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**Responding to this paper**

ESMA invites comments on all matters in this paper and in particular on the specific questions summarised in Annex 1. Comments 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.

ESMA will consider all comments received by **19 June 2020.**

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

**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 present response form.
2. Please do not remove tags of the type <ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP\_TSTR\_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\_TSTR\_nameofrespondent\_RESPONSEFORM. For example, for a respondent named ABCD, the response form would be entitled ESMA\_TSTR\_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 MiFIR report on Systematic Internalisers in non-equity instruments”).
6. If you wish to provide comments on the definitions, formats, allowable values or reconciliation tolerances for the specific reporting fields, please use for that purpose the additional response form in excel format.

**Publication of responses**

All contributions received will be published following the close of the consultation, unless you request otherwise. Please clearly and prominently indicate in your submission any part you do not wish to be publically 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 [Legal Notice](http://www.esma.europa.eu/legal-notice).

**Who should read this paper**

All interested stakeholders are invited to respond to this consultation paper. In particular, responses are sought from financial and non-financial counterparties of derivatives, central counterparties (CCPs) and trade repositories (TRs), as well as from all the authorities having access to the TR data.

**General information about respondent**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the company / organisation | Finance Denmark |
| Activity | Banking sector |
| Are you representing an association? |  |
| Country/Region | Denmark |

**Introduction**

***Please make your introductory comments below, if any***

<ESMA\_COMMENT\_TSTR\_1>

EMIR refit - introductory comments

It’s important to always have focus on the objectives of EMIR and EMIR Refit in the assessment of new requirements to technical standards on reporting, data quality, data acces and registration of Trade Repositories under EMIR REFIT

The overall objective of EMIR Refit is clearly expressed in several recitals of EMIR Refit. We would like to draw the attention to the following recitals:

*Recital 2: “The simplification of certain areas covered by Regulation (EU) No 648/2012 and a more proportionate approach to those areas are in line with the Commission's Regulatory Fitness and Performance programme which emphasises the need for cost reduction and simplification so that Union policies achieve their objectives in the most efficient way, and aim, in particular, at reducing regulatory and administrative burdens. That simplification and a more proportionate approach should, however, be without prejudice to the overarching objectives of promoting financial stability and mitigating systemic risks in line with the statement by G20 leaders at the 26 September 2009 Summit in Pittsburgh.”*

*Recital 4: “…..that report identified areas for which targeted action was necessary to ensure that the objectives of Regulation (EU) No 648/2012 were reached in a more proportionate, efficient and effective manner.”*

*Recital 37: “Since the objectives of this Regulation, namely, to ensure that the rules are proportionate, do not lead to unnecessary administrative burdens or compliance costs, do not put financial stability at risk, and increase the transparency of OTC derivative positions and exposures, cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States but can rather, by reason of their scale and effects, be better achieved at Union level, the Union may adopt measures, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity as set out in Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union. In accordance with the principle of proportionality, as set out in that Article, this Regulation does not go beyond what is necessary in order to achieve those objectives*”

This is also in line with the adjusted Commission Work Programme 2020 where “better regulation will continue to be at the heart of [the Commission’s) policy-making”. In this spirit, the Commission is setting up the Fit-forFuture Platform, to involve stakeholders and all levels of government in simplifying and modernising EU legislation.

We agree that data quality is of great importance, however ESMA and the NCAs must be aware of and relate to what is relevant and necessary information with the objective of financial stability and mitigating systemic risks in mind. The purpose of EMIR is not the same as of MiFIR reporting og MAR (market surveillance and the risk of market abuse). Therefore National Client Identifier should not be seen as an option to the identification of private individuals as suggested in provision 216 on page 59.

In section 4.2.5. ESMA elaborates on the proposed inclusion of CDE guidance into EMIR reporting requirements. The objective of a more proportionate approach and reducing/simplifying the reporting obligations should be kept in mind when analysing what is truly critical data elements of CDE. ESMA should also be aware of the fact that a later reduction of data elements is also an administrative burden since it involves resources to change IT systems even if it’s a reduction of data fields.

Focus should be on what is “need to have” as regards data in order to strengthen financial stability and reduce systemic risks and who need to have access to this data.

