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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 | KDPW S.A. |
| Activity | Other Financial service providers |
| Are you representing an association? |  |
| Country/Region | Poland |

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>

As a Central Sucurities Depository, having certain level of experience with regards to utilisation of DLT within capital markets infrastructures, KDPW welcomes this call for evidence as well as ESMA’s ongoing efforts to enhance investors’ protection and promote stable and well ordered EU’s financial markets.   
Having implemented DLT based **eVoting** system, that bridges issuers and their shareholders through   
remote communication and voting at General Meetings, as well as prototyping a **Blockchain Platform for Capital Markets**, allowing market participants to build networks and provide services within DLT based market infrastructure, KDPW is well positioned to take on another challenge, i.e. developing DLT trading and/or settlement infrastructures for tokenised securities.

Nonetheless, please bear in mind that as an authorsied CSD, not an investment firm nor a market operator our input, at least for the time being, might be limited to our general experience and recommendations. Thus our response might be partial with regards to questions raised, especially those regarding MiFIR RTSes..

Wo would also like to take this opportunity and ask ESMA whether similar call for evidence is planned with regards to CSDR, where KDPW’s input would certainly be much more detailed and insightful?

<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>

As of January 2022 KDPW is running a research project that aims to confirm whether it would be practical to operate a DLT MI under DLT Pilot Regime. Polish capital market have been dematerialised and monstly digital for years now. Any new technology must not only be disruptive but bring real business value or cost saving. Thus we have started broad and detailed analysis of both public and non-public markets, with   
regards to financial instruments allowed under DLT Pilot Regime in order to identify areas of the market where implementation of such new technology as well as changing operational models could have a positive effect on market liquidity, market fragmentation and investors’ protection.

The said project also aims to identify suitable DLT technology or mix of DLT technologies that would best cater for the above purpose.

Results of the research project will be available in H2 2022.

<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>

The most obvious promises that DLT brings are lower cost of capital and greater flexibility for issuers on one hand, and lowering the investment costs and possibly allowing access to previously unattainable   
instruments for investors on the other. Furthermore, well designed DLT infrastructure allows for greater transparency and allows easy access to immutable data for authorised parties.

As for now, we operate on Hyperledger Fabric, a private, permissioned blockchain. However, in view of direct access of retail investors as infrastructure’s participants requirements with regard to private,   
permissioned blockchain might put too much burden on both, investors and infrastructure operators. Thus, one of the options we consider is a hybrid approach where private and public blockchains interoperate within a specified framework. Such approach must of course take into account issues related to a mixture of   
interdependent topics. First, being most crucial is proper identification of direct participants that allows to perfomr KYC, AML, CFT and sanction screening. Second, addressing issues related to accountability and reliability of infrastructure participants in terms of their relation with service providers, and vice versa. Thrid, are privacy concerns versus reporting or data access obligation.

<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>

Given KDPW’s background as a CSD an obious choice would be to operate a DLT SS. However, we believe the real value that DLT brings lays in integrating trading and settlement within one MI. Operating a DLT SS would be an option to consider provided other infrastructures would operate DLT MTFs that DLT SS could provide services for. At this point, plans of other MIs is a question with no answer. Furthermore, operating a DLT SS for legacy trading systems does not seem as a viable option.

<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>

For the time being there is no market for DLT securities in Poland, at least not those allowed under DLT Pilot Regime.

In terms of challenges with the current market structure following the application of the DLT Pilot Regime one thing that instantly pops up is the applicability of transition or exit strategy in terms of moving DLT operations into legacy systems. Designing a viable strategy with this regard, supported with suitable legal and operational arrangements will be a hurdle, especially in case of market infrastructures operating a DLT TSS.

<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>

Reference data and instrument characteristics are basically the same, however in terms of tokenised   
financial instruments additional, mainly technical features should characterise a DLT instrument, i.e. nature of a digital instrument, how it was issued, in which technology, etc.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_6>

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

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_DLTP\_7>

Cross-platfrom OTC no, but inter-platform OTC yes, requires proper identification of counterparties.

<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>

The new ISO 24165 standard for Digital Token Identifiers (DTIs) might well complement ISIN in case of DLT financial instruments. ISIN is the identifier for the reference data of the asset and the DTI may be the   
technical identifier of the token location (covering the nature of the digital token, how it is issued, in which blockchain, etc.).

