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Responding to this paper

The European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) invites responses to the specific questions listed in the ESMA SFTR Discussion Report, published on the ESMA website.

*Instructions*

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

* use this form and send your responses in Word format (pdf documents will not be considered except for annexes);
* do not remove the tags of type <ESMA\_ QUESTION\_SFTR\_1> - i.e. the response to one question has to be framed by the 2 tags corresponding to the question; and
* if you do not have a response to a question, do not delete it and leave the text “TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE” between the tags.

Responses are most helpful:

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

**Naming protocol**

In order to facilitate the handling of stakeholders responses please save your document using the following format:

ESMA\_SFTR\_NAMEOFCOMPANY\_NAMEOFDOCUMENT.

E.g. if the respondent were XXXX, the name of the reply form would be:

ESMA\_SFTR\_XXXX\_REPLYFORM or

ESMA\_SFTR\_XXXX\_ANNEX1

***Deadline***

Responses must reach us by 22 April 2016**.**

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

***Publication of responses***

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

***Data protection***

Information on data protection can be found at [www.esma.europa.eu](http://www.esma.europa.eu) under the headings ‘Legal notice’ and ‘Data protection’.

# Introduction

Please make your introductory comments below, if any:

< ESMA\_COMMENT\_SFTR\_1>

Markit is pleased to submit the following comments to ESMA in response to its Discussion Paper on *Securities Financing Transactions Regulation* (the “***DP***”).

Markit[[1]](#footnote-2) is a leading global provider of financial information services. Many of our products are RegTech services that are designed, often in consultation with market participants, to help them comply with regulatory requirements in an effective and efficient manner. As such our services help financial markets function properly while also levelling the playing field and ensuring that competition is effective. Founded in 2003, we employ over 4,000 people in 11 countries and our shares are listed on Nasdaq (ticker: MRKT). Markit has been actively and constructively engaged in the debate about regulatory reform in financial markets, including topics such as the implementation of the G20 commitments for OTC derivatives and the design of a regulatory regime for benchmarks. Over the past years, we have submitted more than 150 comment letters to regulatory authorities around the world and have participated in numerous roundtables.

**Introduction**

The securities financing markets play a key role in supporting the liquidity of financial markets and allowing for the effective management of collateral. However, the financial crisis has demonstrated that these markets can also lack transparency and contribute to systemic risk.

We welcome the EU Securities Financing Transaction Regulation (the “***SFTR***” or “***the Regulation***”) as an important framework to increase transparency in the securities finance markets, enable regulators to monitor systemic risk in these markets and to protect investors while allowing for the development of the sector. In the context of this DP we recommend that ESMA ensure the final rules are proportionate and workable so they do not damage activity in the securities finance markets which could negatively impact liquidity in underlying markets.

Several of Markit’s services are relevant in the context of the SFTR:

* Markit Securities Finance aggregates securities lending transaction information from a large number of market participants and uses this information to provide transparency and assist in efficient price discovery and risk management in these markets. Over the past 10 years we have gathered the world’s biggest Securities finance transaction database.[[2]](#footnote-3)
* Markit’s derivatives processing platforms are widely used by market participants to increase operational efficiency, reduce cost, and ensure legal certainty and facilitate compliance with various regulatory requirements, including trade reporting and trade confirmation. Globally over 2,000 firms use Markit’s trade processing platforms that process, on average, 90,000 derivative transaction processing events per day. Markit’s trade processing platforms form an important element of derivatives workflows, particularly in the credit, equity, interest rate, and foreign exchange asset classes. Markit currently performs delegated reporting to Trade Repositories under regulatory regimes for OTC derivatives in Europe, the United States, Singapore, Hong Kong, Japan, Australia and Canada. We believe that third party processing services will also be instrumental in the context of SFTR by providing trade verification and delegated reporting services to market participants. Importantly, they will facilitate implementation of these requirements and reduce the cost of compliance for market participants.

**Comments**

We support the creation of additional transparency that reporting to TRs provides to regulators and to the public. Markit’s various reporting and transparency services across asset classes have been focussed on facilitating firms’ compliance whilst securing data quality at the same time.