Administrative burdens: the expansions of the number of fields, combination of action type/event type complexity and the comprehensive matching requirements will in itself lead to increased derived ongoing administrative burdens.

Furthermore, the amount of new data required is not only contrary to the stated objectives of simplification. It is actually counterproductive in relation to one of the main objectives, which is increased matching of reports. We do understand there is a need for matching of data fields, however such an significant increase of data fields provide equally increased  risks for different interpretations and risk of reporting errors. The extremely, finely granulated field content also lead to the risks of the required data not being present in the bank's systems or that information must be used in a context other than that for which it was collected. This also lead to the risk of an increased number of deviations, which at best requires extensive reconciliation processes. In the worst case, reconciliation cannot be achieved at all with the various data available in the European institutes. <ESMA\_COMMENT\_TSTR\_1>

**Questions**

1. [: Do you see any other challenges with the information to be provided by NFC- to FC which should be addressed? In particular, do you foresee any challenges related to the FC being aware of the changes in the NFC status?](#_Toc34747676)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_1>

Yes. If the NFC does not/forgets to make a calculation or its status changes from NFC- to NFC+ as a result of a relevant clearing threshold being exceeded, there is a risk that the NFC will not inform the FC and that the FC will continue to treat the NFC as an NFC-. The same applies with respect to other confirmations, information and selections provided/made by the NFC that is necessary or relevant for an FC to report on behalf of the NFC. Such information, confirmation or election may become incorrect or obsolete. We would welcome a clarifying statement that if an NFC has provided/made in writing any confirmation, information or selection in writing that is necessary or relevant for an FC to report on behalf of the NFC, then the FC may rely on such confirmation, information or selection, until the NFC provides written notice to the contrary to the FC.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_1>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposals set out in this section? If not, please clarify your concerns and propose alternative solutions.](#_Toc34747677)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_2>

Yes, but we suggest a clarification of the course of action for handling of the report if NFC- does not renew its LEI. Is FC supposed to send its own report or are both reports to be sent? Remittance of both reports which are to be accepted with remarks. That would require changes in practice at TR

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_2>

1. : [Do you need any further clarifications regarding the scenario in which the FC and NFC- report to two different TRs?](#_Toc34747678)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_3>

No, the scenario is described clearly. However, we are not convinced, that the solution will work, since it is complicated and depending on third party participation. TR will be overwhelmed by administrative workload and need for differentiated communication with many parties with limited know how.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_3>

1. [: Are there any other aspects related to the allocation of responsibility of reporting that should be covered in the technical standards? If so, please clarify which and how they should be addressed.](#_Toc34747679)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_4>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_4>

1. [: Do you see any other challenges with the information by NFC- to FC of their decision to perform the reporting of OTC derivatives which should be addressed?](#_Toc34747680)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_5>

No, but we would like more than 5 working days notice if duplicates should be avoided. We suggest 10 working days

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_5>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposals set out in this section? If not, please clarify your concerns and propose alternative solutions.](#_Toc34747681)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_6>

Yes, we would expect better data quality from one-sided reporting for NFC-, smilarly to practice with private customers

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_6>

1. [: Do you see any issues with the approach outlined above? Do you see any other challenges with the delegation of reporting which should be addressed?](#_Toc34747682)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_7>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_7>

1. [: Which errors or omissions in reporting should, in your view, be notified to the competent authorities? Do you see any major challenges with such notifications to be provided to the competent authorities? If yes, please clarify your concerns.](#_Toc34747683)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_8>

The proposed action types in table 4 will give national competent authorities access to information regarding for instance “error” and “correct”. A notification to NCASs of errors and omissions in reporting as mentioned in provision 39-42 should be in case of significant incidents.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_8>

1. [: Do you see any issues with the approach outlined above? Do you see any other challenges with the reconciliation of trades which should be addressed?](#_Toc34747684)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_9>

No comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_9>

1. [: Do you see any other data quality issues which should be addressed?](#_Toc34747685)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_10>

No comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_10>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposed technical format, ISO 20022, as the format for reporting? If not, what other reporting format would you propose and what would be the benefits of the alternative approach?](#_Toc34747686)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_11>

