



European Securities and
Markets Authority

Final Report

ESMA Technical advice to EC on fees to TRs under SFTR and on certain amendments to fees to TRs under EMIR




Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	4
2	Background	5
3	Managing deficits and surpluses under EMIR and SFTR	6
4	ESMA's expected costs	8
4.1	TR registration and extension of registration costs	8
4.1.1	Costs of TR registration	8
4.1.2	Cost of extension of TR registration	9
4.2	TR supervision costs	9
4.3	TR recognition costs	9
5	General approach on fees determination under SFTR	10
6	Fees for registration or extension of registration	10
6.1	Fees for registration and extension of registration under SFTR	10
6.1.1	Expected turnover	11
6.1.2	Amounts of registration fees under SFTR	12
6.1.3	Fees for extension of registration	13
6.2	Concurrent application under EMIR and SFTR	14
7	Supervisory fees	15
7.1	Determination of total annual supervisory fees for EMIR and SFTR	15
7.2	Amendments to calculation of applicable turnover under EMIR and proposed way forward under SFTR	16
7.3	Minimum supervisory fees under SFTR	20
7.4	First-year supervisory fee under SFTR	21
8	Recognition fees under SFTR	23
9	Payment and reimbursement conditions under SFTR	24
9.1	Fees for registration, extension of registration and recognition	24
9.2	Reimbursement conditions in case of withdrawal of application	25
9.3	Annual supervisory fees	26
9.4	Annual recognition fees	26
10	Reimbursement of competent authorities under SFTR	27
11	Annex – EC request to ESMA for technical advice	29

1 Executive Summary

Reasons for publication

On 15 January 2016 the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) received a formal request from the European Commission (Commission) to provide technical advice to assist the Commission in formulating a Regulation on fees for Trade Repositories (TRs) under SFTR by a delegated act.

Contents

The present final report contains eleven sections. ESMA details its proposals regarding the determination of fees to TRs under SFTR and certain amendments to the fees under EMIR. Following the assessment of the responses to the consultation carried out until 31 January 2017 ESMA has been able to refine its fee proposals. As a result, first of all, ESMA is proposing an amendment of the general approach under EMIR relating to the treatment of surpluses and deficits in order to make it consistent with the new ESMA budgeting framework. Similarly, ESMA proposes the application of the same approach for the determination of fees under SFTR. Furthermore, ESMA is also proposing a simplification of the way to determine the turnover of TRs for the purposes of calculation of the annual supervisory fees by including only revenues and excluding activity figures. In addition, ESMA has specifically defined the calculation of lower fees in the case of extension of registration under SFTR, or in the case of concurrent application under both regimes. ESMA has also proposed the calculation of fees for recognition of third country TRs and the reimbursement of the cost to NCAs in the case of delegation of tasks. Finally, Section 11 includes the Commission's mandate to ESMA.

Next Steps

ESMA will submit this final report of the technical advice to the European Commission by beginning of Q2 of 2017.

2 Background

1. The objective of the Regulation on transparency of securities financing transactions and of reuse (SFTR, hereinafter) is to enhance the transparency of securities financing markets and thus of the financial system. The SFTR creates a Union framework under which details of securities financing transactions (SFTs) can be efficiently reported to trade repositories (TRs). The SFTR legal framework should, to the extent possible, be the same as that of Regulation No 648/2012 of 4 July 2012 on OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (EMIR, hereinafter) in respect of the reporting of derivative contracts to trade repositories registered for that purpose. This should also enable trade repositories registered or recognised in accordance with EMIR to fulfil the repository function assigned by SFTR, if they comply with certain additional criteria, subject to completion of a simplified registration process.
2. SFTR, like EMIR, grants ESMA direct registration and supervision powers over trade repositories. In accordance with Article 11(1) of SFTR, ESMA shall charge fees to trade repositories and those fees shall fully cover ESMA's necessary expenditure relating to the registration, recognition and supervision of trade repositories.
3. On 15 January 2016 the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) received a formal request from the European Commission (Commission) to provide technical advice to assist the Commission in formulating an EU Regulation on fees for Trade Repositories (TRs) under SFTR by delegated act. The advice was expected to be delivered to the Commission by 12 January 2017. Due to the substantial delivery of all the draft technical standards under SFTR and the revision of the EMIR technical standards in March 2017, this technical advice is delivered slightly later (April 2017).
4. This mandate focuses on the technical aspects of the regulation on fees. In providing its advice, the European Commission requested ESMA to build upon its previous experience in advising on supervisory fees for TRs registered under EMIR and on the experience of relevant national authorities in setting supervisory fees for financial institutions.
5. As required under the second paragraph of Article 11 of SFTR, ESMA shall charge the trade repositories fees that are proportionate to the turnover of the trade repository concerned and fully cover ESMA's necessary expenditure relating to the registration, recognition and supervision of trade repositories as well as the reimbursement of any costs that the competent authorities may incur as a result of any delegation of tasks pursuant to Article 9(1) of SFTR. Therefore, to ensure an efficient use of ESMA's budget and, at the same time, alleviate the financial burden for Member States and the Union, it is necessary to ensure that trade repositories pay for all the administrative costs related to their registration, extension of registration, supervision or recognition.
6. It is worth noting that ESMA, to the extent possible, is basing its advice with regards to ESMA's fees for TRs under SFTR on the Commission Delegated Regulation 1003/2013 (CDR 1003/2013, hereinafter). Where, in the process of elaboration of the technical

advice under SFTR, there are instances of departing from the CDR 1003/2013, those are duly justified. There are also certain instances where ESMA, following the experience gained in supervising TRs, is proposing amendments to the current CDR 1003/2013 and is consequently establishing a level-playing field with the fees under SFTR.

7. ESMA conducted a six-week public consultation to better inform its advice to the Commission. A summary of the feedback received and ESMA's final advice are included in this report. A total of six entities responded to the consultation.
8. Following the submission of ESMA's advice, the Commission will need to adopt a Regulation on fees in the form of a delegated act to specify further the types of fees, the matters for which fees are due, the amount of the fees and the manner in which they are to be paid.
9. The general approach as well as the relevant costs used to determine the fees under this proposal are based on the current EU landscape of reporting. Should this landscape be changed due to further developments related to the already registered TRs established in the United Kingdom, ESMA would assess the need to update its advice to the European Commission in order to ensure the compliance with the requirements established under Article 11 SFTR and Article 72 of EMIR. This might lead to amendments to the current ESMA fees under EMIR as well as to the delegated act adopted by the Commission under Article 11 of SFTR. At this stage the effects of the UK referendum to leave the Union are unknown, therefore the advice is based on the current landscape.

3 Managing deficits and surpluses under EMIR and SFTR

10. ESMA applies a universal budgeting approach, which means that income from fees is treated as general revenue. This is in line with the standard practice of other partially funded agencies, as recommended by DG Budget of the European Commission.
11. ESMA prepares annual budgets aiming at balancing the income through fees with the incurred expenditure, understanding that deficits or surpluses are to be balanced by the rest of ESMA's income sources.
12. In case of deficits (ESMA collecting less than incurred), ESMA does not recover the deficit from TRs. If the deficit is significant, ESMA should analyse the reasons why it happened, drawing up lessons for the next budgeting period. For surpluses (ESMA collecting more than incurred) the same reasoning should be followed. Hence, no excess of fees should be paid back to TRs or CRAs. This mechanism is already in place at ESMA for Credit Rating Agencies (CRAs) and also for TRs under EMIR.
13. Through the existing mechanisms in place (EU budgetary procedure, annual reporting, single programming document), the ESMA Management Board and Board of Supervisors, of which the European Commission is a permanent Member, remain fully informed of the fees' collection and expenditure levels.

