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**Responding to this paper**

ESMA invites comments on all matters in this consultation paper and in particular on the specific questions. Comments are most helpful if they:

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

ESMA will consider all comments received by **14 December 2023.**

**Instructions**

In order to facilitate analysis of responses to the Consultation Paper, respondents are requested to follow the below steps when preparing and submitting their response:

1. Insert your responses to the questions in the Consultation Paper in the present response form.
2. Use this form and send your responses in Word format (**pdf documents will not be considered except for annexes**);
3. Please do not remove tags of the type <ESMA\_QUESTION \_MIC2\_1>. Your response to each question has to be framed by the two tags corresponding to the question.
4. 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.
5. When you have drafted your response, name your response form according to the following convention: ESMA\_MIC2\_nameofrespondent\_RESPONSEFORM. For example, for a respondent named ABCD, the response form would be entitled ESMA\_MIC2\_ABCD\_RESPONSEFORM.
6. Upload the form containing your responses, **in Word format**, to ESMA’s website (www.esma.europa.eu under the heading “Your input – Open Consultations” -> Consultation Paper on the clearing and derivative trading obligations in view of the benchmark transition”).

**Publication of responses**

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

**Data protection**

Information on data protection can be found at [www.esma.europa.eu](http://www.esma.europa.eu) under the heading [Legal Notice](http://www.esma.europa.eu/legal-notice).

**Who should read this paper**

# All interested stakeholders are invited to respond to this consultation paper. In particular, ESMA invites crypto-assets issuers, crypto-asset service providers and financial entities dealing with crypto-assets as well as all stakeholders that have an interest in crypto-assets.

**General information about respondent**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the company / organisation | Global Legal Entity Identifier Foundation - 506700GE1G29325QX363 |
| Activity | Other Financial service providers |
| Are you representing an association? |[x]
| Country/Region | Switzerland |

**Questions**

1. : Do you agree with ESMA’s assessment of the mandate for sustainability disclosures under MiCA?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_1>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_1>

1. : In your view, what features of the consensus mechanisms are relevant to assess their sustainability impacts, and what type of information can be obtained in relation to each DLT network node?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_2>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_2>

1. : Do you agree with ESMA’s approach to ensure coherence, complementarity, consistency and proportionality?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_3>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_3>

1. : Do you agree with ESMA’s approach to mitigating challenges related to data availability and reliability? Do you support the use of estimates in case of limited data availability, for example when data is not available for the entirety of a calendar year?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_4>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_4>

1. : What are your views on the feasibility and costs of accessing data required to compute the sustainability metrics included in the draft RTS?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_5>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_5>

1. : Do you agree with ESMA’s description on the practical approach to assessing the sustainability impacts of consensus mechanisms? If not, what alternative approach would you consider suitable to assess these impacts?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_6>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_6>

1. : Do you agree with the definitions proposed in the draft RTS, in particular on incentive structure and on DLT GHG emissions? If not, what alternative wording would you consider appropriate?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_7>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_7>

1. : In your view, are the proposed mandatory sustainability indicators conducive to investor awareness? If not, what additional or alternative indicators would you consider relevant?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_8>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_8>

1. : Do you consider the proposed optional sustainability indicators fit for purpose? If not, what additional indicators would you consider relevant? Would you agree to making these optional sustainability indicators mandatory in the medium run?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_9>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_9>

1. : Do you consider the principles for the presentation of the information, and the template for sustainability disclosures fit for purpose? If not, what improvements would you suggest?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_10>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_10>

1. : In your view, are the calculation guidance for energy use and GHG emissions included in the draft European Sustainability Reporting Standards relevant for methodologies in relation to the sustainability indicators under MiCA? If not, what alternative methodologies would you consider relevant? For the other indicators for which the calculation guidance of the ESRS was not available, do you consider that there are alternative methodologies that could be used? If so, which ones?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_11>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_11>

1. : Would you consider it useful that ESMA provides further clarity and guidance on methodologies and on recommended data sources? If yes, what are your suggestions in this regard?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_12>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_12>

1. : Is the definition for permissionless DLT in Article 1 sufficiently precise?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_13>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_13>

1. : Throughout the RTS, we refer to ‘critical or important functions’. The term is borrowed from DORA and does not just capture ICT-specific systems. Does this approach make sense?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_14>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_14>