Yes, but a change might be needed, but no new format inventions

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_11>

1. [: Do you foresee any difficulties related to reporting using an ISO 20022 technical format that uses XML? If yes, please elaborate.](#_Toc34747687)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_12>

Yes, but only for new trades. For old trades it should be voluntary to send in old or new format

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_12>

1. [: Do you expect difficulties with the proposed allocation of responsibility for generating the UTI?](#_Toc34747688)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_13>

No, if its only for new trades.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_13>

1. [: Is any further guidance needed with respect to the generation and exchange of the UTI for derivatives reported at position level?](#_Toc34747689)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_14>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_14>

1. [: Is it clear which entity should generate the UTI for the derivatives that are executed bilaterally and brought under the rules of the market (‘XOFF’)? Are there any other scenarios where it may be unclear whether a derivative is considered to be “centrally executed”? Please list all such specific scenarios and propose relevant clarifications in this respect.](#_Toc34747690)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_15>

Not necessary – shouldn’t be included

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_15>

1. [: Should the hierarchy on UTI generation responsibility include further rules on how to proceed when the responsibility for generating the UTI is allocated to an entity (e.g. trading venue or a CCP) from a jurisdiction that has not implemented the UTI guidance?](#_Toc34747691)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_16>

No, we do not perceive the lack of implementation of the UTI guidance as a problem in terms of venues or CCP located in such countries not delivering the UTI in a correct and timely manner. However, we believe, that further definition of availability and exchange formats in technical standards could be helpful in order to ensure an efficient exchange of UTI

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_16>

1. [: Should the hierarchy on UTI generation responsibility include more explicit rules for the case of the delegated reporting? If so, propose a draft rule and its placement within the flowchart.](#_Toc34747692)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_17>

No, but in our opinion, it does not make sense to allocate responsibility for generation of UTI to the delegating party. Typically, the delegating party will have a lesser trading volume and less advanced IT solutions, which in most cases will not be able to handle the complex decisions laid down in the flowchart. The reporting counterparty would have to rely on the timely and correct communication of the UTI from the less advanced delegating party, which in many cases could prevent an effective reporting process.

Thus, we propose, that the delegating party under no circumstances should be responsible for the generation of the UTI. The logical placement of this decision in the flowchart would be right after the check for central execution by a trading venue.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_17>

1. [: Which policy option presented in the flowchart do you prefer? Please elaborate on the reasons why in your reply.](#_Toc34747693)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_18>

It is our belief, that the simplest rules for distribution of UTI generating obligation are the best. The advantages which policy option 1 could have are not obvious. Thus the easier option with one check only is to prefer. In case of 2 parties with same status, the LEI sorting method could be used.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_18>

1. [: Is the additional clarification concerning the sorting of the alphanumerical strings needed? If so, which should method of sorting should be considered?](#_Toc34747694)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_19>

No comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_19>

1. [: Are there any other rules that should be added to the hierarchy on UTI generation responsibility? To the extent that such rules are not contradictory to the global UTI guidance, please provide specific proposals and motivate why they would facilitate the generation and/or exchange of the UTIs.](#_Toc34747695)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_20>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_20>

1. [: Do you support including more specific rules provision on the timing of the UTI generation? If so, do you prefer a fixed deadline or a timeframe depending on the time of conclusion of the derivative? In either case, please specify what would be in your view the optimal deadline/timeframe. Please elaborate on the reasons why in your response.](#_Toc34747696)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_21>

No, we agree with 12.00 UTC on T+1

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_21>

1. [: Do you expect issues around defining when you will need to use a new UTI and when the existing UTI should be used in the report? Are there specific cases that need to be dealt with?](#_Toc34747697)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_22>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_22>

1. [: Do you expect any challenges related to the proposed format and/or structure of the UTI? If yes, please elaborate on what challenges you foresee.](#_Toc34747698)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_23>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_23>

1. [: Do you have any comments concerning the use of ISINs as product identifiers under EMIR for the derivatives that are admitted to trading or traded on a trading venue or a systematic internaliser?](#_Toc34747699)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_24>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_24>

1. [: Do you have any comments concerning the use of UPIs as product identifiers under EMIR? Should in your view UPI be used to identify all derivatives or only those that are not identified with ISIN under MiFIR? ?](#_Toc34747700)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_25>

