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Responding to this paper

The European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) invites responses to the specific questions listed in the Call for Evidence (CfE) on the DLT Pilot Regime for 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\_DLTP\_1> - i.e. the response to one question has to be framed by the 2 tags corresponding to the question; and
* if you do not have a response to a question, do not delete it and leave the text “TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE” between the tags.

Responses are most helpful:

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

**Naming protocol**

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

ESMA\_DLTP\_NAMEOFCOMPANY\_NAMEOFDOCUMENT.

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

ESMA\_DLTP\_ESMA\_REPLYFORM or

ESMA\_DLTP\_ANNEX1

***Deadline***

Responses must reach us by **4 March 2022.**

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

***Publication of responses***

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

***Data protection***

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

# General information about respondent

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the company / organisation | Bundesverband deutscher Banken |
| Activity | Banking sector |
| Are you representing an association? |[x]
| Country/Region | Germany |

1. Please provide any general observations or comments that you would like to make on this call for evidence, including any relevant information on you/your organisation and why the topics covered by this call for evidence are relevant for you/your organisation.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_1>

We welcome the fact that ESMA is addressing important supervisory issues arising from the application of the DLT pilot regime. Investor protection and market integrity must always be ensured regardless of the type of trading - this applies to trading via conventional systems in the same way as to trading based on DLT. This is because both investor protection and the safeguarding of market integrity play an essential role in the functioning of markets. Institutional and retail investors must be able to trust at all times that supervisory authorities are in a position to guarantee the integrity of the markets - the technology used in trading must not play a role in this respect.

In order to enable the supervisory authorities to monitor the markets in an appropriate manner, the supervised market participants must provide them with the necessary data. The manner in which the supervisory authorities receive this data appears to be irrelevant. Rather, it is crucial that the same rules apply to all supervised parties: Same business, same risks, same rules. Whether the required data is sent to the supervisory authority by the supervised entity (push) or whether the supervisor can access data held by the supervised entity (pull) is ultimately just a question of technology. The decisive factor is that all the necessary content is available within the specified period.

Even today, supervisory authorities rightly do not differentiate between where a transaction was concluded - e.g. on-exchange or over-the-counter - rather, the supervised parties always have to provide the specified data if certain financial instruments are affected. This standard must also be applied to trading via DLT.

Our members have extensive experience in realising pre- and post-trade transparency in the market and in reporting transactions to the competent supervisory authority in accordance with Article 26 MiFIR. Extensive organisational arrangements are necessary to fulfil these obligations, which require the establishment of suitable processes and procedures. The use of suitable systems and sufficient resources is indispensable for this. As a result, investment firms contribute to maintaining market integrity and protecting investors.

Against this background, we would like to emphasise that it will also be crucial for trading under the DLT pilot regime to apply the existing rules in an appropriate manner. Especially for the successful establishment of new trading opportunities, ensuring market integrity and investor protection will be of paramount importance.

Exemptions from specific requirements under the pilot regime should therefore be well justified and require effective alternative safeguards to be put in place which would meet the objectives pursued by the provisions from which an exemption is requested or would ensure investor protection and/or market integrity. An authorised test operation under the pilot regime should be required to demonstrate the existence and effectiveness of such safeguards, which could serve as a model for the future framework.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_1>

1. Please indicate whether you/your organisation is planning to operate a DLT MI under the DLT Pilot and provide some high-level explanation of the business model

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_2>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_2>

1. What are the key elements supporting the increased use of DLT in the field of financial services? What are the main obstacles, including in the technical standards, for the development and up-take of DLT-based solutions (listing, trading and settlement)? Do you plan to operate a restricted (permissioned) or unrestricted (permissionless) distributed ledger?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_3>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_3>

1. Would you consider operating a DLT MTF Would you consider operating a DLT SS without operating at the same time a DLT MTF? If yes, under which conditions?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_4>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_4>

1. Please provide an overview of how DLT securities trade in the current market structure (incl. what types of trading system are used, the relevance of secondary market trading)? Do you see any challenges with the current market structure following the application of the DLT Pilot?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_5>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_5>

1. Instrument status: Do DLT financial instruments have different characteristics than ‘standard’ shares, UCITS-ETFs and bonds? If yes, please elaborate and explain whether these different characteristics call for a different approach for the application of the transparency requirements?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_6>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_6>

1. Transactions: Where are DLT financial instruments traded? Could there be OTC trading in those instruments?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_7>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_7>

1. Transactions: Do the lists of transactions in Article 13 of RTS 1 and Article 12 of RTS 2 reflect relevant transaction types for DLT financial instruments? If not, please explain which types of transactions are missing and why they should be added to the lists of transactions.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_8>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_8>

