

Review of the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive

Questionnaire on MiFID/MiFIR 2 by Markus Ferber MEP

The questionnaire takes as its starting point the Commission's proposals for MiFID/MiFIR 2 of 20 October 2011 (COM(2011)0652 and COM(2011)0656).

All interested stakeholders are invited to complete the questionnaire. You are invited to answer the following questions and to provide any detailed comments on specific Articles in the table below. Responses which are not provided in this format may not be reviewed.

Respondents to this questionnaire should be aware that responses may be published.

Please send your answers to econ-secretariat@europarl.europa.eu by 13 January 2012.

Name of the person/organisation responding to the questionnaire	Stadtwerke München GmbH, Pfalzwerke Aktiengesellschaft, VNG - Verbundnetz Gas Aktiengesellschaft, Mainova Aktiengesellschaft, EWE Energie AG
---	---

Theme	Question	Answers
Scope	1) Are the exemptions proposed in Directive Articles 2 and 3 appropriate? Are there ways in which more could be done to exempt corporate end users?	<p>The exemptions are not appropriate because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Energy trading companies deal – according to their main business - on own account in financial instruments in order to be able(i) to offer their customers a demand-based, market-based, transparent and reasonably priced and competitive supply of energy,(ii) to reduce the risks of energy procurement and energy production, and(iii) to react promptly to volatile and changing market

		<p>conditions. This also applies when trading is organised in municipal platforms solely for the customers of public utility companies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The restricted exemptions limit the room for manoeuvre enjoyed by the group of energy supply companies mentioned above, which are state of the art to cope with the specifics and the volatility of the energy market and will most likely result in a reduction of those companies' competitiveness (also vis-à-vis banks engaged in energy trading) and in the final instance lead to a weakening of the competition on the energy markets as a whole. - The activities particularly of medium sized energy trading/supply companies pose a far lower systemic risk than banks and financial firms. This was the conclusion reached by CESR and CEBS in their October 2008 advice which was confirmed in July 2010¹. Additionally, one should take in to consideration, that the "medium-sized" companies mentioned above do not fall under the scope of the definition of "SME" (small-and medium sized companies), as they are bigger than an SME but still smaller than big companies in Europe or banks. - The extension of financial regulation bears the danger that medium sized companies would be tied to financial markets and institutions in a new way, leaving them far more exposed to a crisis in the financial world than before. <p>Without appropriate exemptions for the above mentioned</p>
--	--	--

¹ CESR-CEBS advice 15 Oct 2008 (CESR/08-752), see under: <http://www.cebs.org/getdoc/ee9b85fa-4d64-48dc-9f45-a7350881ddac/2008-15-10-CESR-CEBS-advice-on-Commodities.aspx> , confirmed in "CESR Technical Advice to the European Commission in the Context of the MiFID Review and Responses to the European Commission Request for Additional Information" – 29 July 2010

		<p>medium-sized energy supply companies, regional suppliers and public utilities, they will not be able to cope with the requirements of the MiFID and its related regulations. Free market access would likely only be available to a few major companies who would be able to meet the related financial and other (regarding e.g. reporting or organizational structure) requirements, which would be the consequence of the application of MiFID. The consequence of this, however, would be that oligopoly-like structures might spring up once again from power generation all the way to the supply of the final customer and that previous endeavours to liberalise the energy market (promotion of competition, increase in the number of market players, reduction of the market power of a few individual companies, etc.) might be rendered futile. In that case, one would also have to expect rising and non-transparent prices for the supply of electricity and gas that affect customers and economic growth.</p> <p>It is therefore a matter of uttermost importance that the text of the exemptions for ancillary activities is clear and continues to be applicable in a legally secure manner for a significant group of energy suppliers and their procurement platforms at the level of the consortium. In particular the use of trading instruments for companies whose main line of business is the generation of energy and/ or the supply of energy to customers and other end-users should not be inhibited.</p> <p>It has to be noted that it is not merely the bigger European energy supply companies that would be covered by all the rules of the MiFID and linked regulations, but a large number of</p>
--	--	--