The Regulation establishes a framework for the reporting of securities finance transactions (“SFTs”) to Trade Repositories in Europe to increase regulatory (and public) transparency in these markets. Although the Regulation has similar objectives as reporting requirements for derivatives established in Europe under EMIR,[[3]](#footnote-4) we believe the nature and structure of SFTs will make regulatory reporting far more complicated. At the same time, the Regulation requires market participants to report not only the transaction itself but also the underlying collateral in a dual sided manner. The Regulations further specify the need of regulators to match transactions and monitor positions down to each and every beneficial owner and also to match the collateral pool with the respective transaction. Given these complexities, we believe that the needs of regulators can only be satisfied if appropriate mechanisms are in place that ensures that high quality data is being reported to the Trade repositories (TRs) on a consistent basis. As the experience with derivatives reporting globally has shown the verification of trade data before being reported and the existence of central matching or confirmation platforms can play a key role in this context.

< ESMA\_COMMENT\_SFTR\_1>

1. Are these amendments to the provisions included in EMIR RTS 150/2013 sufficient to strengthen the registration framework of TRs under SFTR? If not, what additional provisions should be envisaged? What are the cost implications of the establishment of the provisions referred to in paragraphs 41-53? What are the benefits of the establishment of the provisions referred to in paragraphs 41-53? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_1>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_1>

1. Are these procedures sufficient to ensure the completeness and correctness of the data reported under Article 4(1) SFTR? If not, what additional provisions should be envisaged?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_2>

To ensure the quality of the SFT data that is reported to TRs, ESMA has been asked to develop draft regulatory technical standards that would specify:

*The procedures referred to in Article 5(2) SFTR and which are to be applied by trade repositories in order to verify the completeness and correctness of the details reported to them under Article 4(1) SFTR.[[4]](#footnote-5)*

We believe that, in this context, ESMA should recognise the activities of third parties in various derivative reporting regimes which assist in the verification of data prior to it being reported to TRs. Electronic confirmation of the trades help ensure high quality of reported data as all the terms of the trade are agreed by all parties to the transaction. Third parties such as Markit’s derivative processing platforms currently confirm the agreement from both parties on the details of the reported data for derivative transactions. We believe such platforms could play a similar role in verifying SFT transactions and collateral data. ESMA should therefore explicitly allow TRs and market participants to benefit from the services of these specialist providers. Furthermore, we believe that there should be no requirement for verification of transaction data if the report has come from a verified trade record that has been agreed by all parties to the transaction.

In addition to providing trade verification/confirmation services, third parties also provide delegated reporting services to market participants. We welcome that ESMA has acknowledged the role such third party service providers play in the reporting of SFTs.[[5]](#footnote-6) We recommend that ESMA also specify that an explicit and prior delegation of reporting to third parties would be allowed.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_2>

1. What are the cost implications of the establishment of the provisions referred to in paragraph 56 to ensure the completeness and correctness of the data reported under Article 4(1) SFTR? Please elaborate and provide quantitative information to justify the cost implications.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_3>

To ensure the completeness and correctness of the SFT data reported to TRs, ESMA proposes requiring TRs to “put in place a procedure to ensure that the reporting entity, i.e. the one submitting messages to the TR, is permissioned to report for the entities/parties to the contract which indicated on the trade”.[[6]](#footnote-7) We agree with ESMA that TRs should have robust procedures in place to ensure that the entity responsible for reporting is authorised/permissioned to report.

Further, ESMA has proposed that TRs validate the authorisation/permission in two phases.

The first validation, “prior to the reporting” phase of the authorization/permission procedure entails that the TR ensure the conditions laid out in Paragraph 56 (c) (i)[[7]](#footnote-8) are met. We support the proposed requirements since this would help TRs establish unequivocally the identity of the reporting entities and/or third parties performing delegated reporting on their behalf. These procedures are also consistent with other regulatory regimes, such as EMIR reporting, where trade repositories require reporting entities to establish an account with them and then only be permissioned to submit trade reports to them. The same procedures are required by TRs of third parties reporting on behalf of either party to the transaction

However, we believe that the procedures outlined in paragraph 56 (c) (ii), in “during the reporting” phase, are superfluous since the TRs have already established the identity of the reporting entities and/or third party reporting on their behalf. Also, the verifications conducted in the prior to reporting phase would ensure that only reporting parties have established secure connections with the TR. Furthermore, they would create unnecessary cost for all parties involved in the process since the TRs would have no other way but to send messages to either the parties to the SFT or third parties reporting on their behalf as the case may be and await confirmation to ensure compliance with their verification obligations as proposed in the DP. This would also delay the processing of the reports and hence delay submission to the regulators. We therefore recommend that ESMA ensures TRs have robust procedures to ensure that the reporting entities have the necessary authorisations prior to reporting.

