

EU Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) – Consultation on design and organisation of emissions allowance auctions

This document contains the responses for the survey. The survey contains **4** initial questions (A-D) to identify respondents and **86** questions for which responses will be made public. Contact details provided in Question C, are not made public and therefore are not in this document.

Period of consultation

From 3 June 2009 to 3 August 2009 inclusive

Specific privacy statement

"Received contributions, together with the identity of the contributor, will be published on the Internet, unless the contributor objects to publication of his or her personal data on the grounds that such publication would harm his or her legitimate interests. In such cases the contribution may be published in an anonymous form. Otherwise, the contribution will not be published nor will, in principle, its content be taken into account. Responses for questions deemed confidential in the consultation will not be available for view on the website irrespective of contributor objecting or not."

Thank you

***Note:** Zero's on the right hand side of page reflect Non-Applicable questions in the survey response.*

Section 1: Questions to categorize participants

Question A

Name of Company/Organization: Drax Power Limited

Principal nature of activities: Electricity Generation

Number of employees in 2008:

World-wide: 750

Europe-wide: 750

Turnover in 2008:

World-wide: £1,752.8m

Europe-wide: £1,752.8m

Question B

Type of respondent:

Company operating one or more installations covered by the EU ETS
Electricity generators

Approx Annual Emissions: 22300000 tCO₂

Question C

Contact details will not be made public.

Question D

Do you object to publication of your personal data because it would harm your legitimate interests?

No

If so, please provide an explanation of the legitimate interests that you think will be harmed:

Ans:

Are any of your responses confidential?

No

If so, please indicate which ones and provide an explanation:

Ans:

Section 2: Survey questions (86)

Question 1

As a general rule throughout the trading period, in your opinion, are early auctions necessary?

Yes

If so, what should the profile of EUA auctions be?

Ans: 20-30% in year n-2, 30-35% in year n-1, remainder in year n

Question 2

Do you think there is a need to auction futures?

Yes

If so, why?

Ans: Futures would be required in order to auction allowances prior to the start of Phase 3, as the allowances would not be available to deliver Spot. Futures allow compliance buyers to hedge their position for future compliance periods, in line with trading in other markets (e.g. the wholesale electricity market), ensuring liquidity is maintained in all related markets.

Question 3

What share of allowances should be auctioned spot and what share should be auctioned as futures for each year?

	SPOT	FUTURES
Year n		
Year n-1		
Year n-2		

Please provide evidence to support your case.

Ans: Auctions of Futures should be profiled as indicated in our answer to Question 1 for n-2 and n-1. Spot should not be auctioned prior to the relevant compliance year; the remainder of the allowances should be auctioned as Spot in year n.

NB: The answer to this question will be published as part of the public consultation. Please do not submit confidential information as part of your answer to this question.

Question 4

Should the common maturity date used in futures auctions be in December (so the maturity date would be December in year n , both when auctioning in year $n-2$ as when auctioning in year $n-1$)?

Yes

If not, please suggest alternative maturity dates and provide evidence to support your view.

Ans:

Question 5

For spot auctions:

What should be the optimum frequency of auctions?

Ans: Weekly

0

What should be the minimum frequency of auctions?

Ans: Monthly

0

What should be the maximum frequency of auctions?

Ans: Other.

Please Specify: Daily

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Ans: More regular auctions will mean less volatility in the secondary market and a lower cost of funding.

Question 6

For spot auctions, what should be the:

If deemed appropriate, please indicate a range and/or distribution over different sizes.

Optimum auction size?

Ans:

Minimum auction size?

Ans:

Maximum auction size?

Ans:

Please provide evidence to support your case.

Ans: This would depend upon the frequency of the auctions.

Question 7

For futures auctions:

What should be the optimum frequency of auctions?

Ans: Weekly

0

What should be the minimum frequency of auctions?

Ans: Monthly

0

What should be the maximum frequency of auctions?

Ans: Weekly

0

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Ans: More frequent auctions avoids huge volatility in the secondary market and also avoids market manipulation / cornering.

Question 8

For futures auctions, what should be the:

If deemed appropriate, please indicate a range and/or distribution over different sizes.

Optimum auction size?

Ans:

Minimum auction size?

Ans:

Maximum auction size?

Ans:

Please provide evidence to support your case.

Ans: This would depend upon the frequency of the auctions.

Question 9

Should volumes of spot allowances be auctioned evenly throughout the year?