1. Can the current transparency requirements in RTS 1 and 2 be applied for DLT financial instruments (e.g. liquidity assessment, thresholds, flags, reporting fields) or would they need to be adjusted? If not, what should be the appropriate approach?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_9>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_9>

1. Are there any standards (e.g. messaging, identification of accounts/users, product identifiers, reporting, etc.) in a DLT environment that should be taken into account when revising the RTS 1 and 2?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_10>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_10>

1. Do you anticipate any problems that may emerge from the current liquidity concepts in Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/567 and RTS 2 for the application of related transparency requirements for DLT financial instruments? Please explain and make proposals on how such problems could be solved.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_11>

No, we do not anticipate that problems will arise. Whether a financial instrument eligible for trading under the DLT Pilot Regime is considered liquid or illiquid for the purposes of Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/567 and/or RTS 2 will have to be assessed by the the relevant liquidity concepts of said regulations.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_11>

1. Are DLT securities traded on different trading systems as ‘standard’ shares and UCITS-ETFs (mostly continuous trading and periodic auctions) or bonds (RFQ, voice trading)? Please explain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_12>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_12>

1. To what extent would the choice of trading protocols and applications have an impact on the trading of instruments and on the requirements to publish information according to RTS 1 and 2?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_13>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_13>

1. Do the systems on which DLT financial instruments trade require tailored pre-trade transparency requirements as those per Table 1 Annex I of RTS 1 and Annex I of RTS 2?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_14>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_14>

1. Would the use of restricted (permissioned) vs unrestricted (permissionless) DLT represent any difference in how the pre-trade transparency requirements should be applied?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_15>

No, whether restricted or unrestricted DLT is used should make no difference in how the pre-trade transparency requirements should be applied. The DLT Pilot Regime allows only DLT MTFs to offer trading under the Pilot Regime. In order to ensure a level-playing field, DLT MTFs and traditional MTFs should follow the same rules. Pre-trade transparency is a means to inform all interested investors about the current market situation. If restricted DLT would be treated differently from unrestricted DLT this would lead to the investor not being able to get the full picture across all MTFs which is to be avoided.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_15>

1. Is it in your view necessary to make changes to the calibration of waivers for DLT shares and UCITS-ETFs in RTS 1? Do you expect any implementation issues in the application of waivers also taking into account the above considerations?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_16>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_16>

1. Is it in your view necessary to make changes to the calibration of waivers for DLT bonds in RTS 2? Do you expect any implementation issues in the application of wavers also taking into account the above considerations?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_17>

No, it is not necessary to make changes to the calibration of waivers for DLT bonds in RTS 2. Waivers should be applicable across all MTFs in the same way, i.e. their application has to be technology neutral. Differentiating between DLT-MTFs and traditional MTFs would hamper market integrity.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_17>

1. What can be considered as close to real-time as possible for the publication of post-trade reports in the context of DLT-securities on DLT MIs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_18>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_18>

1. Are the current deferral periods for equity and non-equity instruments appropriate for DLT securities? Please, distinguish between DLT shares, ETFs and bonds.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_19>

The current deferral periods for non-equity instruments are under review (cf. COM(2021) 727). It remains to be seen if and how they will be changed. In any case, the same rules and waivers should be applicable to DLT-non-equity financial instruments and traditional non-equity financial instruments. The waiver concept is technology neutral and should be applied in a technology neutral manner.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_19>

1. Is it necessary to amend the current fields and flags for post-trade transparency (modifications/cancellations/additions) for their application to DLT shares, ETFs (Tables 2, 3 and 4 of Annex I of RTS 1) and bonds (Annex 2 of RTS 2)? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current fields and flags?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_20>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_20>

1. Is it necessary to amend RTS 3 for the purpose of the DLT Pilot? Do you anticipate any problems with the application of RTS 3 under the DLT Pilot?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_21>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_21>

1. Do you agree with the approach indicated in the above paragraph? Please justify your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_22>

Yes, we agree that an additional set of changes to adapt the relevant parts of RTS 22 on reporting would appear neither efficient nor necessary.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_22>

1. Private individuals: Do you agree that DLT MTFs could report transactions on behalf of the private individual as part of the compensatory measure foreseen by Article 4(1)(c) of the pilot regime? Please explain your statement. What other solutions can be explored to address this data gap?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_23>