We therefore recommend that the validation/authorisation procedure be limited to “prior to reporting” phase since this would achieve the objectives set forth by ESMA.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_3>

1. Are these additional procedures sufficient to strengthen the registration framework of TRs under SFTR? If not, what additional provisions should be envisaged?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_4>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_4>

1. What are the cost implications of the establishment of the provisions referred to in paragraphs 58-65?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_5>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_5>

1. What are the benefits of the establishment of the provisions referred to in paragraphs 58-65? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_6>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_6>

1. Do you agree with the information that should not be provided in the case of extension of registration? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_7>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_7>

1. Are there additional provisions that should be removed / included? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_8>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_8>

1. What are the benefits of providing less documentation? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_9>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_9>

1. Do you agree with the proposed format of the application for registration and the application for extension of registration? If not, do you consider that the format of the application for extension of registration should be different? What are the costs and benefits of the proposed approach? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_10>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_10>

1. Do you agree with the proposed technical format, ISO 20022, as the format for reporting? If not, what other reporting format you would propose and what would be the benefits of the alternative approach?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_11>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_11>

1. How would the proposed format comply with the governance requirements in paragraph 75? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_12>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_12>

1. Do you foresee any difficulties related to reporting using an ISO 20022 technical format that uses XML? If yes, please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_13>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_13>

1. Do you foresee issues in identifying the counterparties of an SFT trade following the above-mentioned definitions?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_14>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_14>

1. Are there cases for which these definitions leave room for interpretation? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_15>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_15>

1. Is it possible to report comprehensive information at transaction level for all types of SFTs and irrespective of whether they are cleared or not?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_16>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_16>

1. Is there any need to establish complementary position-level reporting for SFTs? If yes, should we consider it for particular types of SFTs, such as repo, or for all types?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_17>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_17>

1. Is there any need to differentiate between transaction-level data and position-level data on loans from financial stability perspective? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_18>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_18>

1. Would the data elements included in section 6.1 be sufficient to support reporting of transactions and positions?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_19>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_19>

1. Would the data elements differ between position-level data and transaction-level data? If so, which ones?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_20>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_20>

1. Would the proposed approach for collateral reporting in section 4.3.5 be sufficient to accurately report collateral data of SFT positions? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_21>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_21>

1. From reporting perspective, do you foresee any significant benefits or drawbacks in keeping consistency with EMIR, i.e. applying Approach A? What are the expected costs and benefits from adopting a different approach on reporting of lifecycle events under SFTR with respect to EMIR? Please provide a justification in terms of cost, implementation effort and operational efficiency. Please provide concrete examples.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_22>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_22>

1. Do you agree with the proposed list of “Action Types”? If not, which action types should be included or excluded from the above list to better describe the SFT? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_23>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_23>

1. Do you foresee any benefits or drawbacks of implementing the proposed reporting logic of event types and technical actions (Approach B)? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_24>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_24>

1. Do you agree with the proposed list of event types and technical actions? If not, which ones should be included or excluded?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_25>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_25>

1. Do you foresee any need to introduce a unique reference identifier for the lifecycle events or for technical actions? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_26>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_26>

1. From reporting perspective, do you foresee any drawbacks in keeping consistency with EMIR? If so, please indicate which ones?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_27>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_27>

1. Are the proposed rules for determination of buyer and seller sufficient? If not, in which scenarios it might not be clear what is the direction of the trade? Which rules can be proposed to accommodate for such scenarios?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_28>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_28>

1. Are the proposed rules consistent with the existing market conventions for determination of buyer and seller? If not, please provide alternative proposals.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_29>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_29>

