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Responding to this paper

The European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) invites responses to the specific questions listed in the Consultation Paper on the transparency regime for equity and equity-like instruments, the double volume cap mechanism and the trading obligations for shares MiFID II/ MiFIR review report published on the ESMA website.

*Instructions*

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

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

Responses are most helpful:

* if they respond to the question stated;
* indicate the specific question to which the comment relates;
* contain a clear rationale; and
* describe any alternatives ESMA should consider.

**Naming protocol**

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

ESMA\_CP\_MiFID\_EQT\_NAMEOFCOMPANY\_NAMEOFDOCUMENT.

e.g. if the respondent were ESMA, the name of the reply form would be:

ESMA\_CP\_MiFID\_EQT\_ESMA\_REPLYFORM or

ESMA\_CP\_MiFID\_EQT\_ANNEX1

***Deadline***

Responses must reach us by **17 March 2020.**

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

***Publication of responses***

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

***Data protection***

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

# General information about respondent

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the company / organisation | Finance Finland |
| Activity | Other Financial service providers |
| Are you representing an association? |  |
| Country/Region | Finland |

# Introduction

Please make your introductory comments below, if any:

<ESMA\_COMMENT\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_1>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_COMMENT\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_1>

1. What is your view on only allowing orders that are large in scale and orders in an order management facility to be waived from pre-trade transparency while removing the reference price and negotiated trade waivers? Instead of removing the RP and NT waivers, would you prefer to set a minimum threshold above which transactions under the RP and NT waivers would be allowed? If so, what should be the value of such threshold? What alternatives do you propose to simplify the MiFIR waivers regime while improving transparency available to market participants? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_1>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_1>

1. Do you agree to increase the pre-trade LIS threshold for ETFs to EUR 5,000,000? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_2>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_2>

1. Do you agree with extending the scope of application of the DVC to systems that formalise NT for illiquid instruments?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_3>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_3>

1. Would you agree to remove the possibility for trading venues to apply for combination of waivers? Please justify your answer and provide any other feedback on the waiver regime you might have.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_4>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_4>

1. Do you agree with the proposal to report the volumes under the different waivers separately to FITRS? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_5>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_5>

1. What would be in your view an alternative way to incentivise lit trading and ensure the quality and robustness of the price determination mechanism for shares and equity-like instruments? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_6>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_6>

1. Which option do you prefer for the liquidity assessment of shares among Option 1 and 2? Do you have an alternative proposal? Do you think that the frequency of trading should be kept as a criterion to assess liquidity? If so, what is in your view the appropriate thresholds for the percentage of days traded measured as the ratio between number of days traded and number of days available for trading (e.g. 95%, 90%, 85% etc.)? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_7>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_7>

1. Do you agree in changing the approach for ETFs, DRs as proposed by ESMA? Do you have an alternative proposal? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_8>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_8>

1. Do you agree in removing the category of certificates from the equity-like transparency scope? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_9>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_9>

1. Do you agree in deeming other equity financial instruments to be illiquid by default? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_10>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_10>

1. Do you agree in separating the definition of conventional periodic auctions and frequent batch auctions? Do you agree with ESMA’s proposal to require the disclosure of all orders submitted to FBAs? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_11>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_11>

1. Do you agree that all non-price forming systems should operate under a pre-trade transparency waiver? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_12>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_12>

1. What is your view on increasing the minimum quoting size for SIs? Which option do you prefer?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_13>

We agree that the current quoting size is too small. Finance Finland therefore support ESMA’s proposal to enhance the SI regime by increasing the minimum quoting size to 50% of SMS, i.e. option 1.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_13>

1. What is your view on extending the transparency obligations under the SI regime to illiquid instruments?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_14>

We don’t support the proposed extension of the transparency obligations under the SI regime to also cover all illiquid instruments. Firstly, SIs – in contrast to trading venues – put their own capital at risk when publishing prices, which means they are more exposed to the consequences of transparency. Secondly because such an extension would dilute the definitions of and differences between liquid and illiquid instruments. And thirdly because some equities are really seldomly requested and traded by investors and therefore illiquid in nature.

