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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 Section 9 in the Consultation Paper on the Guidelines on reporting under EMIR 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\_REPO\_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.
* if you wish to provide comments on the validation rules and/or reconciliation tolerances for the specific reporting fields, please use for that purpose the additional response form in excel format.

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\_REPO\_NAMEOFCOMPANY\_NAMEOFDOCUMENT.

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

ESMA\_REPO\_ESMA\_REPLYFORM or

ESMA\_REPO\_ANNEX1

***Deadline***

Responses must reach us by 30 September 2021.

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 close of the consultation, unless you request otherwise. Please clearly and prominently indicate in your submission any part you do not wish 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 headings ‘Legal notice’ and ‘Data protection’.

# 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\_REPO\_1>

Finance Denmark would like to thank ESMA for the open hearing on the EMIR Refit consultation, it’s highly appreciated and was a good opportunity to discuss with ESMA and hear ESMA’s thoughts on specific questions. We would like to encourage ESMA to continue with these open hearings in the future on coming consultations.

We are of the opinion that there are conflicts between different reporting regimes and would like to see a harmonisation between especially EMIR and MIFID II, but also with SFTR. Different reporting standards and definitions create uncertainty and leads to matching problems and poor reporting quality, we have pointed that out in several specific questions.

We are of the opinion that transactions with two legs the description on how these legs should be reported is not clear enough. The introduction of MAKE and TAKE is also unclear. To make it easier and clearer to understand we suggest using terms and definitions as used in SFTR e.g. GIVE/TAKE instead of MAKE/TAKE.

We are of the opinion that that the UPI standard is not completely defined and should therefore not be used already and thus business as usual should be conducted until the UPI is completely defined and implemented.

We are of the opinion when it is possible to use ISIN, CFI and UPI then they should be used and only them and not the underlying fields.

We are of the opinion that it is unnecessary to reconcile on optional fields. We are very worried that this will lead to more breaks if TR’s mark reconciliation breaks if one CTP reports the field and the second don't.

Finally, we have a request for more examples that are outlier examples instead of just mainstream examples to better understand the more extreme cases. We therefore encourage ESMA to publish as many reporting examples for different product types and scenarios as possible. Both standard cases and more rare corner cases are welcomed as long they are business relevant. We also see the value in the reporting example covers the full reporting requirement and not only specific sections of the report.

<ESMA\_COMMENT\_REPO\_1>

1. **Are there any other clarifications that should be provided with regards to the transition to reporting under the revised technical standards?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_1>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_1>

1. Are there any additional aspects to be considered with regards to the eligibility to reporting of currency derivatives?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_2>

We think it is important to see FX derivatives as one contract with one ISIN. There is a conflict in this regard between EMIR and MIFID II which creates uncertainty. We would like harmonisation between these regulations, see generel remarks as well, and prefer a standard where a one contract/one ISIN approach is used.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_2>

1. Are there any aspects to be clarified with regards to the rest of contract types of currency derivatives? Please provide the relevant examples.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_3>

We think it is important to see FX derivatives as one contract with one ISIN. There is a conflict in this regard between EMIR and MIFID II which creates uncertainty. We would like harmonisation between these regulations, see generel remarks as well, and prefer a standard where a one contract/one ISIN approach is used.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_3>

1. Are there any additional aspects to be considered with regards to the eligibility for reporting of the derivatives on crypto-assets? Please provide the relevant examples.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_4>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_4>

1. Are there any additional aspects to be considered with regards to the eligibility for reporting of Total Return Swaps, liquidity swaps, collateral swaps or any other uncertainty with regards to potential overlap between SFTR and EMIR? Please provide the relevant examples.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_5>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_5>

1. Are there any additional aspects to be considered with regards to the eligibility for reporting of complex derivative contracts? Please provide the relevant examples.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_6>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_6>

1. Are there other situations where a clarification is required whether a derivative should be reported?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_7>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_7>

1. Do you agree with the above understanding?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_8>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_8>