14. On a yearly basis, the correct implementation of ESMA's budget, in particular of the fee-funded budget, versus the EU Financial Regulations is checked by the European Court of Auditors. The final audit report is communicated to the European Parliament and Council.
15. The pro-forma supervisory costs are presented together with the annual work plan in September and the approved budget is published on ESMA's website in January.
16. Stemming from the above considerations, ESMA indicated in the Consultation Paper that the provisions in Articles 4 and 7 of the CDR 1003/2013 on adjustments of fees for the purpose of calculation of the relevant amounts of annual supervisory fees would result in some inconsistencies with the implemented ESMA budgeting framework. In particular neither the deficits from one year could be included in the following year supervisory fees nor the additional revenues from new applications for registration, first-year supervisory fees or recognition fees could be returned back to TRs.
17. Therefore for ESMA's fees to be aligned with the applicable budgeting framework, ESMA proposed the following amendments to:
 - a. Delete Articles 4(2), 4(3), 7(2)(b) of the CDR 1003/2013 and to update the relevant cross-references to those articles in CDR 1003/2013 and ensure a consistent implementation of the above framework in the case of SFTR.
 - b. Update the timeline for the second instalment to be paid by TRs and the respective amounts of the two instalments in the case of the CDR 1003/2013 and establish them in consistent manner for SFTR as explained in detail in section 9.
18. Based on the feedback from the consultation, ESMA is establishing a consistent and harmonised framework that is in line with the European Commission budget practices.

ESMA establishes a harmonised framework for dealing with surpluses and deficits and for treating the fees under both EMIR and SFTR as general revenue as follows:

- a. In case of deficits (ESMA collects less than incurred), ESMA does not recover the deficit from TRs.
- b. For surpluses (ESMA collects more than incurred) the same reasoning should be followed hence no excess of fees should be paid back to TRs.

As a result, CDR 1003/2013 should be amended as follows:

- a. Articles 4(2), 4(3), 7(2)(b) of the CDR 1003/2013 should be deleted and the relevant references in CDR 1003/2013 to those articles should be amended in accordance with the new rules on budgeting to ensure a consistent implementation of the above framework in the case of SFTR.

- b. The timeline for the second instalment to be paid by TRs as well as the respective amounts of the two instalments in the case of ESMA's fees under EMIR should be amended and aligned with the ones under SFTR, as explained in greater detail in section 9.

4 ESMA's expected costs

19. ESMA indicated in the Consultation paper on this technical advice on fees, that it is expected that the registration of TRs under SFTR has a lot of in common with the registration of TRs under EMIR. As explained in the Final report on TS under SFTR and on certain amendments to RTS under EMIR (SFTR FR), the majority of the conditions for registration under SFTR are the same as the amended ones for registration of TRs under EMIR.
20. As further explained, where a registered TR applies for an extension of its registration under SFTR, while a simplified process refers to the documentation to be provided, Articles 5(6) and 7(1) of SFTR foresee the same timespan for registration as the one for extension of registration. i.e. 20 working days for assessment of completeness of an application and 40 working days for assessment of compliance.
21. ESMA's budget is managed on the basis of an activity-based method. Financial and staff resources are allocated per activity, rather than per functional cost or per internal management hierarchy. This method is used both for budget planning i.e. calculation of the estimated costs generated per activity (including the relevant overheads), and for budget costing i.e. calculation of ESMA's actual costs per activity. This method has been enhanced recently and has led to some changes in the way ESMA categorises its sub-activities; these changes are reflected in ESMA's 2017 annual work programme¹. According to the work program, the sub-activity budget for Trade Repositories in 2017 is 2.5 million EUR and sub-activity staff is 16 FTEs. The average cost of one FTE dedicated to TR Supervision is around 155,000 EUR per year, which includes the salary and all the relevant overheads.

4.1 TR registration and extension of registration costs

4.1.1 Costs of TR registration

22. ESMA concluded in the CP that an application for registration as a TR requires around 0.65 FTE (full-time equivalent) to be processed.

¹ https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/files/library/esma-2016-1419_-_esma_2017_work_programme.pdf

4.1.2 Cost of extension of TR registration

23. When assessing the costs of extension of registration, ESMA concluded that the estimated cost is around half the cost of an assessment of an application for new registration, i.e. approximately 0.33 FTE.

4.2 TR supervision costs

24. In order to estimate the cost of one FTE working for TR supervision in the most updated and precise way, ESMA took into account the ESMA's 2017 work program which contains a detailed description of ESMA's budget per different activities.
25. As explained earlier, ESMA plans its budget according to an activity-based method, which allocates budgeted financial and staff resources per activity, rather than per functional cost or per internal management hierarchy.
26. ESMA allocates to TR supervisory costs the relevant expenditure budgeted for the supervision of the compliance with the SFTR requirements, however this cost would need to be separated from the one under EMIR so that entities providing repository services under only one of the two regimes can be accurately charged supervisory fees.

4.3 TR recognition costs

27. Until now ESMA has not processed any application for recognition of third country TRs therefore there is no historical information to rely on.
28. For the recognition of TRs, the following steps are envisaged for TRs under SFTR: 1) the Commission determines the equivalence of the relevant third country jurisdiction; 2) ESMA concludes a co-operation agreement with the relevant third country authority. Where TRs authorised in a third country are not subject to a legally binding and enforceable obligation under the law of that third country to give direct and immediate access to the data to the authorities referred to in Article 12(2) of SFTR, the Commission shall submit recommendations to the Council for the negotiation of international agreements with that third country regarding mutual access to, and exchange of, information on SFTs held in trade repositories which are established in that third country, in order to ensure that all of the entities referred to in Article 12(2) of SFTR have direct and immediate access to all of the information needed for the exercise of their duties. Though slightly different from the recognition process envisaged under Articles 75 and 77 of EMIR, the recognition process under SFTR is expected to require similar level of supervisory effort, thus cost, from ESMA.
29. When defining the recognition fees for TRs under EMIR, ESMA indicated in paragraph 70 of the report on staffing and resources that ESMA expects around 0.1 FTE to process each application. Furthermore, in line with the practical experience in the case of the recognition of third-country CCP, ESMA expects that there will be a one-off cost (i) to assess the equivalence of a jurisdiction and (ii) to establish a cooperation arrangement

with the relevant authority, of a total of 0.2 FTE per jurisdiction. The ongoing supervisory cost of recognised third-country TRs is considered below 0.1 FTE per TR.

5 General approach on fees determination under SFTR

30. One of the aspects on which ESMA is requested to provide advice to the European Commission is on the types of fees to be levied by ESMA. Based on the experience with CDR 1003/2013, ESMA proposed in the CP that it would favour the option of a mixed system, levying specific administrative actions fees for (i) the registration process, proportionate to the expected turnover of the TRs, (ii) the extension of registration, and an (iii) annual fee proportionate to the level of turnover of the TRs for on-going supervision, as well as (iv) fees for the initial recognition and (v) on-going supervision of third-country TRs. Furthermore, and in order to cover ESMA's fixed costs relating to supervision, a minimum annual supervisory fee is proposed. This approach will be retained. The following chapters of this final report describe how this mixed system will work in practice.

Under SFTR, ESMA proposes to maintain the EMIR approach on fees thus the following system is proposed to be put in place:

A. Specific administrative fees related to:

- (i) registration, which are proportionate to the expected turnover of the TRs,
- (ii) extension of registration, which are flat fees
- (iii) initial recognition of third-country TRs

B. Annual supervision fee for registered TRs, proportionate to their turnover

C. Flat annual supervision fee for recognised TRs

6 Fees for registration or extension of registration

31. As mentioned in paragraph 5, ESMA's fees need to be proportionate to the turnover of the TRs and need to fully cover the administrative costs related to the registration, supervision and recognition of TRs.

6.1 Fees for registration and extension of registration under SFTR

32. The draft RTS on registration or extension of registration under SFTR establishes very similar requirements for the registration of TRs as the one under EMIR.

33. As mentioned above, ESMA spent on average 0.65 FTE for the assessment of each application for registration received in 2013. All the TRs registered so far have been classified as TRs with high expected turnover.

