to the categories of derivatives subject to the active account requirement be calculated for the purpose

of the exemption mentioned in Article 7a(5) of EMIR?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

A counterparty can benefit from the exemption mentioned in Article 7a(5) of EMIR at any point in time by demonstrating that it clears at least 85 % of its derivative contracts belonging to the categories referred to in Article 7a(6) of EMIR at a CCP authorised under Article 14 of EMIR.

In order to determine whether it is above or below the 85% threshold, the counterparty shall divide the gross outstanding notional of derivative contracts belonging to the categories referred to in Article 7a(6) of EMIR cleared at CCPs authorised under Article 14 of EMIR (numerator) by the total gross outstanding notional of derivative contracts belonging to the categories referred to in Article 7a(6) of EMIR cleared at any CCP, authorised under Article 14 of EMIR, recognised under Article 25 of EMIR or otherwise (denominator).

***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the*

*Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# ESMA\_QA\_2506

**Submission Date**

04/04/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 648/2012 - OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR) - CCPs

### **Topic**

EU-CCPs

## **Subject Matter**

Active Account Requirement

### **Question**

To check whether counterparties are subject to the active account requirement, how should the positions to be compared to the clearing thresholds be calculated?

## ESMA Answer

---

10-07-2025

Original language

In order to determine whether they are subject to the active account requirements in accordance with Article 7a(1) of EMIR, counterparties should check whether they meet the two cumulative conditions:

1. they are subject to the clearing obligation in accordance with Articles 4a and 10 of EMIR; and
2. they exceed the clearing threshold in any of the categories of derivative contracts referred to in Article 7a(6) of EMIR, in an individual category listed in that paragraph or on aggregate across all categories listed in that paragraph.

The methodology to determine the fulfilment of the first condition is specified under Articles 4a and 10 of EMIR, respectively.

For the second condition, counterparties should follow the same methodology as for the first condition, but not with the same frequency (i.e. on a continuous basis rather than every 12 months as mentioned in Articles 4a and 10 of EMIR): once a counterparty is subject to the clearing obligation, it shall determine whether it is above the clearing thresholds in any of the categories of derivative contracts referred to in Article 7a(6) of EMIR, in an individual category or on aggregate across all categories, as the case may be, using the same methodology as described in Articles 4a and 10 of EMIR, on a continuous basis.

***Disclaimer in relation to the answers provided by the European Commission in accordance with Article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and*

*competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2502**

---

**Submission Date**

03/04/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 2020/1503 - European crowdfunding service providers for business

### **Topic**

Best Execution

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 2(1) of the ECSPR

## **Subject Matter**

Assessment of the entity to be considered as the project owner

## **Question**

How should point (h) of Article 2(1) of the ECSPR be applied for the purpose of identifying the project owner?

## ESMA Answer

---

03-04-2025

Original language

Several provisions of the ECSPR concern the project owner including Article 1(2)(c), points (i) and (ii) where a threshold of EUR 5 000 000 for a total consideration of crowdfunding offers made by a particular project owner is imposed (see also Recital 16 of the same Regulation).

Point (h) of Article 2(1) of the ECSPR defines the project owner as '*any natural or legal person who seeks funding through a crowdfunding platform*'.

In most cases, this definition is self-evident and the identification of the natural or legal person which will be considered as project owner for the purpose of the ECSPR is straightforward. However, the identification of the project owner sometimes proves to be more complicated, notably in those situations in which several entities or several layers of entities are involved.

ESMA acknowledges that the ECSPR does not contain provisions preventing a project owner from seeking funding for several crowdfunding projects either at the same time or successively.

At the same time, ESMA would like to clarify that the determination of the project owner shall be grounded on the economic and business reality of the crowdfunding project (in addition to the compliance with the rules set out in the ECSPR). CSPs should pay special attention to avoid practices consisting in designating as project owner an entity having insufficient or artificial link with the crowdfunding project.

When assessing whether a legal or natural person shall be considered as the project owner, CSPs may, *inter alia*, consider some or all of the following indicative elements:

- the entity launched and/or contributed to developing the crowdfunding project in its early stage,
- the entity has sufficient legal and economic ties to the crowdfunding project,
- *for investment-based crowdfunding*, the entity is issuing the transferable securities and the admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes directly or through a SPV,
- *for loan-based crowdfunding*, the entity is the one to which investors make available the amount they lend, and it is the entity that assumes an unconditional obligation to repay that amount to investors, together with the accrued interest, in accordance with the instalment payment schedule.