No

If not, how should volumes be distributed? (more than one answer possible) Please specify:

- A larger proportion in the first 4 months of the year
- A larger proportion in December
- A smaller proportion in July and August

Other. Please specify: If the auctions are frequent, then an even distribution is desirable; however, if auctions are infrequent, then there should be a larger proportion auctioned at the start of the year.

Question 10

In case futures are auctioned, should the volumes for spot and futures auctions be spread over the year in the same manner?

Yes

If not, how should they differ? (more than one answer possible)

- No futures auctions less than six months before the maturity date.
- A larger proportion in December.
- A smaller proportion in July and August.
- Otherwise?

Question 11

Does the Regulation need to have provisions to avoid holding auctions during a short period of time before the surrendering date (30 April each year)?

No

If yes, how long should this period be:

Ans: No Response

In case futures are auctioned, should there be similar provisions with respect to the period immediately prior to the maturity date?

No

If yes, how long should this period be:

Ans: No Response

Question 12

Which dates should be avoided?

Please specify the dates you have in mind in your answers.

Public holidays common in most Member States?

Ans: Christmas, Easter, etc...

Days where important relevant economic data is released?

Ans:

Days where emissions data are released?

Ans:

Other?

Ans:

Question 13

Is a harmonised 10-12 hrs CET auction slot desirable?

Yes

If not, what alternative(s) would you suggest?

Ans:

Question 14

How long in advance should each element of the calendar be determined?

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Annual volumes to be auctioned:

2 years in advance

Ans: Greater information provision provides greater certainty for participants.

Distribution of annual volumes over spot and futures (if applicable):

2 years in advance

Ans: Greater information provision provides greater certainty for participants.

Dates of individual auctions:

1 year in advance

Ans: Greater information provision provides greater certainty for participants.

Volume and product type for individual auctions:

1 year in advance

Ans: Greater information provision provides greater certainty for participants.

Each auctioneer carrying out auction process (if more than one):

1 year in advance

Ans: Greater information provision provides greater certainty for participants.

Question 15

What should be the volume of allowances to be auctioned in 2011 and 2012?

in 2011: 25% of the 2013 volume and 5% of the 2014 volume

in 2012: 30% of the 2013 volume and 25% of the 2014 volume

Please provide evidence to support your case.

Ans: This is in line with the hedging requirements of the electricity market (see answer to Question 1).

What percentage of these shares should be auctioned as futures?

in 2011: 100% of the 2013 share and 100% of the 2014 share
in 2012: 100% of the 2013 share and 100% of the 2014 share

Please provide evidence to support your case.

Ans: All auctions for future compliance periods should be for either Futures or Forwards.

Question 16

What should be the rule with respect to allowances not auctioned due to force majeure?

Ans: They should automatically be added to the next auction on the calendar, irrespective of the auction process.

0

Question 17

Is 1,000 allowances the most appropriate lot size?

Yes

If not, why not?

Ans:

Question 18

Is a single-round sealed-bid auction the most appropriate auction format for auctioning EU allowances?

Yes

If not, please comment on your alternative proposal?

Ans:

Question 19

What is the most appropriate pricing rule for the auctioning of EU allowances?

Ans: Uniform-pricing.

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Ans: Uniform pricing would appear to be the most inclusive pricing methodology, based on the fact that the auction will have both large and small participants. There will be participants that have greater resources to determine what their bid should be, and participants with less resource that would be at a competitive disadvantage with discriminatory pricing (winner's curse). Uniform pricing does not encourage participants to place over-priced bids, as such participants would have to be prepared to pay a high price for their allowances (i.e. if all winning participants place over-priced bids). Participants that place over-priced bids are effectively declaring that they are prepared to pay any price for the allowances.

Question 20

Should the rules for solving ties in the Regulation be:

Ans: pro-rata re-scaling of bids

Please comment on your choice.

Ans: Whilst pro-rata re-scaling of bids may not prevent collusion, competition law should. Pro-rata re-scaling does ensure a fair allocation of allowances for all winning bids.

Question 21

Should a reserve price apply?

No

Question 22

In case a reserve price would apply, should the methodology/formula for calculating it be kept secret?

No

Please comment on your choice.