No, UPI should only be used if no ISIN is available

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_25>

1. [: Do you agree with the assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of the supplementary reporting of some reference data? Are there any other aspects that should be considered?](#_Toc34747701)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_26>

No comments, pls see introductory comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_26>

1. [: Some of the instruments’ characteristics that are expected to be captured by the future UPI reference data are already being reported under EMIR, meaning that they have already been implemented in the counterparties’ reporting systems. If this data or its subset were continued to be required in trade reports under EMIR, what would be the cost of compliance with this requirement (low/moderate/high)? Please provide justification for your assessment. Would you have any reservations with regard to reporting of data elements that would be covered by the UPI reference data?](#_Toc34747702)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_27>

If data are available in DSB ANNA tables, where everyone can access data cost will be low. If data isnt easily accessiable cost will be medium to high.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_27>

1. [: Do you foresee any issues in relation to inclusion in the new reporting standard that the LEI of the reporting counterparty should be duly renewed and maintained according to the terms of, any of the endorsed LOUs (Local Operating Units) of the Global Legal Entity Identifier System?](#_Toc34747703)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_28>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_28>

1. [: Do you foresee any challenges related to the availability of LEIs for any of the entities included in the Article 3 of the draft ITS on reporting?](#_Toc34747704)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_29>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_29>

1. [: Do you have any comments concerning ESMA approach to inclusion of CDEs into EMIR reporting requirements?](#_Toc34747705)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_30>

No, but need same interpretation at all NCA's otherwise it will be challinging. See also opening remarks. Need for proportionality, simplyfying rules and reduce administrative burdens

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_30>

1. [: Is the list of Action types and Event types complete? Is it clear when each of the categories should be used?](#_Toc34747706)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_31>

Yes, we agree that we should aim for better data quality but this suggestion moves many steps further than needed and seems unecessary and inappropriate. See also introductory comments. Need for proportionality, simplyfying rules and reduce administrative burdens

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_31>

1. [: Is it clear what is the impact of the specific Action Types on the status of the trade, i.e. when the trade is considered outstanding or non-outstanding?](#_Toc34747707)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_32>

Yes. See also introductory comments. Need for proportionality, simplyfying rules and reduce administrative burdens

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_32>

1. [: Is it clear what are the possible sequences of Action Types based on the Figure 1?](#_Toc34747708)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_33>

Yes. See also introductory comments. Need for proportionality, simplyfying rules and reduce administrative burdens

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_33>

1. [: Are the possible combinations of Action type and Event type determined correctly? Is their applicability at trade and/or position level determined correctly?](#_Toc34747709)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_34>

Yes. See also introductory comments. Need for proportionality, simplyfying rules and reduce administrative burdens

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_34>

1. [: Is the approach to reporting Compression sufficiently clear? If not, please explain what should be further clarified or propose alternatives.](#_Toc34747710)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_35>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_35>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposal to include two separate action types for the provision of information related to the valuation of the contract and one related to margins?](#_Toc34747711)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_36>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_36>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposal to include the Action Type “Revive”? Are there any further instances where this Action Type could be used? Are there any potential difficulties in relation to this approach?](#_Toc34747712)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_37>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_37>

1. [: Is the approach to reporting at position level sufficiently clear? If not, please explain what should be further clarified?](#_Toc34747713)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_38>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_38>

1. [: Are all reportable details (as set out in the Annex to the draft RTS on details of the reports to be reported to TRs under EMIR (Annex IV)) available for reporting at position level? If not, please clarify which data elements and why.](#_Toc34747714)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_39>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_39>

1. [: Are there any products other than derivatives concluded on a venue and CfDs that may need to be reported at position level?](#_Toc34747715)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_40>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_40>

1. [: Do you have any general comments regarding the proposed representation of the reporting requirements in the table of fields? Please use the separate excel table to provide comments on the specific fields in the table.](#_Toc34747716)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_41>

No, but will cause an increase in number of fields from 129 to 203 data fields. The majority of the data elements is stemming from the globally agreed CDE guidance, but it should be considered if any information could be left out. More reporting fields could make the matching more difficult. Pls introducto comments as well.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_41>