		<p>medium-sized companies, regional suppliers and public utilities. These companies have their own energy trading activities (integrated in the same company or outsourced in daughter companies) and would therefore also be fundamentally affected by the MiFID and linked regulations without being able to benefit from the special rules for the newly to be created sub-category of the so-called “SME growth market.”</p> <p>See also our detailed comment including proposals for the revision of Art 2 below.</p>
	2) Is it appropriate to include emission allowances and structured deposits and have they been included in an appropriate way?	<p>No, it is not appropriate to include emission allowances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - emission allowances differ from financial instruments as they do not confer financial claims against the drawer of such allowances; - for energy companies emission allowances economically have the same function as fuels for power plants and not a derivative character - the inclusion of emission allowances into MiFID would cause a decreased liquidity on the trading market for such allowances, as the stricter requirements in the MiFID regime would limit the number of participants in such markets trading with EUA’s would shift from its users (production) to banks who have a “secondary” interest in this business and only consider this market as an investment market and not a fuel market.
	3) Are any further adjustments needed to reflect the inclusion of custody and safekeeping as a core service?	-
	4) Is it appropriate to regulate third country access to EU markets and, if so, what principles should be followed and what precedents should inform the approach and why?	-
Corporate	5) What changes, if any, are needed to the new requirements on	-

governance	corporate governance for investment firms and trading venues in Directive Articles 9 and 48 and for data service providers in Directive Article 65 to ensure that they are proportionate and effective, and why?	
Organisation of markets and trading	6) Is the Organised Trading Facility category appropriately defined and differentiated from other trading venues and from systematic internalisers in the proposal? If not, what changes are needed and why?	<p>No, the OTF-category is not defined appropriately.</p> <p>In our point of view, OTF should be defined more specifically as an automated system (e.g. algorithmic trading), where a high amount of trades could be operated at once and where matched purchase and sales demands or orders are concluded automatically without a further activity of the companies. This should mean that the conclusion of the trading contract has to be made automatically via the OTF-system, without an intermediate person or arrangements.</p> <p>If “OTF” were to be defined in a wider manner, the largest part of physically settled forward products of energy supply companies would inadequately become financial instruments. However in the energy sector physically settled forward products are the core products to be covered by the exemption in Art 2 Para 1 Fig. i.</p> <p>For the consequences regarding the limited competitiveness and liquidity on energy markets if the exemptions are not further made applicable, e.g. if OTF will not be defined as an automated system, see our comments on question 1.</p>
	7) How should OTC trading be defined? Will the proposals, including the new OTF category, lead to the channelling of trades which are currently OTC onto organised venues and, if so, which type of venue?	OTC should be defined as every trade that is not operated via energy exchange, MTF or OTF (in due consideration of the “OTF”- definition regarding our comments to question 6.)
	8) How appropriately do the specific requirements related to algorithmic trading, direct electronic access and co-location in Directive Articles 17, 19, 20 and 51 address the risks	-

	involved?	
	9) How appropriately do the requirements on resilience, contingency arrangements and business continuity arrangements in Directive Articles 18, 19, 20 and 51 address the risks involved?	-
	10) How appropriate are the requirements for investment firms to keep records of all trades on own account as well as for execution of client orders, and why?	-
	11) What is your view of the requirement in Title V of the Regulation for specified derivatives to be traded on organised venues and are there any adjustments needed to make the requirement practical to apply?	-
	12) Will SME gain a better access to capital market through the introduction of an MTF SME growth market as foreseen in Article 35 of the Directive?	-
	13) Are the provisions on non-discriminatory access to market infrastructure and to benchmarks in Title VI sufficient to provide for effective competition between providers? If not, what else is needed and why? Do the proposals fit appropriately with EMIR?	-
	14) What is your view of the powers to impose position limits, alternative arrangements with equivalent effect or manage positions in relation to commodity derivatives or the underlying commodity? Are there any changes which could make the requirements easier to apply or less onerous in practice? Are there alternative approaches to protecting producers and consumers which could be considered as well or instead?	<p>We oppose the introduction of “position limits” in MiFID and MiFIR for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Position limits reduce the liquidity in energy trading markets, while liquidity and therefore more competitiveness is one of the main purposes of current energy legislation - Position limits can lead to the situation that supply of end-customers is not possible or electricity can not be sold while it is unavoidably produced in a cogeneration production of heat - Position limits would lead to the situation, that risks could eventually not be hedged <p>The definition of “position limits” is unclear</p>