6.1.1 Expected turnover

34. While ESMA considers that the past experience on TRs registration could help in making the process more efficient and reducing the expected workload, at the same time ESMA notes that SFTR specifies in greater detail some requirements, which would need to be taken on board by the TRs. The assessment of those could entail some additional work for ESMA. For these reasons, it is deemed appropriate to use the actual figures on the time that was spent on TRs registrations under EMIR also for registrations under SFTR.
35. In order to classify the TRs under SFTR, ESMA proposed in the CP to use an approach similar to the one used in EMIR. No specialisation at individual TR level is expected to take place per type of SFTs.
36. However, ESMA understands that the provision of services ancillary to SFTR, similar to the provision of ancillary services to EMIR could be an indicator for high expected turnover. Some examples of ancillary services under EMIR are mentioned in Article 78(5) of EMIR, however not all the ancillary services mentioned in that article would be applicable for SFTR.
37. In this respect, ESMA indicated in the Consultation paper that for the purpose of defining the expected turnover of TRs under SFTR, an ancillary service would be any service whose provision is directly or indirectly related to the provision of SFTR services². The rationale for this approach is that if a TR provides ancillary services (i) it would have a more complete commercial offering towards the entities subject to the reporting obligation under Article 4 of SFTR, hence generate higher revenues, and (ii) it would require greater supervisory effort by ESMA to assess its application for registration under SFTR, in view of its higher complexity and possible impacts or interdependency of ancillary services and the core services.
38. Also similar to the approach taken under EMIR, ESMA proposed in the CP that the provision of ancillary service is considered to take place in the following instances: (i) direct provision by the TR, (ii) indirect provision by a company within the TR's group or (iii) provision by a third entity with which the TR has concluded a material agreement to cooperate in the provision of services in the context of the trading or post-trading chain.
39. Consequently, the TRs will be classified as follows:
 - a. in case a TR meets the criterion included in paragraph 36, it would be deemed to be higher expected turnover TR,

² Some non-exhaustive examples would be trade matching, trade confirmation/affirmation, agent lending, collateral management, collateral valuation, third-party reporting, etc.

- b. in case a TR does not meet the criterion included in paragraph 36, it would be deemed to be lower expected turnover TR.
40. Furthermore, as already established in CDR 1003/2013, in case a material change to the conditions of registration of a particular TR under SFTR takes place and it affects the criterion used to estimate the level of turnover of that TR, i.e. a TR starts offering ancillary services, an appropriate adjustment to the registration fees should be done, according to the above-mentioned classification on the basis of expected turnover. This will further align ESMA's necessary expenditure regarding a registered TR with the fees charged based on its expected turnover.
41. The feedback was overall supportive of the proposal to classify TRs and the criterion used. Some respondents expressed preference that the cost should be based only on the notary function of TRs. In this regard, ESMA kindly notes that TRs do not perform a notary function, but a recordkeeping function.

In order to establish a homogeneous and sound framework for TRs' classification, ESMA proposes under SFTR to use an approach similar to the one used in EMIR, thus classifying TRs as follows:

- a. In case a TR provides ancillary services, related to SFTR or jointly related to SFTR and EMIR, it would be deemed to be higher expected turnover TR.
- b. In case a TR does not provide ancillary services, it would be deemed to be lower expected turnover TR.

The provision of ancillary service is considered to take place in the following instances: (i) direct provision by the TR, (ii) indirect provision by a company within the TR's group or (iii) provision by a third entity with which the TR has concluded a material agreement to cooperate in the provision of services in the context of the trading or post-trading chain.

In case a material change to the conditions of registration of a particular TR under SFTR takes place and it affects the criterion used to estimate the level of turnover of that TR, i.e. a TR starts offering ancillary services, an appropriate adjustment to the registration fees should be done, according to the above-mentioned classification on the basis of expected turnover.

6.1.2 Amounts of registration fees under SFTR

42. The current registration fees structure for TRs detailed in CDR 1003/2013 envisages three groups: EUR 45,000 for TRs with low expected turnover, EUR 65,000 for TRs with medium expected turnover, EUR 100,000 for TRs with high expected turnover.
43. Taking into account the cost estimates included in Section 4.1.1, ESMA notes that the cost of assessment of a high expected turnover application under EMIR is 0.65 FTE per

application and that the average ESMA cost (including overheads, office space, etc.) of one FTE dedicated to TR supervision (including registration and recognition) is 155,000 EUR. On that basis, the registration fee for a higher expected turnover TR applicant results to be 100,000 EUR. The expected supervisory effort for a lower expected turnover TRs under SFTR is considered to be the same as the one for medium expected turnover TR under EMIR, i.e. equivalent to 65,000 EUR. No medium expected turnover fees was proposed under SFTR.

44. The vast majority of the respondents were in favour of ESMA's proposal to match the registration fees under SFTR with that of EMIR, simplifying also the categories into higher and lower. A further suggestion from market participants was to encourage ESMA to consider reducing the fees applicable for registration under SFTR in order to boost the competition, SFTs potentially being a small market for TRs. ESMA notes that the fees for registration are only applicable to new applicants and that the fees for extension of registration are certainly reduced. More importantly however, ESMA's registration or extension of registration fees are set out to cover ESMA's administrative costs related to the performance of the relevant functions established by SFTR.
45. Regarding the proposed types and amounts of registration fees, the respondents supported ESMA's proposals to have two types of registration fees for TRs under SFTR:
 - (a) Lower expected total turnover TRs shall pay a registration fee of 65,000 Euros and
 - (b) Higher expected total turnover shall pay a registration fee of 100,000 Euros.

Therefore, on that basis, ESMA advises to establish the following two amounts of registration fees under SFTR:

- a. Lower expected total turnover TRs shall pay a registration fee of 65,000 Euros
- b. Higher expected total turnover shall pay a registration fee of 100,000 Euros

6.1.3 Fees for extension of registration

46. According to the explanation included in Section 4.1.2, ESMA estimates that the extension of a registration would require half of the time requested for the original registration of a high expected turnover TR.
47. Moreover, in the Consultation Paper ESMA suggested that the two levels of registration fees indicated in paragraph 43 should not be replicated in the cases of extension of registration. This was explained mainly by the fact that ESMA is already in possession of certain information regarding the applicant TR, hence it will be able to assess the application for extension of registration without some of the additional costs related to the assessment of a new application for registration. Therefore, ESMA proposed that the relevant fee should be set at a level consistent with 50% of the registration fee, i.e. 50,000 EUR.

48. The majority of the respondents agreed on ESMA’s proposal to have a reduced fee for extension of registration. Nevertheless, the following concerns were raised. One respondent considered excessive the required 70% of time, effort and resources by ESMA compared to a new registration. Another one suggested that the amount of 50,000 EUR for extension might be discouraging for TRs that expect lower volumes of SFTs and might impact their competitiveness on TRs services market. A third one argued for a lower fee for TRs with a lower expected turnover applying for an extension of registration.
49. ESMA takes note of the feedback and has amended its advice in that respect. Therefore, if an application for extension of registration does not include the provision of ancillary services under SFTR, the TR will be required to pay EUR 32,500 and if it includes the provision of ancillary services under SFTR, then the TR should pay EUR 50,000.

ESMA recommends that the amount of fees for extension of registration under SFTR is set at a level consistent with 50% of the relevant registration fees:

- a. for lower expected turnover TR, i.e. 32,500 EUR
- b. for higher expected turnover TR, i.e. 50,000 EUR.

Table 1 – Summary of registration fees structure under SFTR

Extension of registration lower turnover	EUR 32,500
Extension of registration higher turnover	EUR 50,000
New registration lower expected turnover TR	EUR 65,000
New registration high expected turnover TR	EUR 100,000

6.2 Concurrent application under EMIR and SFTR

50. The current regulatory framework implies that a new TR willing to apply for registration both under EMIR and SFTR or under SFTR before being registered under EMIR, should send two separate applications. ESMA mentioned in the CP that this would imply that a given TR will pay up to 50,000 EUR more (depending on the classification) than in the situation where it is first registered under EMIR and then asks for an extension under SFTR.
51. It will not be possible that an applicant pays less in the case of concurrent applications. To avoid such a misalignment, ESMA proposed that if an applicant applies at the same time for a registration under EMIR and SFTR or it has concurrent applications, then the TR should pay (i) the full EMIR fee and (ii) the relevant fee for extension of the registration under SFTR, instead of the full SFTR fee.