1. Are there other situations where a clarification is required whether a derivative involving a specific category of party should be reported?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_9>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_9>

1. Do you agree with the above understanding?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_10>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_10>

1. Are there other specific scenarios where a clarification is required?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_11>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_11>

1. Do you agree with the above understanding?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_12>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_12>

1. Are there any other clarifications required with regards to the IGT exemption from reporting?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_13>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_13>

1. Are there any other clarifications required for the handling of derivatives between NFC- and FC?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_14>

No, but as the obligation and responsibility of reporting on behalf of NFC- counterparties now lies with the FC and the primary reason for the change was that it was judged to be unnecessarily burdensome for NFC- to report for themselves, we find it needless to provide further reports to NFC- counterparties, as proposed in rec. 73, than already provided through trading confirmation as determined in regulation 2017/565 article 59. Confirmations should enable NFC- counterparties to reconcile at an acceptable level. If NFC- counterparties wish to monitor in depth, we instead propose for the NFC- to on-board relevant TRs in order to most efficiently make data available.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_14>

1. Are the current illustrative examples providing clarity and / are there other examples that should be incorporated in the guidelines?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_15>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_15>

1. Are there any other clarifications required for the reporting obligation related to CCPs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_16>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_16>

1. Are there any other clarifications required for the reporting obligation related to Investment Funds i.e. UCITS, AIF and IORP that, in accordance with national law, does not have legal personality?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_17>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_17>

1. Do you see any other challenges with the delegation of reporting which should be addressed?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_18>

No, but Recital 49 states that ESMA “expects the RSE to inform the reporting counterparties and ERRs about relevant reporting and data quality issues for which the information will not be provided by the TRs”. With regard to data available in the TR, submitted by the RSE on behalf of the ERR, we propose to specify an expectation of the ERR to on-board relevant TR in order for this entity to most efficiently being able to monitor compliance.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_18>

1. Do you agree that only action types ‘Margin Update’ and ‘Correct’ should be used to report collateral?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_19>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_19>

1. Are there any other clarifications required with regards to the use of the action types in general (other than specific aspects covered in the sections below)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_20>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_20>

1. Do you agree with the sequences proposed? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_21>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_21>

1. Are there any specific scenarios in which the expected sequence of action types is unclear?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_22>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_22>

1. Are any further clarifications needed with regards to the action type - event type combinations or their applicability?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_23>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_23>

1. Is it clear when the linking IDs should be used, and in which reports they should be provided? Do you agree that the linking IDs should be reported only in the reports pertaining to a given lifecycle events and should not be included in all subsequent reports submitted for a given derivative? Are any further clarifications on linking IDs required?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_24>

Yes, Yes, No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_24>

1. Do you agree with the ESMA´s approach related to leaving the Event type blank in the case of multiple events impacting the same position on a given day? How often multiple events/single events impact the same position on a given day? Have you assessed the single versus multiple events impacting positions on a given day? Do you have systems or methods to distinguish between one or multiple events impacting the positions on a given day?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_25>

Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_25>

1. Do you agree with the proposed clarifications concerning population of certain fields at position level?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_26>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_26>

1. Do you need any other clarification with regards to the position level reporting?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_27>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_27>

1. Are there any other aspects that should be clarified with regards to reporting of on-venue derivatives?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_28>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_28>

1. Do you agree with the proposal for reporting conclusion of derivatives? Please detail the reasons for your response

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_29>

No, this seems to unnecessarily complicate the reporting with no benefits for reporting parties. If changes are needed they should be done at TR level.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_29>

1. Do you agree with the proposal for reporting modifications and corrections to derivatives? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_30>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_30>

1. Do you agree with the specification of the ‘Event date’ for different action types?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_31>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_31>

1. Do you agree with the interpretation of the business events and the suggested action and event types?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_32>

Yes, but this will be a very comprehensive exercise and need quite a lot of coordination and common understanding between market participants and internally as well on all definitions

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_32>

1. Are there other business events that would require clarification? If so, please describe the nature of such events and explain how in your view they should be reported under EMIR (i.e. which action type and event type should be used).