In traditional transaction reporting an investment firm acting as an intermediary between clients and trading venues will always report all relevant details of transactions including data on the client. Since private individuals will not fall under the rules of the DLT Pilot Regime or any other supervisory rules, it will simply be necessary that DLT MTFs report transactions on their behalf if there are no intermediaries involved. Such reports by DLT MTFs will have to encompass all relevant details of the transaction, for the sake of market integrity there should be no differentiation between DLT MTFs and traditional MTFs.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_23>

1. Reporting status and transaction reference numbers (Fields 1 and 2): How will DLT MTF treat cancellations to correct previously submitted information as per Section 5.18 of ESMA Guidelines on transaction reporting being the information stored on DLTs immutable? Is it necessary to amend the current fields 1 and 2 for their application in the context of a DLT environment? Do you foresee any other reporting status other than New and Cancellation in the context of a DLT environment?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_24>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_24>

1. Trading Venue Transaction Identification, TVTIC (Field 3): Is it necessary to amend the current field for its application in the context of a DLT environment? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current fields? Should new fields be added in the context of a DLT environment?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_25>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_25>

1. Executing entity and submission entity identification codes; MiFID II Investment Firm indicator (Fields 4-6); Buyer details and decision maker (Fields 7-15); Seller details and decision maker (Fields 16-24): Is it necessary to amend the current fields for their application in the context of a DLT environment? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current fields? Should new fields be added in the context of a DLT environment?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_26>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_26>

1. Transmission of an order (Fields 25-27): Is it necessary to amend the current fields for the application in the context of a DLT environment? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current fields? Should new fields be added in the context of a DLT environment?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_27>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_27>

1. Trader, algorithms, waivers and indicators (Fields 57-65): Is it necessary to amend the current fields for the application in the context of a DLT environment? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current fields? Should new fields be added in the context of a DLT environment?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_28>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_28>

1. Short selling field (Field 62): Is short selling possible? Does it depend whether it is a DLT MTF or a DLT MTF+DLT SSS? Is it necessary to amend the current field for the application in the context of a DLT environment? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current fields?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_29>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_29>

1. Transaction details (Fields 28-40): Is it necessary to amend the current fields for their application in the context of a DLT environment? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current fields? Should new fields be added in the context of a DLT environment?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_30>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_30>

1. What are your views on the arrangements that DLT MTFs would need to establish to ensure the provision of complete and accurate reference data to ESMA? Do you think that the current arrangements described in RTS 23 should be amended to ensure its application in the DLT environment? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current RTS 23?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_31>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_31>

1. Issuer related fields (Field 5): Is it necessary to amend the current field for the application in the context of a DLT environment? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current fields? Should new fields be added in the context of a DLT environment?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_32>

The principle of same business, same risks, same rules should be applied here, too. Please note that in any reporting environment „implementation issues“ will arise. Any reporting entity will have to make sure they have all the necessary data, be it client related data such as the relevant ID, instrument related data or any other kind of data. If the reporting entity cannot create the data itself – e.g. the releveant client ID – processes to achieve those data have to be set up (this may be time- and resource intensive and costly). If data were missing, market integrity might be at stake.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_32>

1. Venue related fields (Fields 6-12): Is it necessary to amend the current field for the application in the context of a DLT environment? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current fields? Should new fields be added in the context of a DLT environment?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_33>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_33>

1. Notional (Field 13): Is it necessary to amend the current field for the application in the context of a DLT environment? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current fields? Should new fields be added in the context of a DLT environment?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_34>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_34>

1. Bonds or other forms of securitised debt related fields (Fields 14 – 23): Is it necessary to amend the current field for the application in the context of a DLT environment? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current fields? Should new fields be added in the context of a DLT environment?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_35>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_35>

1. Do you agree with ESMA’s assessment that no major amendments to RTS 25 appear necessary for the implementation of the DLT Pilot?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_36>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_36>

1. Do you think the definition of “order” is still applicable to the DLT context? Are the order record keeping requirements in Article 25 and related RTS 25 applicable in the DLT context? If yes, how do you envisage to comply with such requirements? If no, please justify your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_37>

Yes, we think the definition of „order“ is still applicable in the DLT context. Whether an order is given via DLT or in a traditional way does not change the nature of the order as such. The same goes for the order keeping requirements. If ESMA deemed certain elements of the order keeping requirements not necessary for ensuring market integrity, changes should apply to all kinds of trading, i.e. in a technology neutral manner.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_37>

1. Can chains of transmission on DLT financial instruments occur?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_38>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_38>

1. Is it possible to split or aggregate orders? In or out the DLT? Or both?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_39>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_39>

1. Does the concept of “Transmission of an order” defined in Article 4 of RTS 22 make sense in the context of DLT? If so, when would you consider an order to be transmitted?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_40>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_40>

