

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

Board of Supervisors

Date: 25 May 2011 **Time:** 09:00 – 17:00h

Location: ESMA, 11-13 avenue de Friedland, 75008 Paris

Contact: <u>carlo.comporti@esma.europa.eu</u> T: +33 158 3643 24

No Items

1. Adoption of agenda

ESMA/2011/BS/112 for decision

The Chair welcomed new participants in the Board: Tobias Waller as the observer from Liechtenstein, Ronald Gerritse from the Netherlands, and Ugo Bassi from the European Commission.

Decision: The agenda was adopted with the addition of an item discussing the appointment of the Board of Appeal.

2. Summary of conclusions of 12 April meeting

ESMA/2011/BS/113 for

for decision

The Chair noted that some comments have been received and incorporated into the draft summary of conclusions.

Decision: It was agreed that summaries of conclusions should be more concise and that therefore a shorter version should be circulated within two weeks for consideration at the next meeting of the Board of Supervisors.

3. Article 9 Implementation Task Force

☐ Preliminary report on implementation of Article 9 of the	ESMA/2011/BS/114	for discussion
ESMA Regulation		

Jean-Paul Servais presented his report.

Warnings and bans

The Board discussed the report's proposals in relation to warning and bans, and in particular:

☐ the importance of developing a greater understanding of national approaches to product interven-



. •	- 1	1 .	
tion	and	banning	τ.
UUII	anu	Danini	٠,

□ the scope for ESMA to develop a coordinating role in relation to national activities, taking account of the scope for products to be sold on a cross-border basis which would limit the effectiveness of national powers;
□ the need to take into account whether EU action is proportionate and in line with subsidiarity principles, although it was noted that subsidiarity means action being taken at the most appropriate level so it is appropriate for ESMA to coordinate and take action in some circumstances, in particular those set out in Article 9(5) of the ESMA Regulation;
□ the extent to which any general framework developed should be supported in EU legislation and be sufficiently flexible to cope with new situations;
\Box the scope for establishing product characteristics that are not considered acceptable for retail investors;
□ the need to take account of the existing investor protection regulatory regime and if rules are poorly supervised then deal with the poor supervision directly;
□ the need to take account of the different nature of markets across the EU and the differing level of sophistication of investors;
\square the scope for ESMA to have a role in relation to financial literacy; and
\Box that Article 9 extends beyond pure investor protection to financial activities generally, and in particular financial stability issues.
onclusion: Proposals on questions 1 and 4 concerning the ability to issue investor alerts and the need a flexible approach to issuing warnings and banning activities were agreed. The Task Force should

Conclusion: Proposals on questions 1 and 4 concerning the ability to issue investor alerts and the need for a flexible approach to issuing warnings and banning activities were agreed. The Task Force should map the activities of national authorities in relation to product intervention and bans and use the information to consider the scope for a coordinating role for ESMA in relation to national activities. The Task Force should also consider ESMA's banning powers. The Task Force should develop specific proposals for further consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

Committee on Financial Innovation

The Board discussed the establishment of the committee on financial innovation, and in particular:

\Box the level of	participation in	the committee	and whether	its scope sl	hould extend	to all	Article 9	9 is-
sues; and								

□ whether the committee should have an advisory or policy-making role and how it coordinates with other Standing Committees, EBA, EIOPA, Joint Committee and the ESRB while enabling ESMA to react quickly to developments.

Conclusion: It was agreed that the committee should not be a decision-making or policy-making body. The Task Force should consider further how the committee would coordinate with other parts of ESMA and with EBA, EIOPA, Joint Committee and ESRB, including whether the committee should be established as a normal standing committee or should also include the chairs of other Standing Committees. It



was agreed that ESMA should put itself forward to chair the Joint Committee sub-committee on consumer protection and financial innovation.

Data collection

The Board discussed collection of data,	and in particular:

□ the scope for focusing data collection on products that are subject to complaints, noting that complaints are generally available only in national languages and are frequently dealt with by ombudsmen and therefore are not always directly available from competent authorities.
□ the scope for data collection to use a significant amount of time and resources that would need to b justified by identifying the purpose for which data is gathered and who will use it, including th time national authorities may need to establish their own systems where necessary.

Conclusion: The Task Force would continue its work based on a step-by-step practical approach.