1. [: Is the proposed definition adequate? Can you think of any cases where further clarification would be needed or further problems might be expected? What would you expect to be reported as effective date when the trade is not confirmed?](#_Toc34747717)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_42>

Yes to first part and No to second part

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_42>

1. [: Is the proposed definition adequate? Can you think of any cases where further clarification would be needed, or further problems might be expected? What would you expect to be reported as maturity date when the trade is not confirmed?](#_Toc34747718)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_43>

Yes to first part and No to second part

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_43>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposed definition? Are there any other aspects that should be covered in the technical standards?](#_Toc34747719)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_44>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_44>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposed definition? Are there any other aspects that should be covered in the technical standards?](#_Toc34747720)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_45>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_45>

1. [: Do you foresee any difficulties with the reporting of Event date? Please flag these difficulties if you see them.](#_Toc34747721)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_46>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_46>

1. [: In relation to the format of the “client code”, do you foresee any difficulties with reporting using the structure and format of the code as recommended in the CDE guidance? If you do, please specify the challenges.](#_Toc34747722)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_47>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_47>

1. [: Alternatively, would you prefer to replace the internal client codes with national identification number as defined in MIFIR transaction reporting? Please specify the advantages and disadvantages of both alternatives.](#_Toc34747723)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_48>

We are concerned, that a replacement of internal client codes with national identification number is a step too far. The purpose of EMIR is to monitor structural risks on a macro- level and not, to be able to identify specific individuals across boarders. This information is irrelevant for EMIR purposes and EMIR data are shared in a much broader scale than MiFIR data.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_48>

1. [: Do you agree on the proposal to include this process in the draft RTS on procedures for ensuring data quality?](#_Toc34747724)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_49>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_49>

1. [: Do you agree that one month is the good timespan between the notification by the counterparty to the TR the corporate restructuring event and the actual update of the LEI by the TR?](#_Toc34747725)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_50>

Yes, but we do it on effective date, since we cant control when the TR does it

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_50>

1. [: Do you agree on the fact that transactions that have already been terminated at the date when the TR is updating the LEIs should be included in the process?](#_Toc34747726)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_51>

Yes, if this is not the case potential errors will be hard to resolve

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_51>

1. : [In the case of transactions where an impacted entity is identified in any role other than the reporting counterparty (e.g. Counterparty 2, Broker etc), when the TRs should inform the reporting counterparties of the change in the identifier of that entity?](#_Toc34747727)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_52>

Low priority

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_52>

1. [: Which entity should identify all transactions that should be amended due to a partial modification of the identifier of an entity?](#_Toc34747728)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_53>

Reporting Counterparty

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_53>

1. [: In cases where the counterparty is not responsible and legally liable for reporting transactions, which entity should be in charge of notifying the TR and what should be the related requirements between the counterparty itself and the entity who is responsible and legally liable for the reporting?](#_Toc34747729)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_54>

Reporting Counterparty

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_54>

1. [: Do you see any other challenges related to LEI updates due to mergers and acquisitions, other corporate restructuring events or where the identifier of the counterparty has to be updated from BIC (or other code) to LEI because the entity has obtained the LEI?](#_Toc34747730)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_55>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_55>

1. [: In relation to the field “Beneficiary ID”, do you have any concerns regarding the elimination of this field? Based on your reporting experience, which trading scenario may be missed if this field is eliminated, with exception of the cases explained in Q&A General Question 1 (c)?](#_Toc34747731)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_56>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_56>

1. [: In relation to the field “Trading capacity”, do you have any concerns regarding the elimination of this field? Based on your reporting experience, which trading scenario may be missed if this field is eliminated?](#_Toc34747732)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_57>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_57>

1. [: In relation to the “Direction of trade”, do you foresee any difficulties with the adoption of CDE guidance approach? Please provide a justification for your response.](#_Toc34747733)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_58>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_58>

1. [: Are there any products for which the direction of the trade cannot be determined according to the rules proposed in the draft technical standards (based on the CDE guidance)? If so, please specify the products and propose what rules should be applied.](#_Toc34747734)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_59>