52. As indicated by ESMA, such reduction of fees will be justified by the synergies that ESMA would experience, such as reviewing only once the type of documents, like organisational chart, ownership, etc., which are not required to be re-submitted in the case of extension. Furthermore, in the case of concurrent applications those documents will be referring to the same information at the same point in time.
53. Respondents unanimously confirmed the ESMA's proposal regarding reducing the total fee paid by applicant TR in the case of concurrent application of EMIR and SFTR.

In light of the feedback received, ESMA proposes that if an applicant applies at the same time for a registration under EMIR and SFTR or it has concurrent applications on which there is not yet been a formal decision by ESMA, then the TR should pay (i) the full EMIR fee and (ii) the relevant fee for extension of the registration under SFTR, instead of the full SFTR fee.

7 Supervisory fees

7.1 Determination of total annual supervisory fees for EMIR and SFTR

54. CDR 1003/2013 provide that the relevant amount for the calculation of the annual supervisory fee charged to a supervised TR under EMIR for a given year is based on the estimate of expenditure relating to the supervision of TRs under EMIR as included in ESMA's budget for that year set out and approved in accordance with Article 63 of Regulation (EU) No 1095/2010, decreased by (i) recognition fees charged to third country TRs under EMIR, (ii) registration fees and annual supervisory fees under EMIR paid by new TRs, or by already registered TRs, in case a material change to their registration takes place and (iii) surplus of annual supervisory fees under EMIR from the previous year, and increased by the deficit of annual supervisory fees under EMIR from the previous year.
55. However, for the reasons included in section 3, ESMA understands that the aforementioned approach needs to be amended under EMIR and a consistent framework under SFTR needs to be applied.
56. Therefore, under EMIR as well as under SFTR, the annual supervisory fees would be determined in accordance with the ESMA budgeting procedure, which would take into account all the activities that would result in supervisory effort related to each of the regulations.
57. Once the relevant amount is determined, ESMA proposes that the annual supervisory fees paid by each TR are calculated as the proportion of the relevant expenditure amount which corresponds to the ratio of the TR's specific turnover to the total turnover of all registered TRs.

58. Regarding the determination of the allocation of supervisory fees, most of the respondents support the ESMA's proposal. One respondent however pointed out that ESMA should strive to return fees to the supervisory entities, in case they were collected in excess. However, this would not be possible under the EU budgetary framework to which ESMA is subject.

ESMA proposes that the annual supervisory fees under EMIR are determined in accordance with the ESMA budgeting procedure, taking into account the activities that would result in supervisory effort.

As indicated before, Article 7(2)(b) of CDR 1003/2013 should be deleted.

ESMA proposes that the annual supervisory fees under SFTR is determined in accordance with the ESMA budgeting procedure, taking into account the activities that would result in supervisory effort.

7.2 Amendments to calculation of applicable turnover under EMIR and proposed way forward under SFTR

59. When providing its advice to EC, ESMA flagged the following aspects regarding the TR industry in 2013: (a) formed on the basis of a new service, which arises partly as a consequence of regulatory development; (b) an emergence of new suppliers and new customers, appearance of different business models and variety of additional/ancillary products and services; (iii) an uncertainty regarding the demand for the TR's product and the growth potential; (iv) a limited track record and market conditions of the companies and the industry itself are still largely unknown; (v) potential for different commercial and business practices; and (vi) cross sector spill-overs, since TRs may use already existing technology and know-how from other market infrastructures, such as CSDs or IT solutions providers.
60. ESMA further indicated that it would not be unlikely that TRs (i) face different cost structures and, therefore, apply pricing policies that vary significantly between them, causing significant revenue variability; (ii) lack previous financial track records or these are based on very short periods; and (iii) produce financial estimates and business plans that are either over-conservative or overambitious.
61. Now, more than three years after the start of the reporting under EMIR, ESMA understands that many of the potential difficulties regarding the establishment of the industry, the initial business practices and the potential cost structures of the TRs are overcome. In addition, ESMA and the TRs are in possession of historical financial track record on the performance of TRs. In addition, the relevant business plans have been reviewed and adjusted to the reality of the TR market. All this reduces the need to establish a more complex system for calculation of applicable turnover.

62. Pursuant to CDR 1003/2013, the applicable turnover of TRs is based on 3 elements: (i) core revenues of TR obtained in the reference period, (ii) number of trades reported to TR during the reference period and (iii) number of outstanding trades at a TR at the end of the reference period.
63. So far, ESMA has not experienced any material difficulties to determine the first component of the applicable turnover, which is the core revenues of a TR. TRs are obliged by national legislation to prepare their financial statements and they regularly submit their financial statements to ESMA, as periodic information. The profit and loss account and the respective notes of the financial statements usually contain the breakdown of the revenues, which enables to identify what part of revenues related to core services under EMIR. As required by CDR 1003/2013, this information is certified by auditors, therefore the risk that ESMA uses for the calculation of fees a figure which is not accurate is very low.
64. ESMA indicated, however, certain difficulties to ensure consistency and comparability of aggregate data across all TRs.
65. To that extent, ESMA proposed in the CP that for the purpose of calculating the applicable turnover under SFTR, the core revenues for centrally collecting and maintaining the records of SFTs are always taken into account and then enquired whether the revenues from the ancillary services should be taken into account. In case the audited accounts are not available at the moment of calculation of the relevant instalment, the previous year's annual accounts should be used.

$$\frac{\text{Turnover } TR_i}{\sum \text{Turnover}} = \frac{\text{SFT revenue } TR_i}{\sum \text{SFT revenues } TR}$$

66. This proposal was widely discussed. Part of the respondents disagreed on ESMA's proposal, supporting the current activity-based approach to turnover determination under CDR 1003/2013 without including the ancillary services in the fees' computation. According to those, there is not necessarily a correlation between offering ancillary services and greater turnover in any event. Furthermore, one respondent pointed out that it would be more reasonable to solve the underlying problem of trade count accuracy, as the volume of trades processed is the only reliable indicator of the likely supervisory effort required from ESMA. Another respondent suggested retaining the activity figures, but reducing their weight in the calculation of turnover from 2/3 to 1/2 and adding revenues from ancillary services.
67. On the other hand, some market participants counter argued that in EMIR reporting, the inclusion of outstanding trades in the fee calculation brought unexpected problems due to the nature of reporting trades and lifecycle events, particularly for certain derivative types. Therefore those were in favour of the approach suggested by ESMA to use revenues only. They supported the view that the core revenues do not accurately reflect the amount of supervisory work that ESMA needs to carry out. In addition, they also agreed with ESMA's view expressed in the Consultation Paper that the inclusion of ancillary services would mitigate risks or reduce uncertainties related to cross-

subsidizing reporting services with other ancillary SFT services and it will soften its impact on competition between TRs.

68. While, at this stage, ESMA understands that with some level of tolerance supervisory efforts are proportionate to the supervisory fees charged based mainly on core revenues, this might not be the case in the future. For instance, to address this situation, ESMA's fees for credit rating agencies³ are calculated based on the revenues generated from the CRA's credit rating activities and ancillary services.
69. To sum up, based on the feedback received and on the existing rules for other supervised entities, ESMA proposes to calculate the turnover of the TRs based on the revenues from the relevant core repository and ancillary services provided by the TR. In this context, ancillary services should be understood in the same way as they are described in paragraph 37, i.e. as any service whose provision is directly or indirectly related to the provision of the core repository services under EMIR and SFTR. However for the purpose of supervisory fees only the ancillary services provided by the TR should be considered.
70. To that extent, the TRs would need to present in their financial accounts separately the different streams of revenues as per the following categorisation:
 - a. EMIR core services of centrally collecting and maintaining records of derivatives;
 - b. EMIR ancillary services such as credit event servicing, portfolio reconciliation or portfolio compression;
 - c. SFTR core services of centrally collecting and maintaining records of SFTs;
 - d. SFTR ancillary services such as agent lending or collateral management;
 - e. EMIR and SFTR ancillary services such as trade matching, trade confirmation/affirmation, third party reporting or collateral valuation;
 - f. Non-EMIR and non-SFTR services, such as custody or safekeeping activities, REMIT or MIFIR reporting, etc. In general in this category would include all those services provided under regulations different from EMIR and SFTR.
71. ESMA understands that splitting the revenues per the six categories should not be a problem for the TRs as they are required under Article 20 of Commission Delegated Regulation 150/2013 and under Article 20 of the draft regulatory technical standards for registration under SFTR to have unbundled prices and fees for the repository and the ancillary services provided under each Regulation.

³ Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 272/2012 of 7 February 2012, supplementing Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to fees charged by the European Securities and Markets Authority to credit rating agencies, OJ L90, 28.3.2012, p.6

72. Where ancillary services are provided in relation with both EMIR and SFTR altogether, i.e. the situation described in letter e of paragraph 70, a portion of those revenues would be assigned to the turnover calculation for annual supervisory fees under EMIR and SFTR in proportionate terms to the revenues from core services under each regulation. Where one of these services described in letter e of paragraph 70 is provided by an entity which is only registered under EMIR or under SFTR, then it will be used in full for the purposes of the calculation of the turnover for that entity with regards to the regulation under which it is registered.
73. Furthermore, when assessing an application for registration or for extension of registration or in the course of the on-going supervisory activities, the TRs would provide ESMA with the necessary information to assess and assign the services directly provided by the TRs to one of the above categories.

Based on the feedback received, ESMA proposes an amendment to CDR 1003/2013 to calculate the annual supervisory fees under EMIR based on the TR's total turnover related to derivatives reporting, which includes revenues from core and ancillary services.

For the purposes of ESMA's fees for supervision of EMIR activities, the relevant revenues resulting from core and ancillary services related to EMIR should be taken into account. Where the revenue from an ancillary service cannot be explicitly allocated between EMIR and SFTR, it will be taken into account for both calculations in proportionate terms to the revenues received from the core services under each of the two regulations. The revenues from non-EMIR and non-SFTR services will not be taken into account for calculating the turnover of a TR.

$$\frac{EMIR\ Turnover\ TR_i}{\sum EMIR\ Turnover\ TR} = \frac{EMIR\ revenue\ TR_i}{\sum EMIR\ revenues\ TR}, \text{ where}$$

$$EMIR\ revenue\ TR_i = Revenue\ Core\ EMIR\ services\ TR_i + Revenue\ Ancillary\ EMIR\ services\ TR_i$$

Similarly, ESMA proposes to calculate the annual supervisory fees under SFTR based on the TR's total turnover related to SFT reporting, which includes revenues from core and ancillary services.

For the purposes of ESMA's fees for supervision of SFTR activities, the relevant revenues resulting from core and ancillary services related to SFTR should be taken into account. Where the revenue from an ancillary service cannot be explicitly allocated between EMIR and SFTR, it will be taken into account for both calculations in proportionate terms to the revenues received from the core services under each of the two regulations. The revenues from non-EMIR and non-SFTR services will not be taken into account for calculating the turnover of a TR.

$$\frac{SFTR\ Turnover\ TR_i}{\sum SFTR\ Turnover\ TR} = \frac{SFTR\ revenue\ TR_i}{\sum SFTR\ revenues\ TR}, \text{ where}$$

$SFTR\ revenue\ TR_i = Revenue\ Core\ SFTR\ services\ TR_i +$
 $Revenue\ Ancillary\ SFTR\ services\ TR_i$

7.3 Minimum supervisory fees under SFTR

74. The supervision of TRs requires the performance of certain activities towards all TRs. These activities are stemming from ESMA's supervision workplan. ESMA adopts a risk-based approach to supervision and prioritises the supervisory action that it will take each year in accordance with its objectives of promoting financial stability and orderly markets and enhancing investor protection⁴. While the supervisory actions may vary per TR, to be able to perform its tasks, ESMA always needs to undertake a minimum level of supervisory activities.
75. To that extent, and given that the risk-based approach for supervision most probably would be extended also for supervision of TRs under SFTR, as it is under EMIR and as it is for CRAs under CRAR, ESMA indicated in the CP that a minimum annual supervisory fee to be paid by TR registered under SFTR should be similar as the one set out in CDR 1003/2013, i.e. it should be 30,000 EUR.
76. Furthermore, the minimum set of common activities at the level of each regulation would be based on the risk-based approach and would be most likely specific, hence existence of potential synergies as the ones referred in section 6.2 would be hardly achievable. Therefore, ESMA understands that the minimum supervisory fee under SFTR should be the same irrespective of whether it refers to a TR registered only under SFTR or to a TR which has extended its registration under SFTR.
77. For the avoidance of doubt, in case an entity is subject to minimum supervisory fees under both EMIR and SFTR, it would be required to pay two minimum supervisory fees, one under each regulation, totalling 60,000 EUR.
78. The feedback received from the respondents was split. Part of them fully supported ESMA's proposal that an entity operating as a TR for both EMIR and SFTR should be subject to a minimum supervisory fee for each. The rest argued that, according to the content of Art. 11 SFTR, fees should be proportionate to the turnover of the TR and where a TR registered under EMIR is extended registration under SFTR, the minimum supervisory fees should only be adjusted to reflect the additional necessary expenditure. To that extent, the fees should be adjusted to reflect the fact that being registered under multiple regimes reduces the average supervision effort per regime in relation to given

⁴ Link to the latest one can be found here https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/files/library/2016-234_esma_2015_annual_report_on_supervision_and_2016_work_plan.pdf

TR. In addition, one respondent suggested to reduce the minimum fee for TRs supervised both under EMIR and SFTR to a total of 50,000 EUR.

79. All in all, ESMA understands that the minimum supervisory fee should cover the fixed costs related to the supervision under a risk-based approach for services related to EMIR and SFTR reporting. As those costs are fixed and there are no potential synergies to be achieved, contrary to the extension of registration or the concurrent applications, ESMA maintains the proposal to charge two minimum supervisory fees of a total amount of EUR 60,000.

Concerning the establishment of a minimum supervisory fee under SFTR, ESMA proposes to set it out at the same amount as under EMIR, i.e. a minimum annual supervisory fee of 30,000 EUR.

In case an entity is subject to minimum supervisory fees under both EMIR and SFTR, it should minimum supervisory fees under each regulation, totalling 60,000 EUR.

7.4 First-year supervisory fee under SFTR

80. ESMA's experience with the registration and supervision of TRs has shown that the supervision in the first months after the TR is registered requires similar effort as the one during registration and more importantly, the supervisory effort is not related to the actual level of activity of the TR, but is quite similar across all TRs.
81. According to the provisions in Article 33(2)(a) of SFTR, the reporting obligation would start 12 months after the entry into force of the delegated act adopted by the European Commission pursuant to Article 4(9) of SFTR for credit institutions and investment firms. The other entities would follow in accordance with a phased approach. In that regard, the period of time between the registration or extension of registration of TR and the start of the reporting obligation would be part of the preparatory phase for ESMA, the national authorities, the reporting entities and the TRs.
82. It is worth noting however that in case the reporting obligation under Article 4 of SFTR kicks in in the same calendar year in which the TR is registered, this gives rise to a somehow different situation in which the supervision in this first year is more closely related to the business-as-usual supervision. From that perspective, it is expected that ESMA will turn sooner to a business-as-usual risk-based supervision, rather than mainly supervising implementation and deployment of systems and reporting channels. In the case of TRs, the start of the reporting obligation ensures stable revenue flow to them.
83. Alternative A would be to use an EMIR-like first-year supervisory fee where the first-year supervisory fees are capped at the registration amount. Alternative B would that the fees are calculated on the basis of turnover indicator calculated for an interim period. A similar approach is detailed in Article 15 of CDR 1003/2013.

84. Irrespective of whether the reporting obligation starts in the year of registration of the TR or in the following one, as in the case of the CDR 1003/2013, the SFTR supervisory fees in the first year could be based on the registration or extension of registration fees further adjusted by a coefficient. The coefficient may be the ratio between the working days until the end of the year from the date the registration is granted, and ESMA's average registration processing time which as mentioned in section 4.1.1 is equal to 0.65 FTE=150 working days. In that case the maximum amount due for annual supervisory fee by a TR in its first year of operation shall be equal to the amount of the relevant registration fee. The denominator of the formula deviates from the one included in the first-year supervisory fees under EMIR, given the experience acquired by ESMA.