4. Review Panel

□ Report by Jean Guill	ESMA/2011/BS/115	for information		
Jean Guill presented his report.				
\square Prospectus Directive good practices questionnaire	Annex 1	for decision		
Decision: The Board approved the questionnaire.				
\square Decision establishing the Review Panel of ESMA	Annex 2	for discussion		
The Board discussed the draft decision, in particular:				
☐ the desirability of requiring national authorities that object to publication of peer reviews to justify their objection and ESMA publishing the justification;				
□ that conflicts of interest provisions should be limited to personal conflicts in line with the Board of Supervisors rules of procedure;				
\Box the level of independence and objectivity that should be	required of members of tl	ne Review Panel;		
\Box the scope for ESMA staff to chair sub-groups; and				
☐ the Review Panel's interaction with other parts of ESMA.				

The Chair considered that ESMA staff should be treated equally with members of the Review Panel and so there should not be restrictions on staff chairing sub-groups. In relation to the discussion on levels of independence, the Chair noted that Members of the Board of Supervisors are present as independent individuals and not as representatives of their competent authorities.

Conclusion: The Review Panel should finalise the draft decision for adoption by the Board, taking



accounts of the comments raised.

5 .	Credit	Rating	Agencies	SC
------------	---------------	--------	-----------------	----

☐ Report by Karl-Burkhard Caspari	ESMA/2011/BS/116	for information
Karl-Burkhard Caspari presented his report, noting in addi expected to be published on 27 May, coming into effect on responsibility for supervision.		
The SEC has published draft rules which will require analyselent if implemented, with further analysis required to ident	-	-
The Commission welcomed early development of advice on progress being made on registration of CRAs.	equivalence of the SEC rule	es and the swift
The Chair noted that as Karl-Burkhard is stepping down as ously agreed the Standing Committee will be replaced with mittee will be chaired by the Executive Director. The Chair good progress on the MoU with the US.	a Technical Committee. The	e Technical Com-
Conclusion: The Standing Committee (and future Techni work on the US draft regulations with ESMA staff taking ov		-
\square ESMA staff note on exchange of letters between ESI and the Japanese FSA	MA ESMA/2011/BS/128	for decision
☐ Letter to the Japanese FSA on the cooperation of copetent authorities regarding supervision and enforment in the area of CRAs	, , ,	for decision
The Board noted the staff note presented by the Acting Sect	retary General.	
Decision : The Board approved the letter to the Japanese I	FSA.	
☐ Report by Boguslaw Budzinski	ESMA/2011/BS/117	for information
The Board noted the report presented by Ilona Pieczynska-	Czerny.	

Decision: The Board agreed to a one-day written procedure to approve the background information on fees to be submitted to the Commission.

The Acting Secretary-General (ASG) noted that the Commission had requested further background information on the technical advice provided on CRA fees, to be delivered against a very tight timescale.

6. IT Management and Governance Group



	□ Report by Arja Voipio	ESMA/2011/BS/119 including Annexes 1 & 2	for information
	☐ Project Presentation Document	Annex 3	for decision
	☐ IT collaborative tools	Annex 4	for decision
	he ASG presented the report, noting Arja Voipio's apologies th Ianagement Board had discussed the report in its meeting on 2		l and that the
	□ rapid progress on three urgent projects: secure exchange document management;	of documents; CRA supe	ervisory tools; and
	\Box further consideration of the video-conferencing project, it ESAs; and	n particular to coordina	ate with the other
	☐ further work to identify synergies within the three ESAs cussed but without delaying progress on the three urge liaise with EBA and EIOPA to explore this further.		
T	he Board discussed the report and its annexes, in particular:		
	☐ the need to agree common standards and platforms with welcoming agreement in the Joint Committee to increase		ever possible, and
	\Box the extent to which progress on video conferencing should	be a priority;	
	☐ the need for business owners to be assigned in order to most effective for ESMA;	ensure the projects deli	ver tools that are
	$\hfill\Box$ the trade-off between implementing solutions quickly and	promoting integration w	rith other ESAs.

It was noted that there is willingness to cooperate within the ESAs but that difficulties can arise because, for example, of different stages of implementation of existing systems within the ESAs, different membership of the ESAs affecting priorities, and different sectoral requirements. Establishment of the ESAs now provided greater scope to cooperate and overcome some of the difficulties caused by the structure of the 3L3 Committees.

Conclusion: The Board supported the Management Board proposal to proceed quickly with the secure exchange of documents, CRA supervisory tools and document management projects while undertaking a quick analysis, within a month, of the scope for synergies with the other ESAs. There is clear desire in the Board of Supervisors to establish video-conferencing facilities, but on the basis that any facilities should be consistent with systems at the other ESAs.

7. Appointment of the Board of Appeal (Closed ESMA/2011/MB/67 for discussion session)

The Chair presented the report that had been provided to the Management Board, noting the importance



of respecting the confidentiality of the discussion given that it involved discussion of individuals.