Lastly, it should be reminded that ultimately, this determination made by the CSP may be challenged by the relevant Competent Authority as part of its supervision powers following a case-by-case assessment taking into account the specificities of the crowdfunding project and the designated project owner.

# ESMA\_QA\_2501

**Submission Date**

03/04/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation 2020/1503 - European crowdfunding service providers for business

### **Topic**

Best Execution

### **Additional Legal Reference**

Article 25(3) of ECSPR

### **Subject Matter**

Bulletin Board - Disclosure obligations (point (b) of Article 25(3) of the ECSPR)

### **Question**

How should the disclosure obligation established in point (b) of Article 25(3) of the ECSPR be applied?

## ESMA Answer

---

03-04-2025

Original language

According to Article 25(1) of the ECSPR, crowdfunding service providers may operate a bulletin board on which they allow their clients to advertise interest in buying and selling loans, transferable securities or admitted instruments for crowdfunding purposes that were originally offered on their crowdfunding platforms.

Article 25(2) and Recital (55) of the ECSPR help to understand what activity can be or cannot be included in the scope of a bulletin board operated by a crowdfunding service provider. In particular, according to the recalled provisions, the bulletin board cannot be used to bring together buying and selling interests by means of the crowdfunding service provider's protocols or internal operating procedures in a way that results in a contract. The bulletin board shall therefore not consist of an internal matching system that executes client orders on a multilateral basis.

However, - and only in relation to transferable securities -, a crowdfunding service provider that is also authorised as an investment firm in accordance with Article 5 of MiFID II, or as a regulated market in accordance with Article 44 of that Directive (\*) may decide to operate a trading venue to bring together buying and selling interests concerning the transferable securities that were originally offered on its crowdfunding platform.

Article 25(3) of the ECSPR also provides some disclosure requirements concerning the users of the bulletin board. Among those, in particular, it is established that crowdfunding service providers (which operate a bulletin board) have to require their clients which advertise a sale of a loan, transferable security or admitted instrument for crowdfunding purposes “to make available the key investment information sheet” (point (b) of Article 25(3) of ECSPR). This document is prepared under the responsibility of the project owner when a crowdfunding offer is presented on a crowdfunding platform, and its contents are updated until the relevant crowdfunding offer is closed (\*\*).

ESMA acknowledges that the information reported in the KIIS might become outdated by the time the advertisement is made on the bulletin board. Consequently, ESMA believes that, whenever a client of a crowdfunding service provider advertises the sale of a loan, security or instrument on the bulletin board of that provider after the closing of the offer, the relevant crowdfunding service provider should ensure that the selling client indicates the date (month and year only) on which the KIIS was provided to that client.

---

## Endnotes

(\*) Recital 55 of the ECSPR.

See also Recital 8 of MiFIR (Regulation 600/2014) according to which bulletin boards are facilities where there is no genuine trade execution or arranging taking place in the system and are used for advertising buying and selling interests. For a more exhaustive understanding of the scope of activity allowed to bulletin boards, please refer to the [Final Report on ESMA Opinion on Trading Venue Perimeter](#) (2 February 2023, ESMA70-156-6360), available on the ESMA website.

(\*\*) According to Article 23(8) of the ECSPR, the crowdfunding service provider shall request the project owner to notify it of any change of information in order to keep the key investment information sheet updated at all times and for the duration of the crowdfunding offer. The crowdfunding service provider shall immediately inform investors who have made an offer to invest or expressed an interest in the crowdfunding offer about any material change to the information in the key investment information sheet that was notified to it.

# ESMA\_QA\_2496

**Submission Date**

27/03/2025

---

Status: Question Rejected

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

Regulation (EU) 2022/2554 - The Digital Operational Resilience Act (DORA)

### **Topic**

ICT-related incident

## **Subject Matter**

Incident report submission format

### **Question**

What is the submission format for the incident reports (initial notification, intermediate and final) that CTPPs and Financial Entities need to submit to the CA?