TR supervisory fee in year 1 = Min (TR registration or extension of registration fee, TR registration fee * coefficient)

$$\text{Coefficient} = \frac{\text{Supervisory working days in year 1}}{150}$$

85. Alternatively, in case the reporting obligation under Article 4 of SFTR kicks in the first year of supervision of the TRs under SFTR, ESMA proposes in Alternative B that the fees are calculated on the basis of turnover indicator calculated for an interim period. A similar approach is detailed in Article 15 of CDR 1003/2013.
86. In that case the supervisory fees for the TRs in the year when the reporting started, i.e. 2014, were computed on the basis of the turnover using the three relevant indicators – revenues, number of reported derivatives trades and number of outstanding derivatives trades - for the period between 1 January 2014 and 30 June 2014, instead on using the turnover indicators from 2013 which in fact were inexistent.
87. While Alternative B would not allow the TRs to plan in advance their costs, it would be closer to the actual supervisory costs and efforts by ESMA in supervising the TRs. Regarding the alternatives proposed by ESMA about the first year supervisory fees, the majority of the respondents has expressed its preference is in favour of Alternative A in order to be able to plan the costs in advance and adjust the TR's budget.

In view of the feedback received, ESMA proposes to keep the two options available and depending on the start of the reporting obligation under Article 33(2)(a)(i) of SFTR apply the most appropriate one:

- a. Alternative A in which the first-year supervisory fees are capped at the registration amount, in those cases where the reporting start date under Article 33(2)(a)(i) of SFTR falls in the following calendar year to the registration of a TR under SFTR.

*TR supervisory fee in year 1 = Min (TR registration or extension of registration fee, TR registration fee * coefficient)*

$$\text{Coefficient} = \frac{\text{Supervisory working days in year 1}}{150}$$

- b. Alternative B in which first-year supervisory fees are calculated on the basis of a turnover indicator calculated for an interim period, such as half year, in those cases where the reporting start date under Article 33(2)(a)(i) of SFTR falls in the same calendar year of the registration of a TR under SFTR.

8 Recognition fees under SFTR

88. In the CP ESMA proposed that given the similarities of the recognition process under EMIR and under SFTR, and in particular the required effort, ESMA suggests to maintain the same level of fees already envisaged for recognition of third countries TRs under EMIR, which is structured in the following way: (i) 20,000 EUR for the processing of the application for recognition and (ii) the amount resulting from dividing the costs for equivalence assessment and cooperation arrangement, estimated at 35,000 EUR, by the total number of TRs that are either recognised or applying for recognition from that jurisdiction, including the concerned applicant. As explained in ESMA's final advice to the European Commission on CDR 1003/2013, the supervisory effort towards third country entities is somehow reduced in comparison with the directly supervised ones.
89. Under Article 19(4)(b) of SFTR, it is provided that a third country TR may submit an application for extension of registration in the case that the TR is already recognised under EMIR. Given that similar approach to the one on extension of registration should be applied the first component of the recognition fee relating to the assessment of the application, it is proposed that it should be reduced by 50%. The second component, however, will entail costs particular to ensuring compliance with SFTR, hence it is proposed to be kept as it is. Therefore, the fees in the case of extension of registration for a recognised TR would be (i) 10,000 EUR for the processing of the application for extension of registration in case of recognition and (ii) the amount resulting from dividing the costs for equivalence assessment and cooperation arrangement, estimated at 35,000 EUR by the total number of TRs that are either recognised or applying for recognition from that jurisdiction, including the concerned applicant.
90. Given the reduced supervision by ESMA of recognised TRs, ESMA proposes that the on-going recognition fee for TRs recognised under SFTR is kept at 5,000 EUR, which is the same level as under EMIR.
91. For the avoidance of doubt, in case an entity is recognised under both regimes, it would pay a total annual recognition fee of 10,000 EUR.
92. The market participants agreed broadly with ESMA's proposal. Indeed, while there is unanimous consensus on the amount of supervisory fees for recognised entities, concerns were raised about ESMA's decision that equivalence and cooperation

arrangements should not be reduced. In addition, some of the respondents have submitted the suggestions and concerns detailed in the coming paragraphs.

93. Difficulties in splitting the cost of assessment of the legal regime of a third country before recognising a TR based in that country. In view of some of the feedback received, it is worth noting that the equivalence assessment under SFTR will be different from the equivalence assessment under EMIR. Furthermore, it is neither clear that the same third country authority would be responsible for supervising TRs regarding derivatives reporting and regarding SFT reporting. Therefore, at this stage it seems more reasonable to retain the amount as established.
94. There was a further suggestion to encourage TRs to apply simultaneously in order to easily allocate the cost among all of them. If not, the first to apply would suffer the total cost, resulting in an unfair incentive for the other TRs to delay the date of application. However, as ESMA indicated in its proposal the cost of assessment of equivalence and cooperation arrangement for a given third country would be split among all the applicants from that third country.

Based on the feedback received, ESMA proposes to maintain the same level of fees under SFTR as already established in the case of recognition of third countries TRs under EMIR.

In the case of application for recognition under SFTR by a TR without an existing recognition under EMIR, the following amounts should apply: (i) 20,000 EUR for the processing of the application for recognition and (ii) the amount resulting from dividing the costs for equivalence assessment and cooperation arrangement, estimated at 35,000 EUR, by the total number of TRs that are either recognised or applying for recognition from that jurisdiction, including the concerned applicant.

In the case of extension of registration for a TR recognised under EMIR, the following amount should apply: (i) 10,000 EUR for the processing of the application for extension of registration in case of recognition and (ii) the amount resulting from dividing the costs for equivalence assessment and cooperation arrangement, estimated at 35,000 EUR by the total number of TRs that are either recognised or applying for recognition from that jurisdiction, including the concerned applicant.

9 Payment and reimbursement conditions under SFTR

9.1 Fees for registration, extension of registration and recognition

95. As indicated in paragraph 32 of the SFTR CP, Chapter III SFTR includes also Article 11 which establishes the need for ESMA to charge fees to the TRs to “fully cover ESMA’s necessary expenditure relating to the registration, recognition and supervision of trade repositories as well as the reimbursement of any costs that the competent authorities may incur as a result of any delegation of tasks pursuant to Article 9(1) of [SFTR]”. In

that respect, it can be understood that the payment of the relevant fees is essential condition for the TR to be registered, extended registration or recognised under SFTR.

96. A TR should therefore pay the relevant fees established in Sections 6 and 8 at the time at which it applies to ESMA. This is in line with the requirements under CDR 1003/2013.
97. Regarding the payment of fees related to registration, extension of registration and recognition, the majority of the feedback received from the industry support the proposal.

ESMA proposes that the fees for registration, extension of registration and recognition under SFTR are paid at the moment of application.

9.2 Reimbursement conditions in case of withdrawal of application

98. CDR 1003/2013 do not envisage reimbursement to applicant TRs in case of withdrawal of application prior to the registration of the entity under EMIR.
99. In the CP, ESMA proposed that the same approach is taken with regards to fees for registration and extension of registration under SFTR as well as to the application part of the recognition fee under SFTR. The main reasons supporting this proposal are the following ones:
 - a. SFTR establishes a reporting obligation to TRs which creates a market in itself;
 - b. Lowering the expected cost of an incomplete process (by reimbursing a part of the fee) could allow for spurious applications, from companies aiming at establishing a TR without fulfilling a minimum set of requirements; and
 - c. ESMA has to concentrate the limited resources available on the applications that carry a true intention of becoming a trade repository and to discourage the submission of spurious applications.
100. To sum up, the possibility of reimbursement runs contrary to that goal and the applications that end up withdrawing would reduce the available resources for those that do not, thus compromising the proper review of the latter.
101. The respondents agreed unanimously with ESMA's proposal.

Based on the feedback received, and in order to ensure consistency with CDR 1003/2013, ESMA maintains its proposal to not reimburse fees to an applicant TR in the case of withdrawal of application for registration or extension of registration under SFTR.

