**Reply** **form: MiFIR Review**

RTS 2, RTS on reasonable commercial basis and RTS 23

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Responding to this paper

ESMA invites comments on all matters in the Consultation Paper and in particular on the specific questions in this reply form. 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 **28 August 2024.**

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:

* Insert your responses to the questions in the Consultation Paper in this reply form.
* Please do not remove tags of the type <ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_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 responses, save the reply form according to the following convention: ESMA\_CP1\_nameofrespondent.

For example, for a respondent named ABCD, the reply form would be saved with the following name: ESMA\_CP1\_ABCD.

* Upload the Word reply form containing your responses to ESMA’s website (**pdf documents will not be considered except for annexes**). All contributions should be submitted online at [www.esma.europa.eu](http://www.esma.europa.eu) under the heading ‘Your input - Consultations’.

Publication of responses

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

Data protection

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

# General information about respondent

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the company / organisation | Finance Denmark |
| Activity | Investment Services |
| Are you representing an association? |[x]
| Country/Region | Denmark |

# Questions

**CP on the amendment of RTS 2**

1. Do you agree with the definition of CLOB trading systems proposed above? If not, please explain why.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_1>

Finance Denmark[[1]](#footnote-2) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the MiFIR Review Consultation Package covering the review of RTS 2 on transparency for bonds etc, draft RTS on reasonable commercial basis and review of RTS 23 on supply of reference data with a deadline 28 August.

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 23**, Finance Denmark has the following, additional comments to some of the questions in the consultation (please see Q60-Q67).

Please also note that the ESMA response template should contain a specific possibility to deliver “General comments”.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_1>

1. Do you consider that the definition should include other trading systems? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_2>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_2>

1. Do you agree that the description of periodic auction trading systems set out in Annex I of RTS 2 is relevant for specifying the characteristics of those trading systems in the revised RTS? If not, please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_3>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_3>

1. Do you agree to use ESA 2010 to classify bond issuers If not, please explain and provide alternatives on how clarify how to classify sovereign, other public and corporate issuers.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_4>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_4>

1. Do you agree with the proposed LiS pre-trade thresholds for bonds? In your answer, please also consider the analysis provided in sections 4.2.1.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_5>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_5>

1. Do you agree with the proposed LiS pre-trade thresholds for SFPs and EUAs? In your answer, please also consider the analysis provided in section 4.2.2.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_6>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_6>

1. Do you agree with the approach taken for the illiquid waiver for bonds, SFPs and EUA? If you disagree with how the liquidity threshold is determined, please include your comments in Q11 for bonds, Q14 for SFPs and/or Q17 for EUAs.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_7>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_7>

1. Do you agree with the changes to post-trade fields summarised in Table 5? Please identify the proposal ID in your response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_8>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_8>

1. Do you agree not to change the concept of “as close to real-time as technically possible”? If not, what would be in your view the maximum permissible delay?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_9>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_9>

1. Do you agree with the changes proposed for the purpose of the reporting of OTC transactions?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_10>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_10>

1. Do you agree with the liquidity thresholds set out in Table 7 above? If not, please provide an alternative approach.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_11>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_11>

1. Do you agree with the proposed thresholds specified in the above Tables? If not, please justify by providing qualitative data to your analysis and differentiating per asset class.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_12>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_12>

1. Do you agree with the maximum deferral period set out in the tables above?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_13>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_13>

1. Do you agree with a static determination of liquidity and determine that all SFPs are illiquid? If not, can you suggest any alternative methodology on how to define liquidity for SFPs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_14>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_14>

1. Do you agree not to introduce changes to the threshold size currently applicable to SFPs as provided in RTS 2?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_15>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_15>

1. Do you agree with the maximum duration proposed?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_16>

T Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_16>

1. Do you agree with a static determination of liquidity and determine that all EUA are liquid? If not, can you suggest any alternative methodology on how to define liquidity for EUAs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_17>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_17>

1. Do you agree with the proposed framework for the deferral regime for EUAs? If not, please suggest an alternative methodology.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_18>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_18>

1. Do you agree with the classification of ETCs and ETNs as types of bonds?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_19>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_19>

1. Do you agree with the liquidity determination for ETCs and ETNs. If not, please suggest an alternative approach to the liquidity determination.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_20>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_20>

1. Do you agree with the pre- and post-trade thresholds? If not, please suggest an alternative methodology.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_21>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_21>

1. What is your view in relation to the implementation of the supplementary deferral regime for sovereign bonds?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_22>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_22>

1. Do you agree not to make any changes to the temporary suspension of transparency obligations framework as it currently in RTS 2?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_23>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_23>

1. Do you have any further comment or suggestion on the draft RTS? Please elaborate your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_24>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_24>

1. What level of resources (financial and other) would be required to implement and comply with the draft amended RTS and for which related cost (please distinguish between one off and ongoing costs)? When responding to this question, please provide information on the size, internal set-up and the nature, scale and complexity of the activities of your organisation, where relevant.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_25>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_25>