# ESMA\_QA\_2486

**Submission Date**

18/03/2025

---

Status: Published Answer Updated

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

MiCA

### **Topic**

Crypto-Asset Service Provider (CASP)

## **Subject Matter**

Interests earned from client funds deposited at credit institutions

### **Question**

Does MiCA permit crypto-asset service providers (CASPs) to earn interest on client funds deposited in a savings account at a credit institution?

## ESMA Answer

---

18-02-2026

Original language

### Answer provided by the European Commission

No, MiCAR does not permit crypto-asset service providers (CASPs) to earn interest on client funds deposited in a savings account at a credit institution. Article 70(1) to (3) of MiCAR is interpreted to mean that CASPs are obligated to deposit client funds in risk-free savings accounts and are not allowed to earn interest on them. This obligation is intended solely to benefit clients by securing their money. Any interest resulting from a CASPs procedures to comply with the requirement of Article 70(3) MiCAR must be transferred to the client, as this revenue stems from the client's funds.

### Disclaimer:

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2482**

**Submission Date**

14/03/2025

---

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

European Long-Term Investment Funds Regulation (ELTIF) Regulation (EU) 2015/760

### **Topic**

ELTIF

### **Subject Matter**

Redemption policy

### **Question**

Can ELTIFs set a percentage of liquid assets referred to in Article 9(1)(b) of the ELTIF Regulation that is lower than the maximum percentage referred to in

## ESMA Answer

---

14-03-2025

Original language

### ***Answer provided by the European Commission***

Yes, ELTIFs can set a lower percentage. Article 18(2)(d) of the ELTIF Regulation sets the maximum percentage of redemptions permitted at each redemption date. However, Article 18(2)(d) of the ELTIF Regulation does not prevent the ELTIF from applying a lower redemption limit (e.g. defined as a fixed percentage of the net assets, or a pre-defined absolute redemption, or with reference to a certain NAV percentage, or otherwise) than that stipulated in Article 18(2)(d) of the ELTIF Regulation.

### ***Disclaimer***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the*

*Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2481**

---

**Submission Date**

14/03/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

---

### **Level 1 Regulation**

European Long-Term Investment Funds Regulation (ELTIF) Regulation (EU) 2015/760

### **Topic**

ELTIF

## **Subject Matter**

Nationality-related eligibility restrictions on ELTIFs stemming from national law

## **Question**

a) Shall Article 1(3) of the ELTIF Regulation be understood as not allowing a national law, regulation or administrative practice, either generally for all ELTIFs or

specifically for some ELTIFs/specific situations, to require the master ELTIF to be established in the same Member State as the feeder ELTIF?

b) and c) May an ELTIF be required by national law, regulation or administrative practice to be authorised or established in a particular Member State when packaged in insurance products or embedded in pension/savings plans in order to be eligible as target investment? May any other provision or option provided for in the ELTIF Regulation be restricted by a national law, regulation or administrative practice for ELTIFs packaged in insurance products or embedded in pension/savings plans?

## ESMA Answer

---

14-03-2025

Original language

*Answer provided by the European Commission*

**Question a) Shall Article 1(3) of the ELTIF Regulation be understood as not allowing a national law, regulation or administrative practice, either generally for all ELTIFs or specifically for some ELTIFs/specific situations, to require the master ELTIF to be established in the same Member State as the feeder ELTIF?**

Yes, Article 1(3) of the ELTIF Regulation, which sets out that Member States shall not add any further requirements in the field covered by the ELTIF Regulation, should be understood as prohibiting Member States to introduce or impose upon

ELTIFs requirements, whether stemming from national law, regulations, guidance or administrative practices, pertaining to the domiciliation or the establishment of the master ELTIF or the feeder ELTIF. The ELTIF Regulation contains the definitions of “master ELTIFs” and “feeder ELTIFs”.

In addition, Article 5(1)(e)(iv) of the ELTIF Regulation, read in conjunction with Recital (25) of Regulation 2023/606, specifically recognises the possibility for feeder ELTIFs to be established in a Member State other than the home Member State of the master ELTIF. The ELTIF Regulation does not contain any requirements for the master ELTIF to be established in the same Member State as the feeder ELTIF.

