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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 | LSEG |
| Activity | Regulated markets/Exchanges/Trading Systems |
| Are you representing an association? |[ ]
| Country/Region | UK |

# Introduction

Please make your introductory comments below, if any:

<ESMA\_COMMENT\_SAC\_1>

**LSEG is delighted to respond to ESMA’s consultation on scrutiny and approval of prospectus.** We do not comment on individual question in this consultation as other market participants are better placed to provide input. However, we would like to provide a general comment in support of a flexible, proportioante and purposive approach to the framework within which NCAs are required to process prospectus approvals. The requirements should allow NCAs to tailor their approach to ensure a calibrated approach to delivering the right outcomes. We support the Level 1 approach to drafting where NCAs are allowed a certain amount of discretion in the choices they make and we support continuing this approach into the Level 2.

**About LSEG**

LSEG is a leading global market infrastructure provider with major EU operations in Italy, France and the UK. It is home to 2000 listed companies from EU member states with an aggregate market capitalisation of €3.4 trillion (40 per cent of the entire market capitalisation of all EU listed companies). LSEG operates AIM (Europe’s leading SME Growth Market with 1007 companies and a market cap of nearly €100bn); Borsa Italiana (including AIM Italia and the leading retail bond market, MOT); the International Securities Market (ISM), London’s new debt MTF platform; MTS (fixed income trading) & Turquoise (pan-European equities and derivatives trading).

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_10>

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

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_11>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<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>

PLEASE SEE GENERAL COMMENT

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SAC\_15>