The Chair noted that the Management Board had identified four candidates as members and alternates. The Board discussed the four candidates proposed.

Conclusion: The Board supported the four candidates proposed by the Management Board and advised that focus should be given to legal and supervisory expertise while minimising the scope for conflicts of interest, or perception of conflicts of interest, that could arise where lawyers are active in private practice.

8. Protocol for the Cooperative Oversight Ar- ESMA/2011/BS/120 for decision rangement of the Warehouse Trust Company LLC

The ASG presented the report and protocol.

The Board discussed, in particular:

\Box the ability to share confidential information with voting members of the Board of Supervisors;
\Box the possible need for ESMA to ensure appropriate arrangements for sharing relevant information with national authorities when entering into similar agreements;
□ the extent to which the decision to enter into the protocol should take account of ongoing EU legislative discussions regarding reciprocity and mutual recognition and EU discussions with the US, given involvement of the ECB and three European national authorities and central banks in addition to ESMA.

The ASG noted that ESMA supported the Commission's position on reciprocity and mutual recognition and had raised the issues in correspondence with Mary Schapiro and Gary Gensler. The ASG noted that experience of data exchange with DTCC had been positive to date.

The Chair noted that ESMA has to fulfil its own responsibilities as an independent authority and that ESMA has a clear interest in being a party to the protocol. The Chair further noted that ESMA's confidentiality obligations extend to members of the Board of Supervisors as individuals, but do not extend to Board members' staff.

Decision: The Board agreed in principle to ESMA entering into the protocol. The final decision will be taken by written procedure following circulation of further information by ESMA staff.

9. Post-Trading SC

☐ Report by Jean-Pierre Jouvet	ESMA/2011/BS/121	for information
□ Report by Jean-Flerre Jouyer	ESMA/2011/DS/121	101 IIII0I IIIauuiI

Thierry Francq presented his report. Mr Francq noted that the final text of EMIR is awaited and that pending its adoption progress was being made with developing technical standards so far as possible, although unfortunately without ESCB input despite invitations. It was hoped that ESCB input could be obtained prior to consultation later in 2011.

The Chair agreed to support further attempts to involve ESCB at an early stage.



☐ Pre-assessment of the design of TARGET2-Securities (T2S) Services during the development phase	Annex 1	for decision
☐ Letter to T2S Programme Board	Annex 2	for decision
The Board discussed T2S, in particular:		
☐ the need for the Commission and ESMA to coordinate wo on outsourcing which will extend to arrangements with T		islative provisions
☐ the desirability for financial stability purposes of an assess attacks;	sment of the resilience o	of T2S to malicious
☐ the scope for ESMA and national supervisors to take apprefied with aspects of T2S, independently from any ECB as		ultimately unsatis-
Decision: The pre-assessment report and letter to the T2S Pro	gramme Board were app	proved.
10. Corporate Reporting SC		
☐ Report by Fernando Restoy	ESMA/2011/BS/122	for information
Fernando Restoy presented his report.		
\square Letter to IAASB on disclosures	Annex 1	for decision
Decision: The letter was approved.		
\square Note on the IASB's post-June 2011 agenda	Annex 2	for discussion
Conclusion: The Board noted the note.		
☐ Appointment of new SC Chair		for decision
The Chair reported that Fernando Restoy would step down as C its June meeting and invited further indications of interest in cl amongst alternates or at board level within national authorities Standing Committee if needed and pending a permanent appoint particular the Standing Committee's rapporteurs, for the excellent	hairing the Standing Cores. The Chair would be worth	nmittee, including villing to chair the
11. Secondary Markets SC		
\square Report by Alexander Justham	ESMA/2011/BS/123	for information
David Lawton presented Alexander Justham's report.		
☐ Pre-trade transparency waiver NL1	Annex 1	for decision
Decision: Following discussion of the note by ESMA staff, th	e Board decided that, in	n ESMA's opinion,