NO

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_59>

1. [: Do you foresee any difficulties with reporting in case the value “Intent to clear” is not included in the list of allowable values for Field « Cleared » ? Please motivate your answer.](#_Toc34747735)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_60>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_60>

1. [: Do you have any other comments concerning the fields related to clearing?](#_Toc34747736)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_61>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_61>

1. [: The timely confirmation requirement applies only to non-cleared OTC contracts. However, under the rules in force, the confirmation timestamp and confirmation means are reported also for ETD derivatives by some counterparties, leading to problems with reconciliation of the reports. ESMA proposes to clarify that the abovementioned fields should be reported only for OTC non-cleared derivatives. Do you agree with the proposed approach for clarifying the population of the fields “Confirmation timestamp” and “Confirmation means”? Please motivate your response.](#_Toc34747737)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_62>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_62>

1. [: Do you have any comments concerning the fields related to settlement?](#_Toc34747738)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_63>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_63>

1. [: Do you have any comments concerning the proposed way of reporting of the trading venue?](#_Toc34747739)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_64>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_64>

1. : [Do you foresee any difficulties related to the proposal for reporting the data elements related to the regular payments?](#_Toc34747740)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_65>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_65>

1. [: Do you agree to leave the valuation fields unchanged? If not, what changes do you propose?](#_Toc34747741)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_66>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_66>

1. [: Do you agree that the contract value is most relevant for authorities when reported as the IFRS 13 Fair Value without applying valuation adjustments?](#_Toc34747742)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_67>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_67>

1. [: Do you anticipate practical issues with reporting IFRS 13 Fair Value without applying valuation adjustments? If so, what measures can be taken to address these or what alternative solutions can be considered (that would ensure consistent reporting of valuation by the counterparties)?](#_Toc34747743)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_68>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_68>

1. [: Is more guidance needed for the determination of the “valuation type”, e.g. similar to the guidance provided in the CDE guidance on page 41-42?](#_Toc34747744)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_69>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_69>

1. [: Do you agree that the fields IM/VM Posted/Received fields are provided in with both a pre- and post-haircut value?](#_Toc34747745)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_70>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_70>

1. [: Do you agree to change the format of the collateralisation field to one that is compatible with single sided reporting?](#_Toc34747746)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_71>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_71>

1. [: Do you agree that the fields “Counterparty rating trigger indicator” and “Counterparty rating threshold indicator” are added?](#_Toc34747747)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_72>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_72>

1. [: Do you agree that a single A rating is the most relevant trigger for the “Counterparty rating threshold indicator” field?](#_Toc34747748)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_73>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_73>

1. [: Is it possible to separate the value of a collateral portfolio exclusively for derivatives?](#_Toc34747749)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_74>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_74>

1. [: Are there any limitations with regard to ESMA’s proposed adjustments to these EMIR reporting fields? If so please specify what the limitations are and how they could be overcome?](#_Toc34747750)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_75>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_75>

1. [: Do you think that there are other additional fields which would be necessary to fully understand the price of a derivative?](#_Toc34747751)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_76>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_76>

1. [: Are there any further pieces of clarification in relation to these fields (beyond the information in the definitions in the annex) which could be added to the amended standards to ensure reporting is done in a consistent manner? If so, please expand on how ESMA can ensure the standards are clear to reporting entities and reduce ambiguity with regard to what should be reported for different fields.](#_Toc34747752)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_77>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_77>

1. [: Do you agree with the clarification in relation to the approach to populating fields which require reference to a fixed rate? If you believe that an alternative approach would be more effective and ensure a consistent approach is followed by reporting counterparties, please explain that approach.](#_Toc34747753)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_78>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_78>

1. [: Should there be any further guidance provided in relation to the population of the ‘notional’ field on top of the content of the CDE guidance? What should this guidance say? Do you foresee any difficulties with reporting of notional in line with the CDE guidance?](#_Toc34747754)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_79>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_79>

1. [: Is the guidance provided in ESMA Q&A TR 41 clear? Should any further guidance be provided in addition to ESMA Q&A TR 41?](#_Toc34747755)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_80>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_80>