<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>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<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>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<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>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<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>

DLT MI reporting in real-time to NCAs or Trade Repositories through standard messaging protocols or APIs once consensus on a trade is reached, and trade is irrevocably registered in DLT. Different consensus models require different times to register transaction in DLT.

<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>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<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.

<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>

Yes, reporting on behalf of private individuals appears the best possible option. Any other solution,   
including reporting by individuals does not seem practical and would put too much burden on those   
individuals. All data would be immutable and available within DLT MI, thus reporting to NCA or allowing their access to those data should be considered the only option to consider.

<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>

Reporting a new transaction (NEWT), then cancelling such report (CANC) and again correcting a transaction report following a cancellation are all different ‘transactions’ from DLT’s perspective. DLT’s immutability refers rather to the ability of a ledger to remain a permanent, indelible, and unalterable history of   
transactions. This does not mean the state of a particular report cannot be altered, it can each modification will be stored in the ledger once consensus is reached.

<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>

As for now we do not forsee any implementation issues relating to TVTIC and it seems there is no need to amend the current field.

<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>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<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>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<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>

ISO20022 becomes more and more widely used industry standard, thus any new develoments with regards to usage of any new technology, should not deviate from the usage of such industry. This of course may entail necessary amendments to ISO20022 structure, fields and formats if needed due to the the   
characteristics of DLT financial instruments, types of operations and nature of a DLT infrastructure itself. Nonetheless ISO20022 should be the main reference and anchor point when it comes to communication of DLT Mis.

<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>

XML syntax is well suited to accommodate ISO20022 standard. However, from a DLT MI perspective it might be easier and more practical to implement JSON which is also compatible with ISO20022. Whichever is chosen it must be implemented with interopearability in mind, meaning coexistence of XML and JSON accomodating ISO20022 must be taken into account.

<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>

KDPW research project focuses on settling cash side of transactions in DLT financial instruments in CeBM, however at this point we do not know if traditional CeBM or CBDC would be attainable for the DLT MI.

In term of ESMA’s proposal on how to populate the currency fields when the financical instrument is priced in e-money tokens we believe that populating those felds with fiat currency on which the e-money   
token is based is not a good idea, as there might be different e-money tokens backed by the same fiat   
currency. Those e-money tokens may however differ in their characteristics, both functional and   
technological, thus referencing just the underlying fiat currency does not bring any real value and imposes additional risks. ISO 4217 or a new standard should accommodate or allow for different types of e-money tokens.  
<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>

At this stage of the development of DLT infrastructures such scenario is hard to imagine, especially taking into account a temporary nature of the DLT Pilot Regime.

<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>

KDPW’s perspective and experience in development of solutions based on DLT provides that allowing regulatory access to data stored in a ledger is more practical than developing reporting mechanisms. For   
instance, in case of KDPW’s eVoting solution Polish NCA has its dedicated role as a regulatory obsever in the system and has access to all data that otherwise has to be reported to the NCA. Taking into account that all relevant details of transactions are stored in a DLT ledger anyways, given the nature of the   
technology, allowing direct access to ESMA and local NCA should focus on structuring the data properly in   
order to facilitate fulfilling their respective responsibilities. One issue to consider while designing such   
direct access is that part of the transaction details, especially personal data, provided direct access of retail investors to DLT MI is allowed, would have to be stored off-ledger to comply with GDPR provisions, e.g. within Private Data Collection. Thus relevant transaction details shared with ESMA and NCA must   
aggregate data kept on ledger and off-ledger to fulfil the obligation prescribed in article 26(3) of Regulation (EU) No 600/2014.

There is one risk however, willingness of local NCAs and ESMA to access those regulatory data through different GUI or API in relation to different DLT MIs. When filing for such an exemption, DLT MI would have to have such access ready, at least at the design level, and still not be granted an exemption if such access does not suit particular NCAs needs.

<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>

Yes, given the importance of ISO20022 that in our opinion may constitute a ‘bridge’ between DLT MI and the outside ecosystems ledger data models should be based on ISO20022 methodology, and this is not only with regards to reporting obligation, it entails all external communication and potential interoperability between different DLT MIs and/or traditional infrastructures. Another aspect that speaks for such approach is the need to design a trasition or exit strategy from DLT to legacy systems. Having common data models based on ISO20022 would greatly facilitate such transition from a technical point of view, and at the same time would lower the risk of data loss. Again, KDPW’s eVoting data models are based on ISO20022   
methodology. We speak from experience, where DLT system interoperates with non-DLT CSD core system. Having the same data model in both makes interoperability frictionless.

<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>