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_33>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_33>

1. Which approach do you prefer to determine the entity with the soonest reporting deadline? Please clarify the advantages and challenges related to each of the approaches.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_34>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_34>

1. Are there any other aspects that need to be clarified on UTI generation?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_35>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_35>

1. Are there any other types of contracts for which the determination of the counterparty side needs more clarity?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_36>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_36>

1. Are there any other clarifications required with regard to the determination of the counterparty side (other than specific aspects covered in other sections)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_37>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_37>

1. Are there any other clarifications requested with regards to the identification of counterparties?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_38>

No, but we would like to point out some inconsistences between SFTR and EMIR reporting eg. Sector codes - We don't understand why it is no longer possible to select REIN = Reinsurance undertaking in new technical standard as it available in SFTR and old EMIR. Also CCPS = Central counterparty is missing compared to SFTR. It don't seem logical if we need two different methods to define CTP sector especially not when the are so similar.  
  
Point 224 - We find it strange we no longer can use personal or sensitive data when identifying CTP without LEI (Privat customer). The authorities can not identify these CTP. This is inconsistent with MIFIR reporting.  
  
It would desirable that the reporting schemes and definitions are identical.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_38>

1. Are there any other aspects to clarify in the LEI update procedure when a counterparty undergoes a corporate action?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_39>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_39>

1. Are there any other aspects to be considered in the procedure to update from BIC to LEI?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_40>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_40>

1. Do you require any further clarification on the use of UPI, ISIN or CFI for derivatives?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_41>

No, but official CFI should be used as far as possible other wise we might end up with different CFI codes for the same products. Regarding UPI pls. Q.42 for comments.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_41>

1. Do you require any further clarification with regards to the reporting of fields covered by the UPI reference data? Which fields in the future should /should not be sourced exclusively from the UPI reference data rather than being reported to the TRs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_42>

We need ESMA to define the fields covered by UPI.   
We wait on the list to comment if we can omit some of them. Futher we take it that it is business as usual until UPI's are finalized and ready for implementation. When we have better knowledge of the UPI we are in a better position to give specific feedback on this question.   
  
However, as recital 248 states ESMA don’t expect reference data fields identified with the UPI to be required once the UPI system is fully in place. We welcome this proposal but emphasize the importance of validation check to reflect those reference data fields not being required and with no reconciliation check.   
   
Further, referring to Q41, we request the proposal on not to require reference data fields also to apply to transactions reported with an ISIN since ISINs most likely will be linked to an UPI and hence should cover the same reference data fields.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_42>

1. Do you require any further clarification on the reporting of details of the underlying?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_43>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_43>

1. Is any further guidance required in relation to the population of the notional field?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_44>

No, but generally we would like some more examples that are outlier examples instead of just mainstream examples to better understand the more extreme cases

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_44>

1. Is any further guidance required in relation to the population of the Total notional quantity field? How should the Total notional quantity field be populated, distinguishing between ETD and OTC and asset class?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_45>

No, no comment

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_45>

1. Are there other instances when we would expect to see a zero notional for Position Reports? Please provide examples. Are there any instances when we would expect to see a notional of zero for Trade Level Reports? Please provide examples.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_46>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_46>

1. Are there any other aspects in reporting of valuations that should be clarified?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_47>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_47>

1. Are there any other aspects in reporting of delta that should be clarified? Are there instrument types (in addition to swaption) where further guidance is needed with regards to the calculation of delta?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_48>

No, No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_48>

1. Are there any further clarifications required with regards to the reporting of margins?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_49>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_49>

1. Are there any further clarifications required with regards to the reporting of the trading venue?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_50>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_50>

1. Are there any further clarifications required with regards to the reporting of clearing?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_51>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_51>

1. Are there any further clarifications required with regards to the reporting of confirmation timestamp and confirmation means?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_52>

No, but the definition of when this field is supposed to be populated is somewhat vague, so more clarification is needed in this regard.   
  