1. : Do you consider subparagraph (e) in Article 4(2) on external communications with clients in the event of a disruption involving a permissionless DLT appropriate for the mandate (i.e., does it constitute a measure that would ensure continuity of services)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_15>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_15>

1. : Should this RTS also specify that CASPs should establish a business continuity management function (to oversee the obligations in the RTS)? In your view, does this fall within the mandate of ‘measures’ ensuring continuity and regularity?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_16>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_16>

1. : Are there other organisational measures to be considered for specific CASP services?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_17>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_17>

1. : Do you consider the obligation for CASPs to conduct testing of the business continuity plans in Article 4(4) via an internal audit function appropriate for the mandate?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_18>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_18>

1. : In Art. 68(8), CASPs are required to take into account the scale, nature, and range of crypto asset services in their internal risk assessments. Is there support for this general principle on proportionality in Article 6? Do you support the proposed self-assessment under Article 6(2) and in the Annex of the draft RTS?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_19>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_19>

1. : Do you agree with the description provided for the different types of CEX and DEX listed?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_20>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_20>

1. : For trading platforms: Please provide an explanation of (i) the trading systems you offer to your users, (ii) which type of orders can be entered within each of these trading systems and (iii) whether you consider these trading systems to be a CEX or a DEX (please explain why)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_21>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_21>

1. : Do you consider the trading systems described, and the transparency obligations attached to each trading system, in Table 1 of Annex I of the draft RTS appropriate for the trading of crypto-assets? Do you offer a trading system that cannot meet the transparency requirements under the provisions in this Table? Please provide reasons for your answers.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_22>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_22>

1. : Regarding more specifically AMMs, do you agree with the definition included in Table 1 of Annex I of the draft RTS? What specific information other than the mathematical equation used to determine the price and the quantity of the asset in the liquidity pools would be appropriate to be published to allow a market participant to define the price of the assets offered in the liquidity pool?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_23>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_23>

1. : Do you agree with ESMA’s proposals on the description of the pre-trade information to be disclosed (content of pre-trade information) under Table 2 of Annex I of the draft RTS? If not, please explain why. If yes, please clarify whether any elements should be amended, added and/or removed.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_24>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_24>

1. : Do you agree with ESMA’s proposals to require a specific format to further standardise the pre-trade information to be disclosed (format of pre-trade information)? If not, please explain why and how the pre-trade information can be harmonised. If yes, please clarify whether any elements should be amended.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_25>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_25>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed approach to reserve and stop orders?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_26>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_26>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed list of post-trade information that trading platforms in crypto assets should make public in accordance with Tables 1, 2 and 3 of Annex II of the draft RTS? Please provide reasons for your answers.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_27>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_27>

1. : Is the information requested in Table 2 of Annex II of the draft RTS sufficient to identify the traded contract and to compare the reports to the same / similar contracts.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_28>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_28>

1. : Is there any other information, specific to crypto-assets, that should be included in the tables of Annex II of the draft RTS? Please provide reasons for your answers.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_29>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_29>

1. : Do you expect any challenges for trading platforms in crypto assets to obtain the data fields required for publication to comply with pre- and post-trade transparency requirements under Annex I and Annex II of the draft RTS?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_30>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_30>

1. : What do you consider to be the maximum possible delay falling under the definition of “as close to real-time as is technically possible” to publish post-trade information in crypto-assets? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_31>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_31>

1. : Do you agree with ESMA’s approach on the requirements to be included in the draft RTS in relation to a trading platform’s operating conditions? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_32>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_32>

1. : Do you consider that ESMA should include in the RTS more specific disclosure rules regarding a trading platform’s operating conditions, in particular in relation to co-location and access arrangements?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_33>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_33>

1. : From your experience, are all crypto-assets trading platforms making their data available free of charge? If not, what specific barriers have you encountered to access the data (e.g., price, level of disaggregation).