**CP on the RTS on reasonable commercial basis**

1. Do you agree to the general approach used to specify the costs and margin attributable to the production and distribution of market data? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_26>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_26>

1. Do you agree with the proposed approach to cost calculation based on the identification of different cost categories attributable to the production and dissemination of market data (i.e. (i) infrastructure costs; (ii) connectivity costs; (iii) personnel costs; (iv) financial costs; (v) administrative costs)? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_27>

Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_27>

1. Do you agree with the proposal of apportioning costs based on the use of resources (i.e., infrastructure, personnel, software…) for each service provided? Do you think the methodology to be used to apportion costs should be further specified? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_28>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response. .

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_28>

1. Do you agree that the net profit as defined in Article 3 of the draft RTS can be a representative proxy of the margin applicable to data fees and would you include additional principles to define when a margin can be considered reasonable? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_29>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_29>

1. Do you agree with the proposed template for the purpose of information reporting to NCAs on the cost of producing and disseminating data and on the margin applied to data? Please elaborate, including if further information should in your view be added to the template.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_30>

**Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).**

**In relation to the consultation on RTS 2 and the consultation on RCB, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_30>

1. What are in your view the obstacles to non-discriminatory access to data taking into consideration the current data market data policies and agreements?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_31>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_31>

1. What are the elements which could affect prices in data provision (e.g. connectivity, volume)? Do they vary according to the use of data made by the user or the type of user? Please elaborate.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_32>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_32>

1. Do you agree with ESMA’s proposal on how to set up fee categories. Please justify your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_33>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_33>

1. Regarding redistribution of market data, do you agree with the analysis of ESMA? If not, please elaborate on the possible risks you identify and possible venues to mitigate these. In your response please elaborate on actual redistribution models.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_34>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_34>

1. Are there any other terms and conditions in market data agreements beyond the ones listed in this section which you perceive to be biased and/or unfair? If yes, please list them and elaborate your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_35>

**Finance Denmark fully supports the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).**

**In relation to the consultation on RTS 2 and the consultation on RCB, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_35>

1. Please provide your view on ESMA’s proposal in respect to (i) the obligation to provide pre-contractual information, (ii) general principle on fair terms, (iii) the language of the market data agreement, (iv) the market data agreement conformity with published policies and (v) the provision on fees and additional costs.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_36>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_36>

1. According to your experience, has the per-user model been inserted in the market data agreements as an option for billing? If yes, do you have experience in the usage of this option? Is the proposed wording of this option in the draft RTS useful? What are in your views the obstacles to its use?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_37>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_37>

1. Do you agree with ESMA’s proposal on penalties? Please elaborate your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_38>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_38>

1. Do you agree with ESMA’s proposal on audits? Please elaborate your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_39>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_39>

1. Would you adopt any additional safeguards to ensure market data agreements terms and conditions are fair and unbiased? Please elaborate your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_40>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_40>

1. Do you agree with the standardised publication template set out in Annex I of the draft RTS? Do you have any comments and suggestions to improve the standardised publication format and the accompanying instructions? Please elaborate your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_41>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_41>

1. Do you agree with the proposed list of standard terminology and definitions? Is there any other terminology used in market data policies that would need to be standardised? If yes, please give examples and suggestions of definitions.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_42>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_42>

1. Do you consider that the “user-id” and the “device” should still be considered as “unit of count” for the display and non-display data respectively? Do you think (an)other unit(s) of count can better identify the occurrence of costs in data provision and dissemination and if yes, which?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_43>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_43>

1. Do you foresee other types of connectivity that should be defined beside “physical connection” to quantify the level of data consumption? Please elaborate your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_44>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_44>

1. Do you think there is any other information that market data providers should disclose to improve the transparency on market data costs and how prices for market data are set? If yes, please provide suggestions.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_45>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_45>

1. Do you agree with the approach on delayed data proposed by ESMA? Please elaborate your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_46>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_46>

1. Do you agree with the proposal not to require any type of registration to access delayed data? Please elaborate your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_47>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_47>

1. ESMA proposes the RTS to enter into force 3 months after publication in the OJ to allow for sufficient time for preparation and amendments to be made by the industry. Would you agree? Would you suggest a different or no preparation time? Please elaborate your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_48>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_48>

1. Do you have any further comment or suggestion on the draft RTS? Please elaborate your answer.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_49>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_49>

1. What level of resources (financial and other) would be required to implement and comply with the RTS and for which related cost (please distinguish between one off and ongoing costs)? When responding to this question, please provide information on the size, internal set-up and the nature, scale and complexity of the activities of your organisation, where relevant.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_50>

Finance Denmark **fully supports** the response prepared by Nordic Securities Association (NSA).