Investor protection	15) Are the new requirements in Directive Article 24 on independent advice and on portfolio management sufficient to protect investors from conflicts of interest in the provision of such services?	-
	16) How appropriate is the proposal in Directive Article 25 on which products are complex and which are non-complex products, and why?	-
	17) What if any changes are needed to the scope of the best execution requirements in Directive Article 27 or to the supporting requirements on execution quality to ensure that best execution is achieved for clients without undue cost?	-
	18) Are the protections available to eligible counterparties, professional clients and retail clients appropriately differentiated?	-
	19) Are any adjustments needed to the powers in the Regulation on product intervention to ensure appropriate protection of investors and market integrity without unduly damaging financial markets?	-
Transparency	20) Are any adjustments needed to the pre-trade transparency requirements for shares, depositary receipts, ETFs, certificates and similar in Regulation Articles 3, 4 and 13 to make them workable in practice? If so what changes are needed and why?	-
	21) Are any changes needed to the pre-trade transparency requirements in Regulation Articles 7, 8, 17 for all organised trading venues for bonds, structured products, emission allowances and derivatives to ensure they are appropriate to the different instruments? Which instruments are the highest priority for the introduction of pre-trade transparency requirements and why?	-
	22) Are the pre-trade transparency requirements in Regulation Articles 7, 8 and 17 for trading venues for bonds, structured products, emission allowances and derivatives appropriate?	-

	How can there be appropriate calibration for each instrument? Will these proposals ensure the correct level of transparency?	
	23) Are the envisaged waivers from pre-trade transparency requirements for trading venues appropriate and why?	-
	24) What is your view on the data service provider provisions (Articles 61 - 68 in MiFID), Consolidated Tape Provider (CTPs), Approved Reporting Mechanism (ARMs), Authorised Publication Authorities (APAs)?	-
	25) What changes if any are needed to the post-trade transparency requirements by trading venues and investment firms to ensure that market participants can access timely, reliable information at reasonable cost, and that competent authorities receive the right data?	-
Horizontal issues	26) How could better use be made of the European Supervisory Authorities, including the Joint Committee, in developing and implementing MiFID/MiFIR 2?	-
	27) Are any changes needed to the proposal to ensure that competent authorities can supervise the requirements effectively, efficiently and proportionately?	-
	28) What are the key interactions with other EU financial services legislation that need to be considered in developing MiFID/MiFIR 2?	<p>EMIR (OTC Derivatives Regulation):</p> <p>The exemptions in Art. 2 Para 1 as stated in our comments to question 1 as well as in our detailed comments below are also important for EMIR. If a wide range of energy trading activities will be covered by MiFID, the important and undisputed differentiation between financial and non-financial companies made in Art. 7 of EMIR will become obsolete.</p> <p>CRD (Capital Requirements Directive):</p> <p>If energy companies fall under the scope of MiFID, they will have to respect the severe requirements of CRD from 2015 onwards. This would lead to the situation that the above mentioned companies would either have to reduce their</p>

