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**Responding to this paper**

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

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

ESMA will consider all comments received by **Thursday 23th December 2021.**

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 steps below when preparing and submitting their response:

* Insert your responses to the consultation questions in this form.
* Please do not remove tags of the type <ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_1>. Your response to each question has to be framed by the two tags corresponding to the question.
* 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.
* When you have drafted your response, name your response form according to the following convention: ESMA\_BEEX\_nameofrespondent\_RESPONSEFORM. For example, for a respondent named ABCD, the response form would be entitled ESMA\_BEEX\_ABCD\_RESPONSEFORM.
* 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 Review of the MiFID II framework on best execution reports’).

**Publication of responses**

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

**Data protection**

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

**Who should read this paper?**

This document is of interest to execution venues, investment firms and their associations, investors, consumer associations, as well as any market participant engaged in the execution of orders under the MiFID II framework.

# General information about respondent

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the company / organisation | DACSI |
| Activity | Non-governmental Organisation and Other Associations |
| Are you representing an association? |  |
| Country/Region | Netherlands |

# Introduction

Please make your introductory comments below, if any:

<ESMA\_COMMENT\_BEEX\_1>

DACSI – the Dutch Advisory Committee Securities Industry – welcomes the opportunity to express its view on the review of this reporting framework. Our orientation is getting a more effective reporting (in terms of achieving its high-level objectives), while combining this with a lighter burden for reporting entities where possible.

<ESMA\_COMMENT\_ BEEX\_1>

1. **: Do you agree with the proposed scope in terms of execution venues for the reporting under a possible new RTS 27?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_1>

DACSI agrees in general.   
Consolidation of reporting by trading venues will provide a clearer picture to investors when making execution decisions. The only point where DACSI members disagree is the disclosure of the identity of market makers and their contribution: this is not relevant to the overall execution quality of the venue.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_1>

1. **: Do you agree with the proposed level of granularity by types of financial instruments instead of individual financial instruments under a new potential reporting regime? In particular, do you agree with the two proposed categories concerning shares (i.e., shares considered to have a liquid market and shares not considered to have a liquid market)? If not, please state the reasons for your answer and clarify what alternative categorisations you would propose in order to have a meaningful level of granularity for a new reporting regime.**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_2>

Yes, we agree.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_2>

1. **: Do you agree with the proposed metrics to report the execution quality obtained by execution venues?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_3>

We roughly agree.

In DACSI’s view, the proposal to use generic metrics contributes to the usability of the reporting by creating a limited set of comparable high-level data.   
Needless to say that real comparability depends on the actual calculus behind the proposed metrics, as applied by the individual execution venues. We think that some additional regulatory measures are necessary to assure consistent calculus and – consequently – comparable data. Our concern specifically refers to:

* The costs for a median transaction showing the fees the execution venue applied to any of its users for a median transaction during the previous reporting period;
* The bid-offer spread related to the median transaction of the previous quarter .

We also note that, since the median bid-offer spread would apply to an aggregated class of financial instruments, it would lose its information value given the range of bid-off spreads across individual financial instruments.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_3>

1. **: Have you observed good or bad practices of reporting by execution venues under the current RTS 27 that can be relevant for the elaboration of proposals to enhance access and user-friendliness of this information? Please provide specific examples if possible.**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_4>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_4>

1. **: Have you observed good or bad practices of reporting by investment firms under the current RTS 28 that can be relevant for the elaboration of proposals to enhance access and user-friendliness of this information? Please provide specific examples if possible.**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_5>

DACSI’s members (as far as they are investment firms) have published these reports over the last few years. We do not believe that the reported data provide the information that clients would need to choose between service providers.

For retail clients, the data in the reports are too detailed conceptually and difficult to reach in practice, and – at the same time – would not be fully relevant and/or sufficient for their decision making; in practice, they often choose for a much wider service package than order execution.

For wholesale clients, the reports are conceptually relevant, but lack comparability.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_5>

1. **: Do you agree with the classification for reporting proposed in Annex I of the possible new RTS 28, especially with regard to the suggested methodology for the reporting on equity instruments? If not, what alternative categorisations would you propose?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_6>

Yes, we agree.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_6>

1. **: Do you agree with the proposals for a possible review of RTS 28?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_7>

Yes, we agree.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_7>

1. **: Do you agree with the cost benefit analysis as it has been described in Annex II?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_8>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_8>

1. **: Are there any additional comments that you would like to raise and/or information that you would like to provide?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_9>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_BEEX\_9>