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_34>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_34>

1. : Do you agree with the level of disaggregation proposed in the draft RTS? Please provide reasons for your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_35>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_35>

1. : In the context of large number of CASPs and possible different models of data access, what kind of measures (common messages, common APIs, others) would you consider feasible to ensure effective and efficient access to data?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_36>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_36>

1. : Do you agree with using the DTI for uniquely identifying the crypto-assets for which the order is placed, or the transaction is executed? Do you agree with using DTI for reporting the quantity and price of transactions denominated in crypto-assets?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_37>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_37>

1. : Are there relevant technical attributes describing the characteristics of the crypto-asset or of the DLT on which this is traded, other than those retrievable from the DTIF register? Please detail which ones.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_38>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_38>

1. : Do you agree with using the transaction hash to uniquely identify transactions that are fully or partially executed on-chain in orders and transactions records? Please clarify in your response if this would be applicable for all types of DLT, and also be relevant in cases where hybrid systems are used.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_39>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_39>

1. : Do you agree that a separate field for the recording of “gas fees” should be included for the purpose of identifying the sequencing of orders and events affecting the order?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_40>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_40>

1. : Do you agree with the inclusion of the above data elements, specific for on-chain transactions, in both RTS?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_41>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_41>

1. : Are some of the proposed data elements technology-specific, and not relevant or applicable to other DLTs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_42>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_42>

1. : Do you consider it necessary to add a different timing for the provision of identification codes for orders in the case of CASPs operating a platform which uses only on-chain trading?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_43>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_43>

1. : Please suggest additional data elements that may be included to properly account for on-chain trading.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_44>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_44>

1. : Do you find the meaning of the defined terms clear enough? Should the scope be adjusted to encompass or exclude some market practices? Provide concrete examples.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_45>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_45>

1. : Are there other aspects that should be defined, for the purposes of this RTS?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_46>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_46>

1. : Do you anticipate practical issues in the implementation of the proposed approach to reception and transmission of orders?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_47>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_47>

1. : What transaction information can be retrieved in cases where a CASP execute the order on a third country platform/entity?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_48>

As an interoperable, readily-available standard, the ISO 17742 Legal Entity Identifier (LEI) is a data element which can be retrieved by Crypto Asset Service Providers (CASPs) engaging in cross border transfers, providing a consistent and secure means to verify the identity of the counterparties involved in said transfer.

The global nature of the LEI means that it is available to all third country platforms or counterparties that are legal entities, providing suitable coverage.

Additionally, the verifiable LEI (vLEI) could be leveraged in such transactions as a means of establishing decentralised identification and verification of legal entities and the persons who represent them officially or functionally. By combining three concepts – the organization’s identity represented by the LEI, a person’s identity represented by their legal name, and the role that the person plays for the legal entity, vLEI credentials can be issued and become part of organizational wallets. Then vLEIs could be used to identify and verify digitally legal entities and persons acting on their behalf for transfers executed by CASPs.

It is important to also acknowledge the interlinks with the recast of the Transfer of Funds Regulation, which stipulates the additional data elements to be disclosed by entities seeking to process a crypto asset transfer, of which the LEI is a supplementary element. This would apply to transfers between entities operating in the Union, as well as between a EU based entity and an entity based in a third country.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_48>

1. : Do you anticipate problems in retrieving information about the buyer/seller to the transaction?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_49>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_49>

1. : Do you anticipate practical issues in the implementation of the methods for client identification that are used under MiFIR?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_50>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_50>

1. : Do you anticipate practical issues in the implementation of the short selling flag?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_51>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_51>

1. : Do you consider that some of the proposed data elements are not applicable/relevant to trading in crypto-assets?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_52>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_52>

1. : Do you consider that additional data elements for CAPS operating a trading platform are needed to allow NCAs to properly discharge their supervisory duties?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_53>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_53>

1. : Do you believe that a specific definition of routed orders should be provided as it applies to orders that are routed by the trading platform for crypto-assets to other venues? Should this definition include CASPs operating a platform which uses only on-chain trading?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_54>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_54>

1. : Do you believe that fill-or kill strategies as referenced in MiFID II apply to trading in platforms for crypto-assets? Do they apply to partially filled orders?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_55>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_55>

1. : Do you agree with using messages based on the ISO 20022 methodology for sharing information with competent authorities?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_56>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_56>

1. : Do you agree with the criteria proposed for identifying a relevant machine-readable format for the MiCA white paper and consequently with the proposal to mandate iXBRL as the machine-readable format for MiCA white papers, subject to the outcome of the study referred to in paragraph 239?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_57>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_57>

1. : If yes, do you agree that the white paper should be required to be a stand-alone document with a closed taxonomy (i.e., without extensions nor complex filing rules)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_58>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_58>

1. : If not, please elaborate your answer and propose alternative solutions that would best meet the criteria identified in section 7.3.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_59>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_59>

1. : Are you currently preparing white paper documents in a different machine-readable format? If yes, which one?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_60>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_60>