		trading activities or would vanish from the market. This although they don't constitute a systemic risk (see comment to question 1).
	29) Which, if any, interactions with similar requirements in major jurisdictions outside the EU need to be borne in mind and why?	-
	30) Is the sanctions regime foreseen in Articles 73-78 of the Directive effective, proportionate and dissuasive?	-
	31) Is there an appropriate balance between Level 1 and Level 2 measures within MiFID/MiFIR 2?	-
Detailed comments on specific articles of the draft Directive		
Article number	Comments	
Article 2 Para.1 Fig. i)	<p>According to Art. 2 Para. 1 Fig. i it shall be possible to provide in certain cases investment services (known in Germany as “financial services”) without the need for a financial services provider’s licence (bullet point 1 to bullet point 3), provided that the exempted activities are to be regarded as ancillary activities to the main business at company group level alongside a main business that is not itself the provision of an investment service.</p> <p>The intended sense and purpose of the revision of the MiFID is in particular an improved protection of the investors. This is why, in the assessment of the MiFID, financial services that are performed on one’s own account are subject to less stringent requirements than those which are performed on behalf of third parties on a commissioned basis. This is correct insofar as the risks when acting on one’s own account are borne not by the third party but by the provider of the financial service itself.</p> <p>However, the cases of exemption under the 1st and 3rd bullet point of Para. 1 Fig. i contradict this essentially correct assessment and thus result in the paradox that a commodity derivative for a client of one’s main business – e.g. a gas customer – could be procured on that customer’s account in the context of the exemption for ancillary activities, but that same commodity derivative could not be procured for the same customer on the energy supplying company’s own account without falling under the scope of the MiFID. This results from the following considerations:</p>	

- According to Art. 2 Para. 1 Fig. i, 3rd bullet point, persons are to be exempted from the scope of the MiFID who “*provide investment services, **other than dealing on own account**,*” in commodity derivatives or derivative contracts or emission allowances or derivatives thereof to the clients of their main business. Essentially that means that according to Art. 2 Para. 1 Fig. i, 3rd bullet point, commodity derivative transactions may be provided to clients of one’s main business as an ancillary activity if these transactions are **not on one’s own account**.
- According to Art. 2 Para. 1 Fig. i, 1st bullet point, on the other hand, persons are to be exempted from the scope of the MiFID, who “*deal **on own account** in financial instruments, excluding persons who deal on own account by executing client orders*”. This means, however, that falling under the exemption for ancillary activities would be out of the question for persons who, when executing client orders, deal on their own account.

The above differentiation is particularly difficult to comprehend in connection with the statements in Recital 14 of the MiFID. In the last sentence of Recital 14 it is stated that, by way of exemption, “*the execution of orders in financial instruments as an ancillary activity between two persons whose main business, on a group basis, is neither the provision of investment services (...) should not be considered as dealing on own account by executing client orders.*” According to this wording, it should therefore be possible for an energy supply company (main business: sale of gas) to sell to its client (main business: sale of gas) a hedging contract (e.g. to safeguard the current gas price), even if the energy supply company does this on its own account.

This existing contradiction in the draft could be resolved in one of the below mentioned ways:

Possible solution 1:

- By deleting the parenthesis “*excluding persons who deal on own account by executing client orders*” in Art. 2 Para.1 Fig. i, 1st bullet point **or**
- By deleting the parenthesis “*other than dealing on own account*” in Art. 2 Para.1 Fig. i, 3rd bullet point.

Proposal for the revision of Art 2 Para.1 Fig I according solution 1:

(i) persons who:

- *deal on own account in financial instruments, ~~excluding persons who deal on own account by executing client orders~~, or*
- *provide investment services, other than dealing on own account, exclusively for their parent undertakings, for their subsidiaries or for other subsidiaries of their parent undertakings, or*
- *provide investment services, other than dealing on own account, in commodity derivatives or derivative contracts included in Annex I, Section C 10 or emission allowances or derivatives thereof to the clients of their main business,*

provided that in all cases this is an ancillary activity to their main business, when considered on a group basis, and that main business is not the provision of investment services within the meaning of this Directive or banking services under Directive 2006/48/EC

or

(i) persons who:

