

On Wednesday, December 14th, Valerie Ledure, Jasper Jorritsma and Linda Salieska met with [REDACTED] from RWE Supply & Trading GmbH – an energy firm.

On exemptions under Article 2 (1) (d) and Article 2(1) (i), they suggest that the wording of, either the provision itself or the wording of the delegated acts (level 2) with regards to defining the concept of ancillary activity should provide greater clarity and certainty to market participants, such as energy firms. For RWE, the exemption for ancillary activities is crucial as the exemption 2(1)(k) has been deleted. They would welcome more clarity at Level 1, possibly based on the notion of capital employed. This is the assets held by a company, and would entail applying CRD to trading on a hypothetical basis.. They also welcome the inclusion of hedging as an ancillary activity (in line with EMIR definition).

On definition of financial instruments, they seek precise clarification and distinction between financial instruments (covered under MiFID) and physically settled contracts with future delivery (which should not be covered under MiFID) because it is basically a main commercial activity not traditional derivative trading. In order to filter out the commercial activities from the definition of financial instruments, they propose that the "commercial purpose test"/ the intention test should also apply to physically settled forwards traded over RM, MTFs and OTFs. They would propose a commercial purpose test for all physically settled derivatives, instead of looking at where they are traded. Moving physical futures to financial instruments could also shift part of their main business to being considered as financial.

On emission allowances, they do not support the proposal to define the emission allowance as a financial instrument and to expand the scope of the licensing requirement because emission allowances do not represent titles of capital, title to debentures or constitute forward contract. They suggest specific integrity measures to be introduced with respect to emission allowances in order to protect the investors and the proper functioning of the market. They are against reclassification of emission allowances, as this leads to problems when rebalancing portfolios of compliance buyers.

Wuf R / Mitglied

On mandatory platform trading, they are concerned with regards to the threshold specified under EMIR because companies trading on organised trading venues will have to maintain larger capital buffer which very likely will contribute to discourage trading and reduce liquidity. They are concerned about liquidity when moving trading to platforms. They would also want to be able to conduct their hedging OTC, even when having crossed the total threshold under EMIR.

In order to achieve proper implementation of MiFID II, they seek for longer transitional period to enable the commodity derivatives trading business to comply with the new requirements, also taking into account that the scope may be dependent on implementing measures.

Jasper Jorritsma | Policy Officer | Securities Markets Unit | DG Internal Market and Services |
Phone : +(32) 2 29 85833 | Mobile : +(32) 485 492 014 | jasper.jorritsma@ec.europa.eu