**Questions b) and c) May an ELTIF be required by national law, regulation or administrative practice to be authorised or established in a particular Member State when packaged in insurance products or embedded in pension/savings plans in order to be eligible as target investment? May any other provision or option provided for in the ELTIF Regulation be restricted by a national law, regulation or administrative practice for ELTIFs packaged in insurance products or embedded in pension/savings plans?**

No, Article 1(3) of the ELTIF Regulation, which sets out that Member States shall not add any further requirements in the field covered by the ELTIF Regulation, should be understood as prohibiting Member States to introduce or impose upon ELTIFs requirements, whether stemming from national law, regulations, guidance or administrative practices, including those pertaining to the nationality, domiciliation or location of the ELTIF or its manager.

Article 3(1) of the ELTIF Regulation sets out that an authorisation as an ELTIF “shall be valid for all Member States”. This means that once an ELTIF is authorised, it enjoys cross-border recognition across the entire EU. Furthermore, Article 5 of the ELTIF Regulation (Application for authorisation as an ELTIF), read in conjunction with Article 2 (12), does not set out any nationality, domiciliation or location requirements with respect to the AIFM seeking the authorisation of an ELTIF and particularly those that have the intent or the effect of hindering the free cross-border

marketing of ELTIFs into such Member State or unduly favour ELTIFs in or from their Member State as opposed to ELTIFs passported from another Member State.

In this connection, Article 4(1) and Article 6(1) of Directive (EU) 2016/97 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 January 2016 on insurance distribution (recast), as amended (OJ L 026 2.2.2016, p. 19) sets out that insurance, reinsurance and ancillary insurance intermediaries shall be allowed to pursue their activity under the freedom to provide services or the freedom of establishment, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, among others those that enshrine the EU principles of non-discrimination, market access and cross-border service provision.

### ***Disclaimer***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

# **ESMA\_QA\_2480**

**Submission Date**

14/03/2025

Status: Answer Published

## **Additional Information**

### **Level 1 Regulation**

European Long-Term Investment Funds Regulation (ELTIF) Regulation (EU) 2015/760

### **Topic**

ELTIF

## **Subject Matter**

Benefitting from the distributions of the ELTIF

## **Question**

a) May an ELTIF define a minimum period before which the shares cannot benefit from distributions of the ELTIF?

b) May the setting of a minimum holding period during which investors cannot benefit from the distributions of the ELTIF be considered as a “fee” or a “cost”, as per the requirements of Article 25 of the ELTIF Regulation?

## ESMA Answer

---

14-03-2025

Original language

*Answer provided by the European Commission*

**Question a) May an ELTIF define a minimum period before which the shares cannot benefit from distributions of the ELTIF?**

Yes, the ELTIF Regulation does not explicitly prohibit or restrict the ability of an ELTIF manager to set out a period of time within which the units or shares of the ELTIF cannot benefit from distributions. Notably, Article 22(4) of the ELTIF Regulation requires to specify the distribution policy that the ELTIF will apply during its life in the rules or instruments of incorporation. In this context, ELTIFs must comply with the requirements of the ELTIF Regulation, inter alia, with respect to the transparency as to the frequency and the timing of distributions of proceeds, if any, to investors during the life of the ELTIF in line with Article 23(4)(e) of the ELTIF Regulation.

**Question b) May the setting of a minimum holding period during which investors cannot benefit from the distributions of the ELTIF be considered as**

## **a “fee” or a “cost”, as per the requirements of Article 25 of the ELTIF Regulation?**

No, setting out a minimum holding period during which holders of the units or shares of an ELTIF cannot benefit from the distributions of an ELTIF cannot be considered as a “fee” or a “cost” within the meaning of Article 25(1) and (2) of the ELTIF Regulation since different costs and fees, irrespective of whether they are borne directly or indirectly, are solely comprised of the categories set out in Article 25(1) of the ELTIF Regulation. In addition, in accordance with Article 25(1) of the ELTIF Regulation, setting of a holding minimum period is not listed in Article 12 of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2024/2759, which specifies the common definitions, calculation methodologies and presentation formats of the costs referred to in Article 25(1) and the overall ratio referred to in Article 25(2) of the ELTIF Regulation.

### ***Disclaimer***

*The answers clarify provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. They do not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor do they introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answers are merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.*

No hay parametros en la URL.