Seen from our perspective a better solution to the issue ESMA addresses around lack of transparency in some currently illiquid equities, would be to recalibrate the liquidity measures, so all truly liquid shares falls under the definition of liquid, and are thus covered by the transparency obligation under the SI regime. Meaning also that truly illiquid equities will continue to be treated as what they are; illiquid instruments exempted from SI transparency obligations.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_14>

1. With regard to the SMS determination, which option do you prefer? Would you have a different proposal? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_15>

We support option A.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_15>

1. Which option do you prefer among Options A, B and C? Would you suggest a different alternative? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_16>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_16>

1. Would you envisage a different system than the DVC to limit dark trading? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_17>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_17>

1. Do you agree in removing the need for NCAs to issue the suspension notice and require trading venues to suspend dark trading, if required, on the basis of ESMA’s publication? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_18>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_18>

1. Do you agree in removing the requirement under Article 5(7)(b)? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_19>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_19>

1. Please provide your answer to the following [survey](https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=aPIG5OdKgEyJlAJJPaAMA8MbwIo5IbFHiXG6oH-BVkdUNjJUNktLOU1BSVZYUUFEQVUwSVZHSzdZTC4u) (<= click here to open the survey) on the impact of DVC on the cost of trading for eligible counterparties and professional clients.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_20>

[CLICK ON THE WORD “SURVEY” IN THE QUESTION IN ORDER TO PROVIDE YOUR ANSWER]

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_20>

1. Do you agree in applying the DVC also to instruments for which there are not 12 months of available data yet? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_21>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_21>

1. Do you agree foresee any issue if the publication occurs after 7 working days instead of 5? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_22>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_22>

1. Do you agree that the mid-month reports should not be published? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_23>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_23>

1. Do you agree with ESMA’s proposal to include in Article 70 of MiFID II the infringements of the DVC suspensions? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_24>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_24>

1. Do you agree with ESMA’s assessment that the conditions for deferred publication for shares and depositary receipts should not be subject to amendments? If not, please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_25>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_25>

1. Do you agree with ESMA’s proposal to increase the applicable threshold for ETFs and request for real-time publication for transactions that are below 20,000,000 EUR? If not, please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_26>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_26>

1. Do you agree with ESMA assessment of the level of post trade transparency for OTC transactions?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_27>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_27>

1. Do you agree with the proposal to report and flag transactions which are not subject to the share trading obligations but subject to post-trade transparency to FITRS? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_28>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_28>

1. What is your experience related to the publication of post-trade transparency information within 1 minute from the execution of the transaction? Do you think that the definition of “real-time” as maximum 1 minute from the time of the execution of the transaction is appropriate/too stringent/ too lenient? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_29>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_29>

1. Do you agree with ESMA’s approach to third-country trading venues for the purpose of transparency requirements under MiFID II? If no, please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_30>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_30>

1. Do you agree that the scope of the share trading obligation in Article 23 of MiFIR should be reduced to exclude third-country shares? If yes, what is the best way to identify such shares, keeping in mind that ESMA does not have data on the relative liquidity of shares in the EU versus in third countries? More generally, would you include any additional criteria to define the scope of the share trading obligation and, if yes, which ones?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_31>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_31>

1. Would you support removing SIs as eligible execution places for the purposes of the share trading obligation? If yes, do you think SIs should only be removed as eligible execution places with respect to liquid shares? Please provide arguments (including numerical evidence) supporting your views.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_32>

No, we don’t support the idea that SIs would be removed as eligible execution places for the purpose of the share trading obligation (STO).

Liquidity is a key characteristic of a well-functioning capital market. In the EU capital markets liquidity is provided by several entities: Exchanges, trading venues, MTFs and SI’s. Seen from an investor perspective it is important to have access to both deep liquidity pools, but also a broad range of liquidity providers since each of these liquidity providers have their advantages (and disadvantages) in certain situations. Also, access to several (types of) liquidity providers gives investors the possibility to choose the most cost-efficient provider.

The current range of EU execution places should be continued. If SIs were to be excluded as eligible execution venues, critical and massive risk capacity will disappear and thus make it very difficult – if not impossible – to execute large volumes with the speed that characterize a well-functioning and liquid capital market.

Instead of limiting the number of eligible execution places, we encourage ESMA to work on expanding the number of eligible execution places. That’s the best way to support the Capital Markets in EU and the development of the Capital Markets Union (CMU).

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_32>

1. Would you support deleting the first exemption provided for under Article 23 of MiFIR (i.e. for shares that are traded on a “non-systematic, ad-hoc, irregular and infrequent” basis)? If not, would you support the introduction in MiFIR of a mandate requiring ESMA to specify the scope of the exemption? Please provide arguments supporting your views.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_33>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_33>

1. Would you support simplifying the second exemption of Article 23 of MiFIR and not limiting it to transactions “carried out between eligible and/or professional counterparties”? Please provide arguments supporting your views.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_34>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_34>

1. What is your view on the increase of volumes executed through closing auctions? Do you think ESMA should take actions to influence this market trend and if yes which one?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_35>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_MIFID\_EQT\_35>