- *deal on own account in financial instruments, excluding persons who deal on own account by executing client orders, or*
- *provide investment services, other than dealing on own account, exclusively for their parent undertakings, for their subsidiaries or for other subsidiaries of their parent undertakings, or*
- *provide investment services, ~~other than dealing on own account~~, in commodity derivatives or derivative contracts included in Annex I, Section C 10 or emission allowances or derivatives thereof to the clients of their main business,*

provided that in all cases this is an ancillary activity to their main business, when considered on a group basis, and that main business is not the provision of investment services within the meaning of this Directive or banking services under Directive 2006/48/EC

Possible solution 2:

- Amending the concept of “client orders” in Art. 2:

The concept of “client orders” in the context of the phrase “execution of client orders” does not reappear in this form in the definitions (Art. 4). In Art. 4 Fig. 4 however, the “execution of orders on behalf of clients” is legally defined. For clarification

	<p>purposes and to avoid the creation of unwanted room for interpretation, this concept should also be adopted in Art. 2.</p> <p>Proposal for the revision of Art 2 Para. 1 Fig I according solution 2:</p> <p><i>(i) persons who:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>deal on own account in financial instruments, excluding persons who deal on own account by executing client orders on behalf of clients, or</i> - <i>provide investment services, other than dealing on own account, exclusively for their parent undertakings, for their subsidiaries or for other subsidiaries of their parent undertakings, or</i> - <i>provide investment services, other than dealing on own account, in commodity derivatives or derivative contracts included in Annex I, Section C 10 or emission allowances or derivatives thereof to the clients of their main business,</i> <p><i>provided that in all cases this is an ancillary activity to their main business, when considered on a group basis, and that main business is not the provision of investment services within the meaning of this Directive or banking services under Directive 2006/48/EC</i></p> <p>In consequence Art. 2 Para: 1 Fig. d has to be amended in the same way:</p> <p><i>(d) persons who do not provide any investment services or activities other than dealing on own account unless they:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(i) are market makers</i> <i>(ii) are a member of or a participant in a regulated market or MTF; or</i> <i>(iii) deal on own account by executing client orders on behalf of clients;</i> <p><i>(...)</i></p>
Proposals on the differentiation between legitimate, commercial risk-	<p>Recital 88 enumerates criteria for hedging of business activities that are not to be covered by the regulation. We welcome the fact that production-related hedging activities are explicitly mentioned; however, we note that other cases of explicit hedging serve a necessary purpose of the main business:</p> <p>Energy companies use dealing on own account in financial instruments as a risk management strategy to limit or offset the probability of loss from fluctuations in prices changes in prices or changes in forecasted demands of commodities (Hedging).</p> <p>Hedging is especially used to .</p>

<p>reducing hedging activities and commodity speculation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Trade/hedging of sales portfolios</u> As a general rule, energy trading companies use commodity derivatives in order to minimize the risks of their sales portfolio. A risk-minimized purchase of the sales-volume or the volumes according to client demands means that a sales plan and a trading strategy is set up for several tradeable years ahead that enables: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Price fluctuations to be mitigated by a portfolio o Reactions to price changes on the market o Reactions to changes of the sales forecast This approach should be seen as the most successful way to ensure that end-customers receive a well-priced energy supply. - <u>Trade/hedging of production portfolios</u> Energy companies use analogical portfolio-strategies for their production portfolio as above mentioned in respect of sales volumes. This has to be looked upon as a state of the art approach: A risk-minimisation makes it necessary to sell defined parts of the portfolio for several years in advance. Also in this case the option must be left to buy back already sold volumes if the market prices change. This would ensure a trustworthy portfolio optimisation that counteracts price fluctuations and helps to balance out extremes.
<p>Recital 88</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Trading of the residual amounts required due to cascading in order to fulfil delivery commitments</u> An accurate purchase of forecasted sales volumes and an absolutely accurate sale of forecasted production volumes is impossible with the available trading products. It is impossible to trade short-term products during the years ahead. Therefore it is important to include under the wording of “hedging” the purchase of those volumes due to differences between forecasted sales and production volumes and those needed/produced at the time of delivery.
<p>Article 4 Para 2 Fig 34 new</p>	<p>As hedging is of utmost importance for energy companies, we therefore propose to reformulate recital 88 as follows, and we furthermore suggest to integrate the below definition of activities exempted from the scope of MiFID/MiFIR in the legal text, e.g. in the definitions of article 4 of the directive:</p> <p><i>“Considering the communiqué of G20 finance ministers and central bank governors of 15 April 2011 on ensuring that participants on commodity derivatives markets should be subject to appropriate regulation and supervision, the exemptions from Directive 2004/39/EC for various participants active in commodity derivative markets should be modified to ensure that activities by firms,</i></p>