The definition Confirmation time stamp is also somewhat vague, so more clarification is needed in this regard.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_52>

1. Are there any further clarifications required with regards to the reporting of settlement currencies?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_53>

Clarification is needed in regard to which ISO standard this refers to. Is it 4217? If that is the case there is a problem that all currencies are not covered in that standard. One example is the Chinese FX CNH which is not included.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_53>

1. Are there any additional clarifications to be considered related to reporting of regular payments?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_54>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_54>

1. Are there any further clarifications needed with regards to the reporting of other payments?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_55>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_55>

1. How would you define effective day for novations and cash-settled commodity derivatives?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_56>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_56>

1. What are reporting scenarios with regards to dates and timestamps which you would like to be clarified in the guidelines? Are there any other aspects that need to be clarified with respect to dates and timestamp fields?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_57>

Generally we would like some more examples that are outlier examples instead of just mainstream examples to better understand the more extreme cases.  
  
Also it would be desirable to get a clarification on the term "unadjusted" since its used widely in the reporting schemes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_57>

1. Are there any other aspects that need to be clarified with respect to the derivatives on crypto assets?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_58>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_58>

1. Do you consider any scenarios in which more clarification on the correct population of the fields related to package transaction is needed?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_59>

No, but clarification is highly needed since we have major concerns that this leads to the need for reporting of products that are out of scope of EMIR but included as a part of the complex product package. This will widen the scope of the EMIR reporting to products that are not reported today. This will be very burdensome and nearly impossible to include these trades in the reporting since this is not in scope today and systems are not build to include these in the reporting.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_59>

1. Which of the proposed alternatives with regard to significance assessment method do you prefer? Should ESMA consider different metrics and thresholds for assessing the scope of notifications sent to the NCAs? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_60>

Monthly as we see the distribution of trade will be more even over longer periods. But a clear definition is needed.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_60>

1. Do you prefer Option 1 or Option 2 with regard to the number of affected reports notified to the NCAs? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_61>

Option 1

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_61>

1. Should significance of a reporting issue under Article 9(1)(c) of the draft ITS on reporting also be assessed against a quantitative threshold or the qualitative specification only is appropriate? In case threshold should be also applied, would you agree to use the same as under Alternative A or B? Is another metric or method more appropriate for these types of issues? Please elaborate on your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_62>

The significance of reporting issue of article 9(1)(c) should be based on a qualitative specification only and it’s our opinion that the issues listed in provision 385 should be evaluated against the data that ESMA and the NCAs already can receive from TRs and the overview they are able to form on that basis to avoid reporting on issues that are not significant or are already available to ESMA and NCAs.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_62>

1. Are there any other aspects or scenarios that need to be clarified with respect to ensuring data quality by counterparties? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_63>

Not as long we get a clear definition on when to report errors to authorities

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_63>

1. Are there any other aspects in reporting of IRS that should be clarified?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_64>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_64>

1. Are there any other aspects in reporting of swaptions that should be clarified?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_65>

Generally we would like some more examples that are outlier examples instead of just mainstream examples to better understand the more extreme cases. We would like more examples with IRS and swaption

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_65>

1. Are there any other aspects in reporting of FRAs, cross-currency swaps, caps and floors or other IR derivatives that should be clarified?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_66>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_66>

1. In the case of FX swaps, what is the rate to be used for notional amount of leg 2? Should it be the forward exchange rate of the far leg as it is in the example provided? Or the spot exchange rate of the near leg?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_67>

Far leg since its very important that there is concistency in regard to Q. 71 and 95. Very clear guidelines are needed otherwise the current situation will not improve.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_67>

1. In the case of FX swaps, considering that the ‘Final contractual settlement date’ is not a repeatable field, should the settlement date of the near leg be reported, for example using the other payments fields?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_68>

No, but how come in the examples for reporting FX swap (Table 33, 34 & 35) the Final contractual settlement date differs from Expiration date? This is not the case for FX Forward (Table 37) and FXO (Table 38). Is this an error?  
  