Similarly, based on the responses received, and in order to ensure consistency with CDR 1003/2013, ESMA maintains its proposal to not reimburse application fees to an

applicant third country TR in the case of withdrawal of application for recognition or extension of registration under SFTR.

9.3 Annual supervisory fees

102. In accordance with CDR 1003/2013, the TRs need to pay their annual supervisory fees in two instalments – first one by 28 February and second one by 31 August. This calendar ensures that ESMA’s supervisory costs are covered in a timely manner and it is also aligned with the payments calendar for CRAs.
103. However, as mentioned in Section 3, ESMA has updated its approach to budgeting and more specifically to the management of surpluses and deficits.
104. From that perspective, all the costs related to the supervision of TRs should be considered for budget purposes. Given that there might be unexpected applications for registration or recognition, ESMA proposes that the date of the second instalment is moved to 31 October, while the date of the first one is kept at 28 February.
105. For the reasons mentioned, ESMA understands that the calendar provided in CDR 1003/2013 should be updated also in line with SFTR, i.e. the TRs would need to pay 5/6 of their annual supervisory fee by 28 February and 1/6 of their annual supervisory fee by 31 October.
106. Regarding the frequency of payments of the annual supervisory fees under SFTR, the majority of the respondent do not have objection to ESMA’s proposal.

Based on the feedback received, ESMA proposes to amend the calendar and amounts in accordance to which the TRs pay their annual supervisory fees under EMIR. The TRs should pay 5/6 of their annual supervisory fee by 28 February and 1/6 of their annual supervisory fee by 31 October.

Based on the feedback received, an in order to ensure consistency with EMIR, ESMA proposes that concerning the calendar and amounts for payment of annual supervisory fees under SFTR, the TRs should pay 5/6 of their annual supervisory fee by 28 February and 1/6 of their annual supervisory fee by 31 October.

9.4 Annual recognition fees

107. ESMA believes that given the reduced amount of the annual recognition fees, those should be paid in only one instalment by 28 February. The respondents agreed unanimously with this proposal.

Therefore, ESMA proposes to establish a single payment by 28 February of the annual supervisory fees to a recognised TR.

10 Reimbursement of competent authorities under SFTR

108. Any delegation of tasks has to follow the principles established in SFTR. Prior to any delegation of a task to the relevant competent authority, ESMA should consult and agree with such authority the scope and complexity of the task, the timetable for its performance and the transmission of necessary information to ESMA. Any costs incurred by national competent authorities while carrying out supervisory tasks delegated by ESMA will be covered by ESMA's supervisory fees and the NCA will not look to recover these costs directly from the TR.
109. Stemming from the above, and similarly with what is already in place under CDR 1003/2013 the costs to be reimbursed to national competent authorities need to fulfil the following conditions:
- a. they should be previously agreed between ESMA and the NCA;
 - b. they should be calculated in accordance to the method used to determine ESMA's total administrative costs regarding TRs;
 - c. they should be proportionate to the turnover of the relevant TR; and
 - d. they should not be greater than the total amount of supervisory fees paid by the relevant TR.
110. Any delegation of tasks by ESMA to national competent authorities will be determined on an independent basis, may be revoked at any time and will not impact the amount of fees charged to a particular TR.
111. ESMA's proposed approach on dealing with the reimbursement of costs to NCA under Article 9(1) SFTR was supported by respondents.

Therefore, ESMA, proposes that any costs incurred by NCA while carrying out supervisory tasks delegated by ESMA will be covered by ESMA's supervisory fees and the NCA will not look to recover these costs directly from the TR.

The costs to be reimbursed to national competent authorities need to fulfil the following conditions:

- a. they should be previously agreed between ESMA and the NCA;
- b. they should be calculated in accordance to the method used to determine ESMA's total administrative costs regarding TRs;

- c. they should be proportionate to the turnover of the relevant TR; and
- d. they should not be greater than the total amount of supervisory fees paid by the relevant TR.

Any delegation of tasks by ESMA to national competent authorities will be determined on an independent basis, may be revoked at any time and will not impact the amount of fees charged to a particular TR.

11 Annex – EC request to ESMA for technical advice

REQUEST TO ESMA FOR TECHNICAL ADVICE ON POSSIBLE DELEGATED ACTS CONCERNING THE SUPERVISORY FEES TO BE CHARGED TO TRADE REPOSITORIES

With this mandate the Commission seeks ESMA's technical advice on possible delegated acts concerning the Regulation on transparency of securities financing transactions and of reuse ('SFTR')⁵ or the "**legislative act**". These delegated acts should be adopted in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU).

The Commission reserves the right to revise and/or supplement this formal mandate. The technical advice received on the basis of this mandate should not prejudice the Commission's final decision.

The mandate follows the Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council establishing a European Securities and Markets Authority (the "**ESMA Regulation**"),⁶ the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council - Implementation of Article 290 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (the "**290 Communication**"),⁷ and the Framework Agreement on Relations between the European Parliament and the European Commission (the "**Framework Agreement**").⁸

According to Article 11(2) of the legislative act and with regard to the supervisory fees to be charged to trade repositories, the Commission shall adopt a delegated act to specify further the type of fees, the matters for which fees are due, the amount of the fees and the manner in which they are to be paid.

The European Parliament and the Council shall be duly informed about this mandate.

In accordance with the Declaration 39 on Article 290 TFEU, annexed to the Final Act of the Intergovernmental Conference which adopted the Treaty of Lisbon, signed on 13 December 2007, and in accordance with the established practice within the European Securities Committee,⁹ the Commission will continue, as appropriate, to consult experts appointed by the Member States in the preparation of possible delegated acts in the financial services area.

In accordance with point 15 of the Framework Agreement, the Commission will provide full information and documentation on its meetings with experts appointed by the Member States within the framework of its work on the preparation and implementation of Union legislation, including soft law and delegated acts. Upon request by the Parliament, the Commission may also invite Parliament's experts to attend those meetings.

The powers of the Commission to adopt delegated acts are subject to Article 82 of the legislative act. As soon as the Commission adopts a possible delegated act, the Commission will notify it simultaneously to the European Parliament and the Council.

1. Context

1.1 Scope

The objective of the Regulation on transparency of securities financing transactions and of reuse (SFTR) is to enhance the transparency of securities financing markets and thus of the financial system. The SFTR creates a Union framework under which details of securities financing

⁵ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32015R2365&from=DE>

⁶ Regulation (EU) No 1095/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 establishing a European Supervisory Authority (European Securities and Markets Authority), OJ L 331, 15.12.2010, p. 84

⁷ Communication of 9.12.2009. COM (2009) 673 final.

⁸ OJ L 304, 20.11.2010, p. 47.

⁹ Commission's Decision of 6.6.2001 establishing the European Securities Committee, OJ L 191, 17.7.2001, p.45.

transactions (SFTs) can be efficiently reported to trade repositories (TRs). The SFTR legal framework should, to the extent possible, be the same as that of Regulation No 648/2012 of 4 July 2012 on OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories ('EMIR') in respect of the reporting of derivative contracts to trade repositories registered for that purpose.

SFTR, like EMIR, grants ESMA direct registration and supervisory powers over trade repositories. In accordance with Article 11(1) of SFTR, ESMA shall charge fees to trade repositories and those fees shall fully cover ESMA's necessary expenditure relating to the registration, recognition and supervision of trade repositories.

The Commission shall adopt a Regulation on fees, to be adopted in the form of a delegated act, to specify further the type of fees, the matters for which fees are due, the amount of the fees and the manner in which they are to be paid.

This mandate focuses on the technical aspects of the Regulation on fees. In providing its advice, ESMA should build upon its previous experience in advising on supervisory fees for TRs registered under EMIR and from the experience of relevant national authorities in setting supervisory fees for financial institutions.