		<p><i>which are not part of a financial group, involving the hedging of production-related, sales-related and other risks as well as the provision of investment services in commodity or exotic derivatives on an ancillary basis to clients of the main business remain exempt, but that firms specialising in trading commodities and commodity derivatives are brought within this Directive.”</i></p> <p><i>“commercial risk-reducing hedging activities” means in particular activities by firms, which are not part of a financial group, involving the hedging of production-related, sales-related and other risks as well as the provision of investment services in commodity or exotic derivatives on an ancillary basis to clients of their main business.</i></p>
Article Para 3:	2	<p>Art. 2 Para. 3 is intended to empower the European Commission to adopt delegated legal acts concerning measures with which the criteria for the definition of ancillary activities may be determined. In this regard, two elements have already been developed by the European Commission that shall be taken into account when establishing the criteria for determining whether an activity is ancillary to the main business.</p> <p>Since, by way of defining ancillary activities, the scope of the energy trading activities that are or are not subject to supervision may be determined and therefore major areas of the MiFID-revision are affected, the existing proposals need to be made more specific or extended, in order to do justice to the principle of democracy at EU-level:</p> <p>Proposal for the revision of in Art 2 Para. 3.</p> <p><i>The Commission shall adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 94 concerning in respect of exemptions (c) and (i), to clarifying when an activity is to be considered as ancillary to the main business on a group level as well as for determining when an activity is provided in an incidental manner.</i></p> <p><i>The criteria for determining whether an activity is ancillary to the main business shall take into account at least the following elements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>- the extent to which the activity is objectively measurable as reducing risks directly related to the commercial activity or treasury financing activity, or</i> <i>- the proportion of the capital employed for carrying out the activity in relation to the capital on a group basis.</i> <p>It should be possible to supplement further objective elements/criteria in the forthcoming legislative process.</p>

Article 2 Para 1 Fig. b)	<p>For energy supply companies that conduct their energy trading together with a number of partners through the agency of a common, non-consolidated subsidiary, the definition of “parent company and subsidiary” in Art. 4 para 1 b) Figs. 24 and 25 takes on relevance for the application of exemptions following the intended lapse of the exemption for commodities and commodity derivatives according to Art. 2 Para. 1 Fig. k. These companies would, according to the draft of the MiFID – depending on their specific constellation – no longer fall under any one of the exemptions because, owing to the lack of consolidation neither the exemption under Art. 2 Para. 1 Fig. b nor that under Fig. i, 2nd bullet point would take effect. What should be crucial for the applicability of an exemption, however, is the nature of the investment service and not the question of whether the subsidiary, through whose agency the energy trade was carried out, has a consolidated parent company or several (non-consolidated) partners.</p> <p>In order to maintain a liquid energy trading market it is necessary that non-consolidated companies also fall under the exemption rules, provided that the other preconditions are fulfilled.</p>
Detailed comments on specific articles of the draft Regulation	
Article 2 Para 1 Fig 7	<p>As a result of the above under question 6 discussed arguments we propose:</p> <p>Proposal for the revision of Article 2 Para 1 Fig 7</p> <p>organised trading facility (OTF) means any system or facility, which is not a regulated market or MTF, operated by an investment firm or a market operator, in which multiple third-party buying and selling interests in financial instruments are able to interact automatically in the system in a way that results in a contract in accordance with the provisions of Title II of Directive (new MiFID)</p>
Article ... :	
Article ... :	
Article ... :	