1. Are you aware of any other bilateral repo trade scenario? With the exception of tri-party agents that are documented in section 4.2.5, are there any other actors missing which is not a broker or counterparty? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_30>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_30>

1. Do you consider that the above scenarios also accurately capture the conclusion of buy/sell-back and sell/buy back trades? If not, what additional aspect should be included? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_31>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_31>

1. Do you agree with the description of the repo scenarios?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_32>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_32>

1. Are you aware of any other repo scenarios involving CCPs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_33>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_33>

1. Are there any other scenarios that should be discussed? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_34>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_34>

1. Do you consider that the documented scenarios capture accurately the conclusion of buy/sell-back trades? If not, what additional aspects should be considered?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_35>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_35>

1. According to market practices, can buy/sell-back and sell/buy back trades involve a CCP?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_36>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_36>

1. Are there any other actors missing which are not mentioned above, considering that tri-party agents are be covered in section 4.2.5? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_37>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_37>

1. Are there any differences in the parties involved according to the different agency lending models?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_38>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_38>

1. When would the both counterparties know the other’s identity in an undisclosed lending agreement?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_39>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_39>

1. What other solution would you foresee for the reporting of trades involving the agent lender? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_40>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_40>

1. Would an open offer clearing model possibly apply to securities lending too?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_41>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_41>

1. Would a broker be involved in addition to lending agent in such a transaction?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_42>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_42>

1. Would it be possible to link the 8 trade reports to constitute the “principal clearing model” picture? If yes, would the method for linking proposed in section 4.3.4 be suitable?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_43>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_43>

1. In the case of securities lending transactions are there any other actors missing, considering that tri-party agents will be covered in section 4.2.5?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_44>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_44>

1. What potential issues do reporting counterparties face regarding the reporting of the market value of the securities on loan or borrowed?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_45>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_45>

1. Do such securities lending transactions exist in practice?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_46>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_46>

1. Do you agree with the proposal to explicitly identify non-collateralised securities or commodities lending transactions in the reporting fields? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_47>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_47>

1. Would it be possible that an initially unsecured securities or commodities lending or borrowing transaction becomes collateralised at a later stage? Please provide concrete examples.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_48>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_48>

1. Which of the scenarios described for securities lending (Section 4.2.4.2), repo and buy-sell back (Section 4.2.4.1) are currently applicable to commodities financing transactions? Please provide a short description of the commodity financing transactions that occur under each scenario and the involved actors.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_49>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_49>

1. Are you aware of commodity financing transactions that would fall in the scope of the Regulation but are not covered in the scenarios described for securities lending (Section 4.2.4.2), repo and buy-sell back (Section 4.2.4.1)? If yes, please describe the general characteristics of such a transaction.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_50>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_50>

1. Are the types of transactions recognised sufficiently clear for unambiguous classification by both reporting counterparties of commodity financing transactions into one of the types?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_51>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_51>

1. What additional details may help to identify the type of transactions used?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_52>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_52>

1. What are the main types of commodities used in SFTs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_53>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_53>

1. How often, in your experience, are other commodities used?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_54>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_54>

1. In your experience, what share of the transactions involves standardised commodity contracts, such as most traded gold and crude oil futures? Please provide concrete examples.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_55>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_55>

1. In your experience, what share of the transactions involve commodities that meet the contract specification for the underlying to derivative contracts traded on at least one [EU] exchange?? If yes, please elaborate and provide concrete examples.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_56>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_56>

1. Do the proposed fields and attributes in Section 6.1 sufficiently recognize the characteristics of commodity financing transactions? Please describe any issues you may see and describe any reporting attributes that should be added in order to enable meaningful reporting of commodity financing transactions.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_57>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_57>

1. Could all scenarios described for securities lending, repo and buy-sell back theoretically apply to future forms of commodities financing transactions?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_58>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_58>

1. Should other scenarios be considered? If yes, please describe.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_59>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_59>

1. Would you agree that the ISIN could be used to uniquely identify some commodities used in SFTs? If yes, which one and what prerequisites would need to be fulfilled? If no, what alternative solution would use propose for a harmonised identification of commodities involved in SFTs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_60>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_60>

1. Would the classification as described in RTS 23 of MiFIR be the most effective way to classify commodities for the purposes of transparency under SFTR?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_61>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_61>