This is inconsistent with definitions in SFTR, so we propose to use same definitions as in SFTR to avoid confusions

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_68>

1. Do you have any questions with regarding to reporting of FX forwards?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_69>

No, but in the example of table 35, 36 & 37. Near leg of FX Swap is part of PTRR compression task. The far leg should be reported as a new FX forward trade. Do you see any challanges reporting valuation for the new FX forward trade?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_69>

1. Do you have any questions with regarding to reporting of FX options?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_70>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_70>

1. What is the most appropriate way to report direction of the derivative and of the currencies involved with an objective to achieve successful reconciliation? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_71>

Alternative B is preferred since its very important that there is concistency in regard to Q. 67 and 95 and we see this would lead to fewer reconciliation breaks. Very clear guidelines are needed otherwise the current situation will not improve.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_71>

1. Do you agree with the population of the fields for NDF as illustrated in the above example? Should other pairs of NDFs be considered? Please provide complete details and examples if possible.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_72>

Yes, No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_72>

1. Do you agree with the population of the fields for CFD as illustrated in the above example? Do you require any other clarifications?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_73>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_73>

1. Specifically, in the case of equity swaps, portfolio equity swaps and equity CFDs how should the notional and the price be reported in the case of corporate event and in particular “free” allocations?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_74>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_74>

1. Are there any other clarifications required with regards to the reporting of equity derivatives?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_75>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_75>

1. Are there any other clarifications required with regards to the reporting of credit derivatives?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_76>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_76>

1. Are there any other aspects in reporting of commodity derivatives that should be clarified?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_77>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_77>

1. Do you agree with the population of the counterparty data fields? Please detail the reasons for your response and indicate the table to which your comments refer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_78>

Yes to all tables but clarification is needed on the number reports needed to report is it as is today = 2x CTP data and 1x trade data + collateral or will it be like SFTR = 2x CTP data and 2x trade data + collateral.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_78>

1. Is there any other use case related to the population of counterparty data which requires clarifications or examples? Please detail which one and indicate which aspect requires clarification.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_79>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_79>

1. Do you agree with the approach to reporting action types? Please detail the reasons for your response and include a reference to the specific table.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_80>

Recital 485 refer to ISO 20002 XML schemas pls confirm that it is 20022.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_80>

1. Are there any additional clarifications required with regard to the reporting of other payments?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_81>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_81>

1. Do you agree with the approach to reporting margin data? Please detail the reasons for your response and include a reference to the specific table.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_82>

Yes, but recital 530 example isn't business valid. Why would a clearing member delegate reporting to NFC? We need more business valid examples

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_82>

1. Which of the two approaches provide greater benefits for data reporting and data record-keeping? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_83>

Approach B as the logic should be centralized. SFTR should then follow this logic to align between reporting regimes since we observe some breaks in the SFTR reporting that can be difficult to understand

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_83>

1. In case Approach B is followed, should the TRs update the TSR when counterparties have reported lately the details of derivatives? If so, do you agree with the time limit ten years for such an update? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_84>

10 years seems to excessive it should follow other limits meaning 5 years or 5 years + 2.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_84>

1. Are there any fields that should be taken into account in a special way not allow change in values?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_85>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_85>

1. Is the guidance on treatment of action type “Revive” clear? What additional aspects should be considered? Please detail the reason for our answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_86>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_86>

1. Should the TR remove after 30 calendar days the other side of a derivative for which only one counterparty has reported “Error” and no action type ”Revive”? Please detail the reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_87>

Definately No - The CTP that didn't error out the report need to make an agreement with the CTP that did who is wrong. Removing the data from TR likely impact the CTP that didn't error out the report's controlling tool. We realize that in normal circumstance the agreement between the two parts should have been reached inside ethe 30 days window.  
Letting TRs close reports also remove the reporting CTP as master of what have been reported

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_87>

1. Which alternative relating to the provision of the notional schedules and other payments data would be more beneficial? Which of the two alternatives has higher costs? Please detail the reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_88>

