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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 **30 May 2025.**

**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 \_EUGB\_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\_EUGB\_nameofrespondent\_RESPONSEFORM. For example, for a respondent named ABCD, the response form would be entitled ESMA\_EUGB\_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 technical standards on the European Green Bonds Regulation”).

**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 encourages entities that intend to apply for registration as external reviewers of European Green Bonds, as well as financial market participants who have or intend to issue or invest in green bonds or sustainability-linked bonds, to participate.

**General information about respondent**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the company / organisation | Lavola 1981, S.A.U. |
| Activity | Audit/Legal/Individual |
| Are you representing an association? |[ ]
| Country/Region | Spain |

**Questions**

1. **Do you agree with ESMA’s proposals for the assessment of the appropriateness, adequacy and effectiveness of systems, resources and procedures?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_EUGB\_1>

Yes, we agree with ESMA’s proposals. It is our belief that having robust systems and procedures, as well as adequate resources is key for ensuring the integrity and reliability of external reviews. Our firm has implemented comprehensive IT infrastructures, communication networks, and organizational frameworks to streamline workflows and support integration across departments and is firmly committed in their constant revision and improvement. We also evaluate and plan the deployment sufficient human, technical, and material resources to manage risks and ensure the security and continuity of our reviews.

We think that the regulatory technical standards should provide clarity on the requirements baseline to avoid lack of determination and also specific guidelines or benchmarks for assessing the adequacy and effectiveness of these systems, resources, and procedures. This could include detailed criteria for evaluating IT security measures, the sufficiency of human resources, and the robustness of procedural protocols. Clear specifications that leave room for self-organization will help ensure consistent and objective assessments across different external reviewers while maintaining corporate culture.

The frequency and, in its case, specifications of monitoring such assessment should ideally be related to significant material changes take place to prevent it from being unnecessarily cumbersome.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_EUGB\_1>

1. **Do you agree with ESMA’s proposals for the assessment of whether the compliance function has the authority to discharge its responsibilities properly and independently, the necessary resources and expertise and access to all relevant information?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ EUGB\_2>

Yes, we agree on the three aspects.

Regarding compliance function’s discharge of its responsibilities properly and independently, we agree it shall operate with full authority and independence, ensuring adherence to all regulatory and ethical standards without undue influence and we agree is paramount to integrate these standards into the strategy and decision-making processes to foster a culture of proactive compliance and accountability.

Additionally, we recognize the need to appropriately dimension the size of the compliance function to match the scale of each reviewer. This ensures that the compliance team is adequately resourced to effectively monitor and enforce compliance standards, thereby safeguarding the integrity of our external reviews while not forcing over dimensioning internal resources.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ EUGB\_2>

1. **Do you agree with ESMA’s proposals for the assessment of the soundness of administrative and accounting procedures and of internal control mechanisms and the effectiveness of control and safeguard arrangements for information processing systems?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ EUGB\_3>

Yes, we agree.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ EUGB\_3>

1. **Do you agree with ESMA’s proposals to specify the criteria to assess whether the information used when providing reviews is of sufficient quality and from reliable sources?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ EUGB\_4>

Yes, we agree.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ EUGB\_4>

1. **Do you agree with ESMA’s proposals to specify the information, form and content of applications for recognition?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ EUGB\_5>

Yes, we agree.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ EUGB\_5>

1. **Do you agree with ESMA’s proposals to specify the standard forms, templates and procedures to notify ESMA of material changes in the information provided at registration?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ EUGB\_6>

We agree in general terms.

We consider that the need to motivate certain elements such as sufficiency of staff, duration of reviews or even the number of these is contingent and related to market and commercial circumstances that might substantially vary after the definitive implementation of the green bond regulation.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ EUGB\_6>

1. **Do you have comments or quantitative information to provide on the CBA and options considered by ESMA?**

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ EUGB\_7>

We acknowledge the costs associated with implementing the proposed RTS, including initial setup and ongoing compliance assessments. While we recognize the potential benefits, such as enhanced data quality, legal certainty, and improved market trust, we believe it is important to adopt a prudent approach.

We recommend that ESMA consider the potential financial burden on smaller firms that are not specialized in financial revision and provide clear guidelines (or baseline definition) to help mitigate these costs. Additionally, we suggest a phased implementation plan to allow external reviewers adequate time to adapt to any requirements without compromising their operational stability. Concise and clear documentation that takes into account streamlining reporting process with clear requirements to be met that are proportional to applicant’s dimension seems recommended.

By taking a conservative approach, we can ensure that the transition to the new standards is smooth and sustainable, ultimately contributing to a more reliable and transparent European Green Bond market and simultaneously ensuring the existence of a real external reviewer market.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ EUGB\_7>