waivers	ESMA/2011/BS/124	for discussion
The ASG presented the note by ESMA staff.		
The Board discussed the note, and in particular:		
□ whether decisions on waivers should be issued as opinion thorities under Article 29 of the ESMA Regulation, or as cle 16, noting that in practice the existing practice of treated as precedents by competent authorities and finance.	guidelines/recommend publication leads to the	lations under Arti- ne decisions being
\Box the practical challenges of issuing the decisions as guidelin	nes;	
☐ the desirability of providing opinions on individual cas which could then usefully be issued as general guidelines		
☐ the mapping carried out when the CESR procedure was scope to revisit those waivers to ensure a level playing fie with ESMA if necessary using its breach of Union law powers.	eld amongst financial m	_
Conclusion: ESMA decisions on individual pre-trade transparand clearly stated to be such. The Standing Committee will replaying field in the light of the new ESMA arrangements. This cong waivers. ESMA opinions and CESR positions could be taken aw investigations where appropriate. Underlying principles of as guidelines where possible.	review previous waivers can result in new ESMA n into account to suppo	s to ensure a level opinions on exist- rt breach of Union
O December of the second of th		
2. Progress reports	ECMA /cost /DC/so=	
☐ Report by Jean-Paul Servais (IPISC)	ESMA/2011/BS/125	for information
•	ESMA/2011/BS/126	for information for information
☐ Report by Jean-Paul Servais (IPISC)	, , , ,	
☐ Report by Jean-Paul Servais (IPISC) ☐ Report by Anastassios Gabrielides (ESMA-Pol)	ESMA/2011/BS/126	for information
☐ Report by Jean-Paul Servais (IPISC) ☐ Report by Anastassios Gabrielides (ESMA-Pol) ☐ Report by Giuseppe Vegas (IMSC)	ESMA/2011/BS/126 ESMA/2011/BS/127	for information



\Box progress regarding the level of representation in the Board of Supervisors;	
\square discussions with the Commission regarding ESMA's involvement in the EU legisla	tive process;
\square arrangements for ESMA's official inauguration on 11 July 2011, to be attended Barnier and Sharon Bowles MEP; and	by Commissioner
\square discussions on future funding arrangements for the ESAs taking account of broad of Supervisors for 100% Union funding.	oad support in the
14. A.O.B.	
□ Proposed letter to SEC and CFTC regarding cross- border effects of Dodd Frank and cover letter from Thierry Francq, Alexander Justham and Karl-Burkhard Caspari	for discussion
Karl-Burkhard Caspari reported on the proposed letter.	
Decision: The Board approved the letter subject to drafting proposals to be provide sion.	ed by the Commis-
15. Future meetings	for information
\square 11 July 2011 (pm) and 12 July 2011 (am) (Paris)	
□ 20 September 2011 (Warsaw)	
□ December 2011 (Paris)	
The Chair proposed an additional meeting at the end of October, with dates for the October meetings to be fixed by ESMA staff and shared as soon as possible.	ober and Decem-
Steven Maijoor Chair	



PARTICIPANT LIST

Voting Members

Member State	Representative	Accompanying Person
Belgium	Jean-Paul Servais	Antoine van Cauwenberge
Bulgaria	Antoniya Gineva	Nina Koltchakova
Czech Republic	Pavel Hollmann	-
Denmark	Julie Galbo	Hanne Råe Larsen
Germany	Karl-Burkhard Caspari	Philipp Sudeck
Estonia	Raul Malmstein	-
Ireland	Gareth Murphy	Elva Martin
Greece	Anastassios Gabrielides	Eleftheria Apostolidou
Spain	Fernando Restoy	Antonio Mas
France	Thierry Francq	Xavier Tessier Thierry Courret
Italy	Giuseppe Vegas	Nicoletta Giusto
Cyprus	Liana Ioannidou	-
Latvia	Irena Krumane	-
Lithuania	Renata Babkauskaitė	-
Luxembourg	Jean Guill	-
Hungary	László Balogh	-
Malta	Andre Camilleri	-
Netherlands	Ronald Gerritse	Max Simonis
Austria	Kurt Pribil	Andrea Kuras-Goldmann
Poland	Ilona Pieczynska-Czerny	Adam Blasiak
Portugal	Carlos Alves	Margarida Matos Rosa
Romania	Bogdan Chetreanu (observer)	



Slovenia	Damjan Zugelj	Sabina Bester
Slovakia	Slavomir Stastný	Ivan Barri
Finland	Jarmo Parkkonen	
Sweden	Martin Andersson	
United Kingdom	David Lawton (alternate)	Cristina Frazer

Non-voting members

ESMA Chair	Steven Maijoor	
European Commission	Emil Paulis	Ugo Bassi
ESRB	Francesco Mazzaferro	Fabio Recine
EIOPA	Carlos Montalvo	
EBA	Adam Farkas	

Observers

Iceland	Gunnar Andersen	-
Liechtenstein	Tobias Wanner	Philipp Roeser
Norway	Eirik Bunaes	Kristin Lund

ESMA

Acting Secretary General	Carlo Comporti
Interim Executive Director	Olivier Salles
Minutes	Jonathan Overett Somnier