Ans: There are arguments both for and against a reserve price. Given the scale of the allowance market, it could be argued that there should not be a reserve price as there will be sufficient competition to encourage a true valuation of allowances; this is particularly the case if the auctioning of allowances were centralised. However, it may be prudent to set a reserve price to avoid pricing anomalies; such a reserve price should be set at a discount to market and not set to artificially support the secondary market (i.e. it may be right for an auction to clear at a discount to the secondary market if the secondary market is over-priced).

With regards to keeping the formula a secret, Drax feels that it is important to maintain a transparent auctioning process with decisions on matters of pricing being auditable and accountable. There should be sufficient competition for bids to encourage a true valuation of allowances.

Question 23

Is a maximum bid-size per single entity desirable in a Uniform-price auction?

No

Please comment on your choice.

Ans: Given the scale, liquidity and turbulent nature of the allowance market during Phase 1 and 2 (including during the economic downturn), it would appear to be in the interests of a compliance buyer to purchase allowances as part of a hedging strategy for their main business, rather than attempting to corner the market. For the wider community of purchasers, it must be noted that there is existing competition law to discourage (and penalise) participants for asserting market power.

Is a maximum bid-size per single entity desirable in a discriminatory-price auction?

No

Please comment on your choice.

Ans: See above comment.

Question 24

If so, what is the desirable bid-size limit (as a percentage of the volume of allowances auctioned per auction):

Ans: No Response

Please comment on your choice.

Ans:

Question 25

In case only one of the two following options would be chosen, to limit the risk of market manipulation or collusion, which one would be preferable?

Ans: No Response

Please comment on your choice.

Ans: Neither; if auctions were small and frequent, this would reduce a participants ability to manipulate the market. There are participants that need a huge volume of allowances to remain compliant; such users should be allowed to purchase these allowances as they see fit.

Question 26

Are the following pre-registration requirements appropriate and adequate?

Identity:

- Natural or legal person;
- Name, address, whether publicly listed, whether licensed and supervised under the AML rules; membership of a professional association; membership of a chamber of commerce; VAT and/or tax number;
- Contact details of authorised representatives and proof of authorisation; and
- CITL-Registry account details.
- Anything else?

0

Declarations with respect to the past 5 years on absence of:

- Indictment or conviction of serious crimes: check corporate officers, directors, principals, members or partners;
- Infringement of the rules of any regulated or unregulated market;
- Permits to conduct business being revoked or suspended;
- Infringement of procurement rules; and
- Infringement of disclosure of confidential information.
- Anything else?

0

Declarations and submission of documentation relating to:

- Proof of identity;
- Type of business;
- Participation in EU ETS or not;
- EU ETS registered installations, if any;
- Bank account contact details;
- Intended auctioning activity;
- Whether bidding on own account or on behalf of another beneficial owner;
- Corporate and business affiliations;
- Creditworthiness;

- Collateral; and
- Whether it carries out transactions subject to VAT or transactions exempted from VAT.
- Anything else?

0

Question 27

Do you agree that the pre-registration requirements for admittance to EU auctions should be harmonised throughout the EU?

Yes

Please comment on your choice.

Ans: It is important to ensure that all trades are made on an equal basis by competent participants.

Question 28

Should the amount of information to be supplied in order to satisfy the pre-registration requirements for admittance to EU auctions depend on the:

- means of establishing the trading relationship;
- identity of bidder;
- whether auctioning spot or futures;
- size of bid;
- means of payment and delivery;
- anything else?

0

If so, what should the differences be?

Ans: The key element is that checks are performed to ensure that the participant is competent.

Question 29

Should the bidder pre-registration requirements under the Regulation apply in the same manner irrespective of whether or not the auctioneer is covered by the MiFID or AML rules?

Yes

0

0

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Ans:

Question 30

Do you agree that the auctioneer(s) should be allowed to rely on pre-registration checks carried out by reliable third parties including:

Yes

- Other auctioneers?
- Credit and/or financial institutions?
- Other

Please specify: See UK Financial Standards Authority "know your customer" advice and guidance.

Please comment on your choice.

Ans:

Question 31

In order to facilitate bidder pre-registration in their home country, should the auctioneer(s) be allowed to provide for pre-registration by potential bidders in other (or all) Member States than the auctioneer's home country e.g. by outsourcing this to a reliable third party?

Yes

Please comment on your choice:

Ans:

If so, should such entities be:

- Covered by the AML rules?
- Covered by MiFID?
- Covered by both?
- Other

0

Please comment on your choice:

Ans:

Question 32

Should the Regulation prohibit the multiplicity of pre-registration checks in the case of Member States auctioning jointly?