1. Is there another classification that ESMA should consider?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_62>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_62>

1. Are there transactions in which a pool of commodities is financed that the reporting needs to take into account? Please provide concrete examples.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_63>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_63>

1. Do you agree with this basic scenario? If no, please explain what changes would need to be made to the scenario.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_64>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_64>

1. Are there other entities that do not act as counterparties but can be involved in the transaction chain (e.g. brokers or intermediaries)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_65>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_65>

1. Are there standard margin agreements used in the market? If yes, which ones? If no, are there standard elements in margin agreements in the EU that are noteworthy from a financial stability perspective and not included in the list of questions or current data tables included in Section 6.1?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_66>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_66>

1. Are there margin loans that do not have a fixed maturity or repayment date, or other conditions in the agreement on which full or partial repayment of the loan can be conditioned?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_67>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_67>

1. Are floating rates used in margin lending transactions? Are there specificities that ESMA should be aware of regarding interest rates in the context of margin lending transactions?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_68>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_68>

1. What potential issues do reporting counterparties face regarding the reporting of margin account/credit balances?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_69>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_69>

1. How is information regarding the market value of short positions in the context of margin lending used by the lender (if at all)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_70>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_70>

1. What kind of provisions do lenders have in place to limit or mitigate client losses from short positions?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_71>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_71>

1. Do you foresee any issues with reporting information on SFT involving tri-party by the T+1 reporting deadline? If so, which ones – availability of collateral data, timeliness of the information, etc.? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_72>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_72>

1. Would you agree with the proposed split between the counterparty and transaction data?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_73>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_73>

1. Is the reporting of the country code sufficient to identify branches? If no, what additional elements would SFT reporting need to include?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_74>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_74>

1. Do you foresee any costs in implementing such type of identification?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_75>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_75>

1. Would it be possible to establish a more granular identification of the branches? If yes, what additional elements would SFT reporting need to include and what would be the associated costs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_76>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_76>

1. What are the potential benefits of more granular identification of branches? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_77>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_77>

1. Are there any situations different from the described above where the actual transfers between headquarters and branches or between branches can be considered transactions and therefore be reportable under SFTR? Please provide specific examples.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_78>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_78>

1. Are there any other cases which are not identified above, where the beneficiaries and the counterparties will be different? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_79>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_79>

1. Do you agree with the proposal to link the legs of a cleared transaction by using a common identifier?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_80>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_80>

1. Could you suggest robust alternative ways of linking SFT reports?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_81>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_81>

1. Are the different cases of collateral allocation accurately described in paragraphs 221-226? If not, please indicate the relevant differences with market practices and please describe the availability of information for each and every case?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_82>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_82>

1. Is the assumption correct that manly securities lending would require the reporting of cash collateral? If no, for which other types of SFTs is the cash collateral element required? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_83>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_83>

1. Does the practice to collateralise a transaction in several amounts in different currencies exist? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_84>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_84>

1. Do you foresee any issues on reporting the specified information for individual securities or commodities provided as collateral? If yes, please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_85>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_85>

1. Are there any situations in which there can be multiple haircuts (one per each collateral element) for a given SFT? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_86>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_86>

1. Would you agree that the reporting counterparties can provide a unique identification of the collateral pool in their initial reporting of an SFT? If no, please provide the reasons as to why this would not be the case.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_87>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_87>

1. Are there cases where a counterparties to a repo, including those executed against a collateral pool, would not be able to provide the collateral with the initial reporting of the repo trade? If yes, please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_88>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_88>

1. Are there any issues to report the collateral allocation based on the aforementioned approach? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_89>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_89>

1. In the case of collateral pool, which of the data elements included in Table 1 would be reported by the T+1 reporting deadline? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_90>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_90>

1. Which option for reporting of collateral would be in your opinion easier to implement, i.e. always reporting of collateral in a separate message (option 2) or reporting of collateral together with other transaction data when the collateral is known by the reporting deadline (option 1)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_91>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_91>

1. What are the benefits and potential challenges related to either approach? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_92>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_92>

1. Do you foresee any challenges with the proposed approach for reporting updates to collateral? What alternatives would you propose? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_93>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_93>