1. What do you consider are the phases of a DLT transaction? At what point in time can such a transaction in DLT securities be considered executed? How do you think “broadcast the transaction to the network” should be defined?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_41>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_41>

1. Do you think the definition of “transaction” is still applicable to the DLT context?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_42>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_42>

1. General fields (Fields 1 - 3), ISIN for RTS 1-3: Is it necessary to amend the current fields for the application in the context of a DLT environment? Do you expect any implementation issues on basis of the current fields? Should new fields be added in the context of a DLT environment?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_43>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_43>

1. Should a new field indicating the DTI be added to RTS 23 and RTS 1-3? What kind of analysis could be performed on a tokenised security by coupling ISIN and DTI information?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_44>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_44>

1. Is the ISIN sufficient to ensure uniqueness of a given tokenised financial instrument? Is there any element of the DTI standard that you consider should be added as a separate field in RTS 23 and RTS 1-3?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_45>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_45>

1. Traditional reporting systems - RTS 22/23: Does the setting up of the traditional reporting systems as illustrated in Annex 1 of the ESMA Guidelines on transaction reporting make sense in the context of the pilot regime?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_46>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_46>

1. Execution and IT infrastructure - RTS 22/23: Does the fact that execution takes place on a DLT has an impact on the investment firm’s reporting system and requires setting up of separate/new IT infrastructures?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_47>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_47>

1. ISO standards 20022 and RTS 22/23: Can ISO 20022 be implemented and used by DLT MTFs or DLT TSS and/or their members/participants to comply with the reporting required under Article 26 and 27 of MiFIR. Do you think ISO 20022 would represent an opportunity or an issue for DLT MTF? Please explain your statement.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_48>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_48>

1. XML template of RTS 22/23: do you think that different formats might be more suitable to the DLT while keeping the common ISO 20022 methodology? If yes, please explain what the most appropriate format would be and for which reasons.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_49>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_49>

1. Do you/your organisation plan to offer settlement of DLT securities in e-money tokens? If yes, what would be the most appropriate way for reporting these transactions? Do you agree with ESMA’s proposal on how to populate the currency fields when the financial instrument is priced in e-money tokens?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_50>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_50>

1. Do you consider it possible that transactions in DLT securities could be settled in different currencies and/or different e-money tokens? If yes, please explain what would be the most appropriate way for converting such transactions in EUR.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_51>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_51>

1. What are your views on the arrangements that DLT MTFs and DLT TSSs would need to establish to grant direct and immediate access to transaction data to regulators by admitting them as regulatory observer participants? Do you expect any implementation issues in relation to the obligation to make MiFIR transaction data available to the NCAs and MiFIR transparency/ reference data to ESMA?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_52>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_52>

1. Is it technically feasible to store on the DLT the details of the transaction according to ISO 20022 methodology in order to enable regulators to pull that data directly into a readable format without any transformation of the data? Do you believe that the use of ISO 20022 could have a significant negative impact in terms of scalability of the system and the related congestion risk? If yes, please justify your answer and specify if the impact is dependent on the type of governance model and technology that the DLT is using.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_53>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_53>

1. Can all information to be reported under MiFIR Article 27 pursuant to Table III of the Annex to RTS 23 be recorded on the DLT according to the ISO 20022 methodology? Please explain your answer also in relation to scalability impact at DLT level.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_54>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_54>

1. Can all data necessary to perform the transparency (Article 2 of RTS 3) and DVC (Article 6 of RTS 3) calculations be recorded on the DLT according to the ISO 20022 methodology? Please explain your answer also in relation to scalability impact at DLT level.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_55>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_55>

1. Do you see any issue with obtaining the data elements required by RTS 22 and 23 from external databases like GLEIF, ISO 4217 list (currencies), ISO 10383 (MIC) or ANNA-DSB (ISIN) before the data is permanently stored into the distributed ledger? Please explain your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_56>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_56>

1. Do you see any major impediments for the regulator as a regulatory observer participant to pull large size of encrypted data from the distributed ledger? Please explain your answer in the context of encryption of data and key management, and in relation to any scalability impact at DLT level.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_57>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_57>

1. Taking into consideration the variety of technologies available in the DLT world, what is, in your opinion, the most efficient way to admit regulators as regulatory observer participants? Please explain your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_58>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_58>

1. Do you have any suggestion to ensure interoperability among DLT MTFs, DLT TSS and the regulators as described in Paragraph 126? Please explain your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_59>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_59>

1. Do you have any suggestion to ensure interoperability among different DLT MTFs and/or DLT TSS as described in Paragraph 127? Please explain your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_60>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_60>