In relation to the **consultation on RTS 2** and the **consultation on RCB**, Finance Denmark have no additional comments to the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_50>

**CP on the amendment of RTS 23**

1. Do you agree with the proposal for a daily reporting of reference data for both transaction reporting and transparency purposes?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_51>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_51>

1. For the purposes of both equity and non-equity transparency, do you prefer to retain the MiFIR identifier as currently defined or to rely on other fields for classification purposes? If latter, please outline the proposed solution.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_52>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_52>

1. Is in your view, the granularity level of the MiFIR identifier adequate for the purposes of MiFIR transparency in the equity and non-equity space? If not, how should it be adjusted?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_53>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_53>

1. How do you expect the change in scope of instruments subject to transparency to impact transparency reference data? Would you agree to maintain the current whole set of reference data for non-equity instruments, currently in RTS 2, in RTS 23? If not, please specify which reference data should not be retained in the view of the revised scope.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_54>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_54>

1. Do you agree with deleting Field 5 of RTS 2, Annex IV, and use the CFI code for the purposes of derivatives’ contract type classification?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_55>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_55>

1. Do you agree with the proposed alignment between RTS 23 and RTS 2 as set out in this section? Please provide details on which alignment is (not) feasible and why, considering the impact in terms of comprehensiveness and consistency of the reported information.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_56>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_56>

1. As it concerns “underlying type” classification, do you agree with the proposed reliance on CFI and other reporting fields? With specific regards to Field 27, do you have proposals on how that field may be streamlined?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_57>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_57>

1. Do you see additional room for simplification and/or alignment of reference data for transaction reporting and transparency purposes? What would be the impact in terms of one-off and ongoing costs, benefits and change management of such simplifications, in particular with respect to reducing and consolidating data flows to ESMA that exist currently?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_58>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_58>

1. Do you have suggestions on how the fields mentioned above may be improved and streamlined?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_59>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_59>

1. Do you agree with the above assessment of the necessary adjustments to be made in the RTS 23 to accommodate for the identifying reference data?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_60>

Yes, Finance Denmark agrees with the proposal, but we expect alignment with the ongoing response to the Delegated Act on OTC derivatives and the use of UPI in RTS 23.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_60>

1. Do you see a need to specify the ‘date by which the reference data are to be reported’ different from the date of application or have other comments with regards to the proposed timeline? If so, please specify.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_61>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_61>

1. Are there any other international developments or standards agreed at Union or international level that should be considered for the purpose of the development of the RTS on reference data?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_62>

Yes, Finance Denmark suggests considering ROC CDE Guidance document as used for EMIR Refit and US CFTC and ISO 4914 UPI.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_62>

1. Do you agree with the changes proposed in the tables above? Should any other changes be considered to align the MiFIR reporting specifications with the international standards, EMIR and / or SFTR?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_63>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_63>

1. Do you foresee any challenges with the proposed approach under which the CSDR publications would be integrated in FIRDS?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_64>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_64>

1. Do you have any comments with regards to the inclusion of additional fields in the instrument reference data published by ESMA to indicate whether the instrument is in the scope of CSDR and to specify which MIC corresponds to a venue with the highest turnover or the most relevant market in terms of liquidity?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_65>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_65>

1. Do you support inclusion of the new fields listed above?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_66>

For the fields #1, #2, #4, #5 and #6 it is ok to include if only for use in the registry and not for additional use in transparency reporting or transaction reporting where the info will not add value. For #3: ok but make sure not to add limitations for trading outside of venue to execute small client trades. We have not input to field #7.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_66>

1. Do you agree with the amendment listed above for the existing fields?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_67>

Data is possessed by venues, and we expect they will report these data since we do not have that info today. It is unclear if it applies to DPE's as well.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_67>

1. With regards to monitoring of de-listing and re-admission, which option is preferable in your view: (i) reporting by the trading venue of all previous trading periods in the repeatable fields 10, 11 and 12 or (ii) implementing adequate reporting logic of events impacting the instrument (new, modification, termination etc) in order to enable ESMA to reconstruct all trading periods?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_68>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_68>

1. Do you support suppressing the reporting of the fields listed above?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_69>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_69>

1. Do you foresee any challenges with the use of JSON format comparing to XML? Please provide estimates of the costs, timelines of implementation and benefits (short- and long term) related to potential transition to JSON.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_70>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_70>

1. In addition to including a field to identify the DPE, are there any other adjustments needed to enable comprehensive and accurate reporting of reference data by the DPEs?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_71>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_71>

1. With regards to the categorisation of classes of financial instruments for the purpose of the DPE register, how such classes should be designated in the register? Is there any further information that should be included in the register to ensure its usability and interoperability with other relevant systems? Do you foresee any practical implementation challenges, and if so, how they could be mitigated?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_72>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_72>

1. Are any other adjustments needed to enable comprehensive and accurate reporting of Article 8a(2) derivatives under RTS 23?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_73>

Finance Denmark supports the NSA response.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_CP1\_73>
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