1. [: Do you foresee any challenges with the interpretation of the EMIR data should the fields “Quantity” and “Price multiplier” be removed? In case these fields are maintained, should there be further clarity as to what should be reported therein? What should this guidance say? Should this guidance be per asset class? Should this guidance distinguish between OTC and ETD derivatives?](#_Toc34747756)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_81>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_81>

1. [: Do you foresee any challenges with reporting of the Total notional quantity?](#_Toc34747757)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_82>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_82>

1. [: Which of the two described approaches to reporting the notional amount schedules is preferable? Please motivate your view.](#_Toc34747758)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_83>

Model 2

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_83>

1. [: Do you foresee challenges in relation to the proposed approach for reporting of Delta? Are there any challenges regarding the reporting of Delta every time there is a valuation update?](#_Toc34747759)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_84>

No comments, pls see introductory comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_84>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposal for reporting of attachment and detachment point?](#_Toc34747760)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_85>

No comments, pls see introductory comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_85>

1. [: Do you consider that the fields Attachment point and Detachment point serve to report additional data or are applicable to other products than those foreseen in the CDE guidance?](#_Toc34747761)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_86>

No comments, pls see introductory comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_86>

1. [: Do respondents believe that any of these new fields would be problematic to report? If so, please explain why.](#_Toc34747762)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_87>

No comments, pls see introductory comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_87>

1. [: Do you foresee any difficulties related to reporting of the additional fields for package transactions? Please motivate your reply.](#_Toc34747763)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_88>

We foresee possible difficulies with the reporting of package transactions. It does not appear quite obvious, which content is to be reported in the respective fields

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_88>

1. [: Do you foresee any difficulties related to the reporting of prior UTI? Please motivate your reply.](#_Toc34747764)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_89>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_89>

1. [: Do you foresee any difficulties related to the reporting of PTRR ID? Please motivate your reply. Are you aware of alternative solutions that would enable regulators to link derivatives entering into and resulting from the same post-trade risk reduction event? Please provide details of such solutions.](#_Toc34747765)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_90>

No comments, pls see introductory comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_90>

1. [: Do you foresee any difficulties related to the generation and reporting of the PTRR ID for cleared derivatives? Please motivate your reply.](#_Toc34747766)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_91>

No comments, pls see introductory comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_91>

1. [: Do you see a need for further adjustment of the reporting requirements to allow for effective reporting of PTRR events, in addition to the ones proposed in the section 4.4.11.3?](#_Toc34747767)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_92>

No comments, pls see introductory comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_92>

1. [: Do you foresee any difficulties related to the reporting of position UTI in the reports pertaining to the derivatives included in a position? Please motivate your reply.](#_Toc34747768)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_93>

No comments, pls see introductory comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_93>

1. [: Do you foresee any difficulties related to the reporting of any of the additional data elements related to custom baskets? Please motivate your reply.](#_Toc34747769)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_94>

pls see introductory comments but on first sight, this appears to be complicated

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_94>

1. [: With regard to reporting of delivery interval times, which alternative do you prefer: (A) reporting in UTC time or (B) reporting in local time? Please provide arguments.](#_Toc34747770)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_95>

A, Reporting in UTC time

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_95>

1. [: Are you currently reporting derivatives on crypto-assets under EMIR? If so, please describe how they are reported. In particular, please clarify how do you identify and classify these derivatives in the reports under EMIR?](#_Toc34747771)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_96>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_96>

1. [: Would you see the need to add further reporting details or amend the ones envisaged in the table of fields (see Annex V) in order to enable more accurate, comprehensive and efficient reporting of derivatives on crypto-assets?](#_Toc34747772)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_97>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_97>

1. [: Do you support the proposal that reports pertaining to the derivatives outstanding on the reporting start date should be updated in order to ensure consistent level of quality of data and limit the operational challenges?](#_Toc34747773)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_98>

We welcome the intention, however, we see great challenges with missing data

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_98>

1. [: Do you foresee challenges with the update of reports pertaining to outstanding derivatives in line with the revised requirements? If so, please describe these challenges. In particular, if they relate to some of the newly added or amended reporting fields, please mention these fields.](#_Toc34747774)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_99>

We welcome the intention, however, we see great challenges with missing data

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_99>

1. [: Do you think that additional time after the reporting start date should be granted for the counterparties to update the reports pertaining to the outstanding derivatives? If so, how much additional timeline would be required?](#_Toc34747775)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_100>