1. Is it possible to link the reports on changes in collateral resulting from the net exposure to the original SFT transactions via a unique portfolio identifier, which could be added to the original transactions when they are reported?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_94>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_94>

1. Do you foresee any difficulties related to the linking of the collateral report to the underlying SFTs by specifying UTIs of those SFTs in the collateral report?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_95>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_95>

1. Are there additional options to uniquely link a list of collateral to the exposure of several SFTs to those specified? If yes, please detail them.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_96>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_96>

1. What would you deem to be the appropriate option to uniquely link collateral to the exposure of several SFTs? Are you using any pro-rata allocation for internal purposes? What is the current market practice for linking a set of collateralised trades with a collateral portfolio? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_97>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_97>

1. Do you foresee any issues between the logic for linking collateral data and the reporting of SFT loan data? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_98>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_98>

1. Do you agree with the description of funding sources mentioned above?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_99>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_99>

1. Are there other funding sources used in the context of margin lending?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_100>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_100>

1. What are the obstacles to lenders reporting the market value of funding sources?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_101>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_101>

1. Would reporting pro-rata amounts address some of the challenges or facilitate reporting?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_102>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_102>

1. Should the cash in the margin accounts be considered also as part of the collateral for a given margin lending transaction? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_103>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_103>

1. What are the metrics used (other than LTV ratios) to monitor leverage from margin lending, and more broadly to address risks related to the value of collateral? How are these calculated?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_104>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_104>

1. Using these metrics, what are the current limits or thresholds used by margin lenders that will trigger a collateral action? How are these limits determined? Are there different thresholds triggering different actions? Can they vary over time, and for what reasons?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_105>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_105>

1. What kind of collateral actions can be triggered by crossing these limits or thresholds? Please describe the actions, their impact on the metrics described in Question 13, and the potential associated changes in limits or thresholds.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_106>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_106>

1. Are there any other important features, market practices or risks that you would like to bring to our attention in the context of margin lending?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_107>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_107>

1. Do you have any alternative proposals for reporting information related to funding sources that might reduce the burden on reporting entities?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_108>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_108>

1. Do you agree with the collateralisation and margin lending practices described above? Are there instances where margin loans are not provided (or haircuts applied) on a portfolio basis?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_109>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_109>

1. What are the potential obstacles to reporting information regarding the individual securities set aside in margin accounts by the lender?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_110>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_110>

1. Would you agree that in the context of margin lending the entire collateral portfolio, i.e. both cash and securities, would require reporting? If no, please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_111>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_111>

1. What are the obstacles to the reporting of reuse of collateral for transactions where there is no transfer of title? What are the current market practices aimed at mitigating risks from collateral re-use specifically in the context of margin lending?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_112>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_112>

1. What options exist to link collateral that is re-used to a given SFT or counterparty? Please document the potential issues.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_113>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_113>

1. In which cases can the re-use be defined at transaction level?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_114>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_114>

1. Do you see other ways to calculate the collateral re-use for a given SFT?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_115>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_115>

1. Are there any circumstances in which the re-use percentage applied at entity level could not be calculated for a given security (e.g. per ISIN)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_116>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_116>

1. Which alternatives do you see to estimate the collateral re-use?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_117>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_117>

1. When the information on collateral availability for re-use becomes available? On trade date (T) or at the latest by T+1?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_118>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_118>

1. Is it possible to automatically derive the collateral re-use in some cases given the nature of the SFT (meaning based on the GMRA, GMSLA or other forms of legal agreements)? If yes, please describe these cases and how the information could be derived. Please explain if deviations could be drafted within legal agreements to deviate from the re-usability.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_119>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_119>

1. Do you agree with the rationale for collection of information on the settlement set out in this section?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_120>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_120>

1. Do you consider that information on settlement supports the identification and monitoring of financial stability risks entailed by SFTs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_121>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_121>

1. Do you agree with the approach to identify the settlement information in the SFT reports?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_122>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_122>

1. Do you envisage any difficulties with identifying the place of settlement?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_123>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_123>

1. Are there any practical difficulties with identifying CSDs and indirect or direct participants as well as, if applicable, settlement internalisers in the SFT reports? Would this information be available by the reporting deadline? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_124>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_124>