1. : How different is the white paper mandated by MiCA and further specified in this Consultation Paper from any white paper which you have drawn up or analysed prior to MiCA? Do you think that any additional information that used to be included in white papers prior to MiCA but that is no longer allowed under the relevant provisions of MiCA for the white paper will continue to be made available to investors as marketing communication?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_61>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_61>

1. : Do you agree with ESMA’s estimate of the cost of preparing a white paper in iXBRL format? If not, where would you put the estimate of a preparing a white paper in iXBRL format (not considering costs of information sourcing which should be considered as base scenario)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_62>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_62>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed template for presenting the information as indicated in the Annex to this CP? We welcome your comments on the proposed fields and values/descriptions to be included in the fields - please provide specific references to the fields which you are commenting in your response and pay specific attention to the areas where additional explanatory description of the information is provided.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_63>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_63>

1. : Are there additional data elements in the table of fields that would benefit from further explanatory descriptions to ensure that the information provided by a given issuer/offeror is understandable and comparable to the information provided by other issuer/offeror of the same type of crypto-asset? If yes, please elaborate and provide suggestions.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_64>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_64>

1. : Would you deem it useful for ESMA to provide an editable template to support preparers with the compliance of the format requirements proposed in the draft ITSs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_65>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_65>

1. : Are there any other data elements that you would consider relevant to ensure that investors can properly compare different crypto-asset white papers and NCA can perform their classifications on the basis of harmonised information?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_66>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_66>

1. : Do you agree with ESMA’s conclusion that an issuer, an offeror or a person seeking admission to trading of crypto-assets should always be eligible for an LEI? If not, please provide a description of the specific cases

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_67>

The Global Legal Entity Identifier (GLEIF) welcomes ESMA’s conclusion that entities seeking admission to partake in the trading of crypto-assets should be eligible for an LEI, in line with the principle already in place for issuers, offerors, or persons seeking admission to trade under the MiFID/R framework.

The ISO 17742 LEI provides an efficient and secure means of verifying the identity of entities seeking to trade financial instruments, such as crypto assets. The introduction of the LEI would therefore further help enhance regulatory oversight by providing an efficient means for supervsiors to exchange information on market actors.

GLEIF also welcomes the clarification raised by ESMA that the LEI shared with national authorities as part of the application process should be renewed accordingly with the local operating unit (LOU). Indeed, such step is crucial to ensure the underlying information associated with the LEI is up-to-date, ensuring more accurate due diligence checks.

Furthermore, GLEIF takes note of the additional clarifications provided by ESMA concerning which specific types of entities would be eligible for an LEI, and the references made to the regulatory oversight committee (ROC) online portal.

As a next step, it is important that future communications pertaining to the novel passport regime clarifies which entities should be eligible for an LEI, as well as the necessity to update the business information with the LOU on a regular basis.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_67>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed metadata elements, also considering the mandatory metadata expected to be mandated in the context of ESAP?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_68>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_68>

1. : Do you have any feedback in particular with regards to the metadata on the “industry sector of the economic activities” and its relevance for the ESAP search function?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_69>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_69>

1. : Do you agree with the listed definitions? Would you consider useful to clarify any other term used in the ITS?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_70>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_70>

1. : Do you agree with the proposed requirements for publication on the website of the issuer, offeror or person seeking admission to trading? Would you consider necessary any additional requirements regarding the publication on the website?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_71>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_71>

1. : In your view, is there any obstacle for the website of the relevant parties to allow for specific alerts?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_72>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_72>

1. : In your view, what are the media most relied upon by the public to collect information on crypto-assets? In case you are an issuer, offeror or person seeking admission to trading, please specify/add which media you would normally use to communicate with investors and the reasons supporting your choice.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_73>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_73>

1. : Should a social media or a web-based platform be media reasonably relied upon by the public, what are the risks that you see when using them to achieve dissemination of inside information in relation to crypto assets? Should the dissemination rather take place through traditional media channel?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_74>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_74>

1. : Please comment the proposed means for dissemination of inside information? Please motivate your answer by indicating why the means they are/are not valuable tools for dissemination purposes.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_75>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_75>

1. : Would you add any means of communications for the persons subject to the disclosure obligation to consider when disseminating inside information? Please motivate your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_76>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_76>

1. : Do you agree with the technical means for delaying the public disclosure of inside information as described?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_77>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_MIC2\_77>