We support alternative A as we don't see value for TRS to have this detailed data. Data can be given on request. Related to Q81 what is the value to report this detailed data if no authorities uses them.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_88>

1. Do you agree with the described process of update of the TSR? What other aspects should be taken into account? Please elaborate on the reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_89>

Recital 565. a.: Does ESMA means Event type = ETRM or Action type = TERM? Or do the introduce a new action type only to be used in this scenario? Clarification is needed.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_89>

1. Should only the Field 1.14 be used for determining the eligibility of derivative for reconciliation? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_90>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_90>

1. Is there any additional aspect that should be clarified with regards to the derivatives subject to reconciliation? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_91>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_91>

1. From reconciliation perspective do you agree with the proposed differentiated approach for the latest state of derivatives subject to reconciliation depending on the level at which they are reported? What are the costs of having such a differentiation? Should the timeline for reconciliation of derivatives at trade level be aligned with the one for positions? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_92>

Yes as it will secure higher match rates.   
  
ERR RSE will later notice recon breaks on position lvl.  
  
No as we agree with the issue described in point 569

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_92>

1. From data use perspective, should the information in the TSR and in the reconciliation report be different? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_93>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_93>

1. Which alternative do you prefer? What are the costs for your organisation of each alternative? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_94>

No preference between A or B, but we don’t see the purpose and need for reconciliation of valuation with the extreme low threshold tolerance. We accept the idea of reconciliation but not with the proposed low thresholds, as it will cause all to many breaks. In practice marked standards for valuations follow the IFRS standard, but is still within the scope of individual fixing and so forth. In case of disputes between counterparties internal valuations will not necessarily be adjusted. As a second input the low thresholds set out in the guidelines conflicts with the thresholds set out in EMIR requirements for portfolio reconciliation/dispute resolution delegated regulation article 13, 149/2013 and article 15 149/2013

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_94>

1. Which alternative do you prefer? What are the costs for your organisation of each alternative? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_95>

approach B as the logic should be centralized since concistency is needed in regard to Q. 67 and 71

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_95>

1. Do you agree with the proposed approach for reconciliation of notional schedules? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_96>

Reference is missing so we can't answer the question for now

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_96>

1. Do you agree with the proposed approach for reconciliation of venues and the clarification in case of SIs? Please elaborate on the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_97>

Yes

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_97>

1. What other aspects need to be considered with regards to the aforementioned approach to rejection feedback? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_98>

The error codes and error description received from TR need to be understandable for end-users which can be problematic today eg. state specific field where the logic breaks

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_98>

1. Do you agree with the approach outlined above with regards to the missing valuations report? Are there any other aspects that need to be considered? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_99>

Yes, No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_99>

1. Do you agree with the approach outlined above with regards to the missing margin information report? Are there any other aspects that need to be considered? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_100>

Yes, No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_100>

1. Do you agree with the approach outlined above with regards to the detection of abnormal values and the corresponding end-of-day report? Are there any other aspects that need to be considered? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_101>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_101>

1. Is there any additional aspect related to the provision of reconciliation feedback by TRs that should be clarified? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_102>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_102>

1. Is there any additional aspect related to the rejection of reports with action type “Revive” by TRs that should be clarified? Please detail the reasons for your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_103>

No

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_103>

1. Regarding the requirements in the RTS on registration, as amended, and the RTS on data access, as amended, do you need any further specifications and/or clarification?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_104>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_104>

1. Are there any specific aspects related to the access to data based on UPI that need to be clarified? Please detail which ones.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_105>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_105>

1. What access rights would you like to be clarified and/or which access scenarios examples would you consider to be inserted in the guidelines? Please list them all, if appropriate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_106>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_106>

1. Are there any aspects, or procedures you would like to be clarified? If yes, please describe in detail.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_107>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_107>

1. Is there any other information that should be provided by the entity listed in Article 81(3) EMIR to facilitate the swift and timely establishment of access to data?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_108>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_REPO\_108>