Yes, minimum 6 months

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_100>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposed timelines for implementation, i.e. 18 months from the entry into force of the technical standards?](#_Toc34747776)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_101>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_101>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposed framework for verification of data submission? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747777)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_102>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_102>

1. [: Are there any additional aspects that would need to be clarified or specified with regards to the verification of logical integrity of submissions with different Action types such as “Revive”? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747778)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_103>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_103>

1. [: Do you consider that the proposed procedure will allow the TRs to verify the compliance by the reporting counterparty or the submitting entity with the reporting requirements, and the completeness and correctness of the data reported under Article 9 EMIR? If not, what other aspects should be taken into account? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747779)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_104>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_104>

1. [: Are there any additional aspects that would need to be clarified or specified with regards to the updates to the LEI that are to be performed by the TRs? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747780)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_105>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_105>

1. [: Are there any other aspects that should be considered with regards to the scope and start of the reconciliation process? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747781)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_106>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_106>

1. [: Are there any aspects related to the intra-TR reconciliation that need to be clarified? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747782)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_107>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_107>

1. [: What additional aspects with regards to inter-TR reconciliation will need to be considered? Should additional fields be considered for pairing? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747783)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_108>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_108>

1. [: What other aspects should be considered to ensure the integrity of the number and values of the reconciled derivatives? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747784)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_109>

No comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_109>

1. [: What other aspects should be considered to reduce data transformation and format issues in the inter-TR reconciliation process? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747785)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_110>

No comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_110>

1. [: What other aspects should be taken into account with regards to the timeline for completion of the inter-TR reconciliation process? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747786)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_111>

No comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_111>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposed approach to establish tolerances for certain fields? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747787)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_112>

Yes, suggested tollerances seem feasable

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_112>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposed set of fields? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747788)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_113>

No comments, pls see introductory comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_113>

1. [: Do you foresee any problem in the reconciliation of field “Valuation amount”? How should the valuation amount be reconciled in the case of derivatives which are valued in different currency by the counterparties, such as currency derivatives? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747789)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_114>

Yes due to different marketvalues, rates and calculation models

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_114>

1. [: Do you agree with excluding the newly added fields from the first stage of the inter-TR reconciliation process? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747790)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_115>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_115>

1. [: Do you consider that any additional requirement in relation with the policies and procedures referred to in Article 78(9) EMIR needs to be added to ensure better performance of the data transfer by TRs? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747791)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_116>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_116>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposed framework for rejection responses? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747792)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_117>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_117>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposed framework for reconciliation responses? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747793)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_118>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_118>

1. [: Do you agree with the suggested reconciliation categories? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747794)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_119>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_119>

1. [: Are there any relevant aspects related to the application of action type “Revive” that should be considered for the purposes of carrying out the reconciliation process?](#_Toc34747795)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_120>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_120>

1. [: Are there any aspects that need to be further specified regarding the end-of-day reports to be provided to reporting counterparties, the entities responsible for reporting and, where relevant, the report submitting entities? Is there any additional information that should be provided to these entities to facilitate their processing of data and improve quality of data? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747796)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_121>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_121>

1. [: Especially regarding the abnormal values, please indicate which of the two approaches you prefer and which other aspect should be taken into account. Please detail the reason for your response.](#_Toc34747797)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_122>

No comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_122>

1. [: Do you believe that there are any other aspects that need to be aligned between the current RTS on registration under SFTR and the ones under EMIR? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747798)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_123>

No comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_123>

1. [: Do you agree with the above proposals for provision of information in the case of extension of registration? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747799)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_124>

No comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_124>

1. [: Do you believe that there are any other aspects that need to be covered by the draft ITS on registration under EMIR? Please detail the reasons for your response.](#_Toc34747800)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_125>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_125>

1. [: Do you agree with the proposed amendments to the data access requirements with respect to the terms and conditions of data access?](#_Toc34747801)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_126>

No comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_126>

1. [: What other aspects need to be clarified with regards to the definition of elements for the establishment of direct and immediate access to data?](#_Toc34747802)

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_127>

No comments

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_TSTR\_127>