1.2 Principles that ESMA should take into account

On the working approach, ESMA is invited to take account of the following principles:

- It should respect the requirements of the ESMA Regulation, and, to the extent that ESMA takes over the tasks of CESR in accordance with Art 8(1)(l) of the ESMA Regulation, take account of the principles set out in the Lamfalussy Report¹⁰ and those mentioned in the Stockholm Resolution of 23 March 2001¹¹.
- The principle of proportionality: the technical advice should not go beyond what is necessary to achieve the objective of the delegated acts set out in the legislative act. It should be simple and avoid suggesting excessive financial, administrative or procedural burdens for trade repositories.
- While preparing its advice, ESMA should seek coherence within the regulatory framework of the Union, in particular with the EMIR framework.
- In accordance with the ESMA Regulation, ESMA should not feel confined in its reflection to elements that it considers should be addressed by the delegated acts but, if it finds it appropriate, it may indicate guidelines and recommendations that it believes should accompany the delegated acts to better ensure their effectiveness.
- ESMA will determine its own working methods depending on the content of the provisions being dealt with. Nevertheless, horizontal questions should be dealt with in

¹⁰Final Report of the Committee of Wise Men on the Regulation of European Securities Markets, chaired by M. Lamfalussy, Brussels, 15 February 2001.

(http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/securities/docs/lamfalussy/wisemen/final-report-wise-men_en.pdf)

¹¹Results of the Council of Economics and Finance Ministers, 22 March 2001, Stockholm Securities legislation, (<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/01/105&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>).

such a way as to ensure coherence between different standards of work being carried out by the various expert groups.

- In accordance with the ESMA Regulation, ESMA is invited to widely consult market participants in an open and transparent manner. ESMA should provide advice which takes account of different opinions expressed by the market participants during their consultation. ESMA should provide a detailed feedback statement on the consultation, specifying when consultations took place, how many responses were received and from whom, as well as the main arguments for and against the issues raised. This should be annexed to its technical advice. The technical advice should justify ESMA's choices vis-à-vis the main arguments raised during the consultation.
- ESMA is invited to justify its advice by providing a quantitative and qualitative cost-benefit analysis of all the options considered and proposed.
- The technical advice carried out should contain sufficient and detailed explanations for the assessment done, and be presented in an easily understandable language respecting current legal terminology at European level.
- ESMA should provide comprehensive technical analysis on the subject matters described below covered by the delegated powers included in the relevant provision of the legislative act, in the corresponding recitals as well as in the relevant Commission's request included in this mandate.
- The technical advice given by ESMA to the Commission should not take the form of a legal text. However, ESMA should provide the Commission with an "articulated" text which means a clear and structured text, accompanied by sufficient and detailed explanations for the advice given, and which is presented in an easily understandable language respecting current terminology in the Union.
- ESMA should address to the Commission any question they might have concerning the clarification on the text of the legislative act, which they should consider of relevance to the preparation of its technical advice.

2 Procedure

The Commission is requesting the technical advice of ESMA in view of the preparation of the possible delegated acts to be adopted pursuant to the legislative act and in particular regarding the questions referred to in section 3 of this formal mandate.

The mandate takes into account the ESMA Regulation, the 290 Communication and the Framework Agreement.

The Commission reserves the right to revise and/or supplement this mandate. The technical advice received on the basis of this mandate will not prejudice the Commission's final decision.

In accordance with established practice, the Commission may continue to consult experts appointed by the Member States in the preparation of the delegated acts relating to the legislative act.

The Commission has duly informed the European Parliament and the Council about this mandate. As soon as the Commission adopts possible delegated acts, it will notify them simultaneously to the European Parliament and the Council.

3 ESMA is invited to provide technical advice on the following issues

ESMA is invited to provide technical advice to assist the Commission in formulating a delegated act on fees for trade repositories, and more specifically on the following aspects:

- In order to ensure a fair treatment of trade repositories within the Union framework, ESMA should base its work, to the fullest possible extent, on Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 1003/2013 of 12 July 2013 supplementing Regulation (EU) No 648/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to fees charged by the European Securities and Markets Authority to trade repositories ('EMIR Delegated Regulation on trade repositories' fees)¹². In particular, ESMA should duly justify and substantiate any potential need to depart in its technical advice from the principles contained in 'EMIR Delegated Regulation on trade repositories' fees.

- ESMA is invited to reflect on the type of fees that could be levied. Fees could be provided for specific supervisory actions (e.g. registration fees) or a general flat fee (for example annual) could be levied which would cover all supervisory activity for a year. A mixed system (fees for individual supervisory actions complemented by a general flat fee to cover the remaining expenditure) could also be considered.

- In case ESMA suggests fees for specific supervisory actions, ESMA should draw up a list of supervisory actions with the corresponding amounts of fees taking into account any applicable fees on trade repositories already registered under EMIR where such repositories extend their services under SFTR. ESMA is also invited to advise on whether exceptional circumstances need to be foreseen in the fees structures to take into account potential exceptional/nonroutine supervisory activities.

- In case ESMA suggests annual flat fees, ESMA should indicate how the flat fee should be calculated, i.e. how its expenditure necessary for the registration, recognition and supervision of trade repositories should be distributed to the individual supervised trade repositories. ESMA should take into account any applicable fees on trade repositories already registered under EMIR where such repositories extend their services under SFTR. ESMA is invited to advise on whether fees should be yearly adjustable or fixed.

- According to Article 11(1) of SFTR, the amount of fees charged to a trade repository shall fully cover all necessary expenditure incurred by ESMA for its registration, recognition and supervision activities under SFTR. ESMA is invited to detail its assessment of the necessary expenditure it will incur for the registration, recognition and supervision of trade repositories, and provide information on its estimates and methods of calculation. ESMA should build upon its existing experience of registering and supervising trade repositories under EMIR to inform its analysis. ESMA should also advise on how the surpluses/deficits in ESMA's supervision budget for trade repositories should be managed.

¹² OJ L 279, 19.10.2013, p. 4.

- According to Article 11(1) of SFTR, the amount of fees charged to a trade repository shall be proportionate to the turnover of the trade repository concerned. ESMA is invited to provide its technical advice on the appropriate method for considering the turnover of the trade repository in fee calculations, including the use of activity indicators when revenue figures are not yet existent, are not reliable or are not an adequate measure of the trade repository activity. ESMA should take into account any applicable fees on trade repositories already registered under EMIR where such repositories extend their services under SFTR.
- According to Article 11(1) of SFTR, the fees charged to trade repositories shall also fully cover the reimbursement of any costs that the competent authorities may incur carrying out work pursuant to SFTR in particular as a result of any delegation of tasks in accordance with Article 9(1) of SFTR. ESMA is invited to suggest a method for calculating the amount that competent authorities may claim from ESMA. The amount should depend on the scope and complexity of the task to be delegated and should be consistent with any specific supervisory fee that ESMA can claim from the trade repository for undertaking a supervisory action.
- According to Article 11(1) of SFTR, where a trade repository has already been registered under EMIR, the supervisory fees charged under SFTR shall only be adjusted to reflect additional necessary expenditure and costs relating to the registration, recognition and supervision stemming from the SFTR. ESMA is invited to reflect on whether there is any need to adapt the methodologies and fees specified in the EMIR Delegated Regulation on trade repositories' fees, to the situation where a trade repository chooses to provide services under both SFTR and EMIR. In this regard, ESMA should consider that additional operational costs for market participants should be minimised.
- ESMA should suggest the timing and appropriate modalities of the payment of the fees taking into account existing rules under the EMIR Delegated Regulation on trade repositories fees. ESMA is invited to advise on appropriate schedules for the collection of fees (one single payment vs several payments). It has to be ensured that ESMA has at its disposal the resources to finance its activities related to trade repositories. This could for instance be achieved by requiring the supervised trade repositories to pay the expected fees upfront, drawing up an account at the end of the year.

4. Indicative timetable

This mandate takes into consideration that ESMA requires sufficient time to prepare its technical advice and that the Commission needs to adopt the delegated acts according to Article 290 of the TFEU. The powers of the Commission to adopt delegated acts are subject to Article 30 of the legislative act which allows the European Parliament and the Council to object to a delegated act within a period of 2 months, extendable by 2 further months. The delegated act will only enter into force if neither the European Parliament nor the Council has objected on expiry of that period or if both institutions have informed the Commission of their intention not to raise objections.

The deadline set to ESMA to deliver the technical advice is twelve months after the entry into force of SFTR.