1. Will this information be available by the reporting deadline? What are the costs of providing this information?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_125>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_125>

1. What other data elements are needed to achieve the required supervisory objectives? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_126>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_126>

1. Do you agree with the proposed categories of trading methods to be reported by SFT counterparties?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_127>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_127>

1. Are there any other methods of trading that are not covered?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_128>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_128>

1. Do you agree with the proposed types of validations? Would you include any further validations? If so which ones? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_129>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_129>

1. Do you agree with the proposed scope of the reconciliation process? Should trades expired or terminated more than a month before the day on which reconciliation takes place be included in the reconciliation process? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_130>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_130>

1. What is the earliest time by which the reconciliation process can be completed? If not, please indicate what other characteristics need to be included? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_131>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_131>

1. Do you foresee issues with following the EMIR approach on reconciliation of data for SFT? What other approaches for reconciliation of transactions exist? How many data elements are reconciled under those approaches? What is the timeframe of reconciliation under those approaches? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_132>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_132>

1. What are the expected benefits from full reconciliation? What are the potential costs from TR and counterparty perspective to adopt a full reconciliation approach? In terms of the matching of data, which of the data fields included in Section 6.1 can be fully reconciled and for which ones certain degrees of tolerance has to be applied? Please provide concrete examples. Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_133>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_133>

1. Do you foresee any potential issues with establishing a separate reconciliation process for collateral data? What data elements have to be included in the collateral reconciliation process? Alternatively, should collateral data be reconciled for each collateralised SFT individually? What would be the costs of each alternative? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_134>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_134>

1. What additional feedback information should be provided to the reporting counterparties? What should be the level of standardisations? What would be the benefits of potential standardisation of the feedback messages? Do you agree with the proposed timing for feedback messages?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_135>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_135>

1. Would you be favourable of a more granular approach for public data than the one under EMIR? Would you be favourable of having public data as granular as suggested in the FSB November 2015 report? What are the potential costs and benefits of such granular information? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_136>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_136>

1. In terms of criteria for aggregation, which of the following aspects ones are most important to be taken into account – venue of execution of the SFT, cleared or not, way to transfer of collateral? What other aspects have to be taken into account for the purposes of the public aggregations? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_137>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_137>

1. Do you foresee any issues with publishing aggregate data on a weekly basis? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_138>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_138>

1. At which point in time do you consider that the additional data elements regarding the reconciliation or rejection status of an SFT will be available? What are the potential costs of the inclusion of the above mentioned additional data elements? What other data elements could be generated by the TRs and provided to authorities? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_139>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_139>

1. Do you consider that all the relevant data elements for generation of the above reports will be available on time? What are the potential costs of the generation of above mentioned transaction reports? What are the benefits of the above mentioned transaction reports? What other transaction reports would you suggest to be provided by the TRs? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_140>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_140>

1. Do you consider that all the relevant data elements for calculation of the above reports will be available on time?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_141>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_141>

1. What are the potential costs of the generation of above mentioned position reports? other reports would you suggest to be provided by the TRs? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_142>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_142>

1. Do you consider that there should be one position report including both reconciled and non-reconciled data or that there should be two position reports, one containing only reconciled data and the other - one only non-reconciled data? What are the potential costs of the separation of above mentioned position reports? What are the benefits of the separation above mentioned position reports? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_143>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_143>

1. Do you foresee any technical issues with the implementation of XSD in accordance with ISO 20022? Do you foresee any potential issues related to the use of same cut-off time across TRs? Do you foresee any drawbacks from establishing standardised xml template in accordance with ISO 20022 methodology for the aggregation and comparison of data? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_144>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_144>

1. Further to the aforementioned aspects, are there any other measures that have to be taken to avoid double counting? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_145>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFTR\_145>

1. See [www.markit.com](http://www.markit.com) for more details. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Markit’s SFT database contains information on USD 15tn lendable inventory which includes transaction information on USD 2tn worth of securities financing transactions which comprises an average of 3mn transaction daily and covers over 200,000 equity and fixed income instruments. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Article 9, European Market Infrastructure Regulation [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Pg. 15, Par. 32(a) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Pg. 20, Par. 56 (c) (i) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Pg. 19, Par. 56 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Pg. 20 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)