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Responding to this paper

ESMA invites responses to the questions set out throughout this Consultation Paper. Responses are most helpful if they:

1. respond to the question stated;
2. contain a clear rationale; and
3. describe any alternatives ESMA should consider.

ESMA will consider all responses received by 28 September 2017.

Instructions

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

1. Insert your responses to the questions in the Consultation Paper in the form “Response form\_Consultation Paper on scrutiny and approval”, available on ESMA’s website alongside the present Consultation Paper ([www.esma.europa.eu](http://www.esma.europa.eu) 🡪 ‘Your input – Open consultations’ 🡪 ‘Consultation on technical advice under the new Prospectus Regulation’).
2. Please do not remove tags of the type <ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_1>. Your response to each question has to be framed by the two tags corresponding to the question.
3. If you do not wish to respond to a given question, please do not delete it but simply leave the text “TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE” between the tags.
4. When you have drafted your response, name your response form according to the following convention: ESMA\_SAC\_nameofrespondent\_RESPONSEFORM. For example, for a respondent named ABCD, the response form would be entitled ESMA\_SAC\_ABCD\_RESPONSEFORM.
5. Upload the form containing your responses, in Word format, to ESMA’s website ([www.esma.europa.eu](http://www.esma.europa.eu) under the heading ‘Your input – Open consultations’ 🡪 ‘Consultation on technical advice under the new Prospectus Regulation’).

Publication of responses

All contributions received will be published following the close of the consultation, unless you request otherwise. Please clearly indicate by ticking the appropriate checkbox on the website submission page 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. A confidential response may be requested from us in accordance with ESMA’s rules on access to documents. We may consult you if we receive such a request. Any decision we make not to disclose the response is reviewable by ESMA’s Board of Appeal and the European Ombudsman.

Data protection

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

Who should read this Consultation Paper

This Consultation Paper may be of particular interest to investors, issuers, including issuers already admitted to trading on a regulated market or on a multilateral trading facility, offerors or persons asking for admission to trading on a regulated market as well as to any market participant who is affected by the new Prospectus Regulation.

# General information about respondent

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the company / organisation | AMAFI – Association française des marches financiers |
| Activity | Investment Services |
| Are you representing an association? | YES |
| Country/Region | France |

# Introduction

Please make your introductory comments below, if any:

<ESMA\_COMMENT\_SAC\_1>

*Association française des marchés financiers* (AMAFI) is the trade organisation working at national, European and international levels to represent financial market participants in France. It acts on behalf of credit institutions, investment firms and trading and post-trade infrastructures, regardless of where they operate or where their clients or counterparties are located. AMAFI’s members operate for their own account or for clients in different segments, particularly organised and over-the-counter markets for equities, fixed-income products and derivatives, including commodities. Nearly one-third of members are subsidiaries or branches of non-French institutions.

For over two years, AMAFI has been paying close attention to progress in the Capital Markets Union (CMU) initiative and, within such initiative, to the proposals which aimed at revising the Prospectus Directive with a view to making it easier and cheaper for companies, and in particular smaller companies, to access capital and improve prospectus accessibility for investors.

Having contributed to the 2015 EC consultation on the review for the Prospectus Directive (*AMAFI / 15-27*), AMAFI is now keen, after the publication of the Prospectus Regulation, to contribute to the three consultations launched by ESMA on 6 July 2017 - until 28 September 2017- on the draft technical advice that it proposes to give to the EC in relation to each one of these consultations. Below is AMAFI’s response to ESMA’s consultation on Scrutiny and approval of the Prospectus *(ESMA1-62-650).*

<ESMA\_COMMENT\_SAC\_1>

1. : Do you agree with the criteria for determining whether a prospectus is complete (Article A(1))? Do you consider that additional completeness criteria are necessary?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_1>

AMAFI agrees with the proposed criteria for scrutinizing or reviewing the completeness of the information.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_1>

1. : Do you agree that NCAs should apply different criteria when assessing the comprehensibility of retail and wholesale prospectuses? If yes, do you agree with the criteria proposed in Article A(2)? Please make an alternative proposal if you do not agree with these criteria.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_2>

Yes, NCAs should definitely apply different criteria when assessing the comprehensibility of retail and wholesale prospectuses as the investors concerned have necessarily a very different knowledge of those matters and ability to understand the information put at their disposal. Given the knowledge and ability of wholesale investors, the criteria set forth in Article A(2) seems far too detailed and burdensome.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_2>

1. : Do you agree with the criteria for assessing the consistency of a prospectus proposed in Article A(3)? Do you consider that additional consistency criteria are necessary?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_3>

AMAFI agrees with the criteria for assessing the consistency of a prospectus proposed in Article A(3).

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_3>

1. : In relation to scrutiny and review of the URD where ESMA proposes that only minimal changes be made to the generally applicable scrutiny criteria, do you consider there to be any further aspects where scrutiny and review of the URD need to differ from the general criteria?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_4>

No.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_4>

1. : Do you agree that it is not necessary to address partial/repeated reviews of a URD in the technical advice?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_5>

AMAFI agrees that it is not necessary to address partial/repeated reviews of a URD in the technical advice.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_5>

1. : In order to take a proportionate approach to scrutiny and review of prospectuses, do you agree that NCAs should only be required to scrutinise information which has not already been scrutinised/reviewed/approved, as proposed in Article B(2)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_6>

Yes, absolutely. AMAFI considers that it is important that the principle of a proportionate approach be adequately implemented.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_6>

1. : Do you believe that application of the proposed criteria will impose additional costs on issuers, offerors or persons asking for admission to trading? If yes, please specify the type and nature of such costs, including whether they are one-off or on-going, and quantify them.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_7>

As a professional organisation, AMAFI is unable to respond to this question.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_7>

1. : Do you have any further suggestions for harmonising the way in which NCAs scrutinise prospectuses? In your view, should ESMA propose more detailed or additional criteria for scrutiny/review in its technical advice?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_8>

No.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_8>

1. : Has ESMA identified all the necessary amendments to the existing procedures for approval of the prospectus?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_9>

It would seem that ESMA has identified the necessary amendments to be made to the existing procedures for approval of the prospectus.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_9>

1. : Do you agree with the provision for providing the appendix to the registration document/URD laid down in Article C(2)(d) and (e)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_10>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_10>

1. : Do you agree with the procedures for approval of the URD?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_11>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_11>

1. : Do you agree with the procedures for filing of the URD? Are there any further considerations which ESMA should take into account in this regard?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_12>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_12>

1. : Do you believe that any of the proposed procedures for approval and filing will impose additional costs on issuers, offerors or persons asking for admission to trading? If yes, please specify the type and nature of such costs, including whether they are one-off or on-going, and quantify them.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_13>

As a professional organisation, AMAFI is unable to respond to this question.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_13>

1. : Do you agree that it is not necessary at Level 2 to further specify the conditions for losing the status of frequent issuer? If no, please elaborate on how ESMA should further specify the conditions already established at Level 1.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_14>

AMAFI agrees that it is not necessary at Level 2 to further specify the conditions for losing the status of frequent issuer which are sufficiently detail at Level 1.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_14>

1. : Do you have any other considerations which ESMA should be aware of when finalising the technical advice covered by this Consultation Paper?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_15>

No.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_15>