Yes

Please comment on your choice.

Ans: If the pre-registration checks are harmonised, it would seem inefficient for multiple Member States to repeat such checks for a joint auction.

Question 33

Do you agree that the level of collateral accepted in EUA auctions should be harmonised for all EU ETS auctions?

Yes

If so, how should they be harmonised?

Ans: Via a standard collateral methodology.

If not, why not?

Ans:

Question 34

Do you agree that the type of collateral accepted in EUA auctions should be harmonised for all EU ETS auctions?

Yes

If so, how should they be harmonised?

Ans: Via a standard collateral list.

If not, why not?

Ans:

Question 35

Do you agree that 100% collateral in electronic money transfer ought to be deposited up-front at a central counterparty or credit institution designated by the auctioneer to access spot auctions?

No

If not, why not?

Ans: Bidding in an auction does not necessarily mean a participant will gain allowances; transaction costs to move money to and from the auctioneer should be kept to minimum.

What alternative(s) would you suggest? Please provide arguments to support your case:

Ans: Participants should be required to pay for allowances within a designated timeframe prior to delivery. Sanctions should be applied to participants that do not abide by the payment rules.

Question 36

In case futures are auctioned, should a clearing house be involved to mitigate credit and market risks?

Yes

If so, should specific rules – other than those currently used in exchange clearing houses – apply to:

- the level of the initial margin;
- the level of variation margin calls;
- the daily frequency of variation margin call payments?

If you have answered yes, please justify and elaborate on the rules that should apply and the mechanisms to implement them:

Ans:

Question 37

What are the most preferable payment and delivery procedures that should be implemented for auctioning EUAs?

- Payment before delivery.
- Delivery versus payment.
- Both.

Please comment on your choice.

Ans: This would allow for reduced collateral requirements.

Question 38

Irrespective of the payment procedure, should the Regulation fix a maximum delay of time for payment and delivery to take place?

Yes

If yes; what should it be?

Ans: 7 working days

0

Question 39

Should the Regulation provide any specific provisions for the handling of payment and delivery incidents or failures?

Yes

If yes, what should they be?

Ans:

Question 40

Should the Regulation provide for all matters that are central to the very creation, existence and termination or frustration of the transaction arising from the EUA auctions?

Yes

If not, why not?

Ans:

If so, are the matters enumerated below complete?

- The designation of the parties' to the trade.
- The characteristics of the auctioned product:
 - Nature: EUAs or EUAAs, trading period concerned.
 - Date of delivery: date at which winning bidders will receive the allowances on their registry account
 - Date of payment: date at which payment will be required from winning bidders.
 - Lot size: number of allowances associated with one unit of the auctioned good.
- Events of 'force majeure' and resulting consequences.
- Events of default by the auctioneer and/or the bidder and their consequences.
- Applicable remedies or penalties.
- The regime governing the judicial review of claims across the EU.

Ans: Yes

If not, what additional matters should be foreseen in the Regulation and why?

Ans:

Question 41

Should the Regulation provide for rules on jurisdiction and the mutual recognition and enforcement of judgments?

Yes

If so, should these be:

- specific to the Regulation;
- by reference to the Brussels I Regulation;
- by citing exceptions from the Brussels I Regulation;
- by citing additions to the Brussels I Regulation?

Please comment on your choice:

Ans: There needs to be a harmonised recognition of jurisdiction and view of the enforcement of judgements across all Member States, in order to ensure that all participants in all Member States are treated equally.

If not, why not?

Ans:

Question 42

Which auction model is preferable?

- Direct bidding?
- Indirect bidding?
- Both?

Please comment on your choice.

Ans: Whilst larger participants will want to use a direct bidding model, smaller players may find it useful to bid indirectly via intermediaries.

Question 43

If an indirect model is used, what share of the total volume of EU allowances could be auctioned through indirect bidding?

Ans: N/A

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Ans: An indirect model is not feasible for Phase 3; participants should have the option to bid either directly or indirectly. All bids, whether direct or indirect, should take effect in the same auction for the same allowances.

Question 44

If the primary participants model is used, what provisions would be desirable for mitigating disadvantages of restricting direct access:

- Allow direct access to largest emitters, even if they trade only on their own account?
If so, who should have direct access and what thresholds should apply?

Ans: Ideally, all participants should have the option to bid directly.

- Disallow primary participants trading on their own account?

Impose strict separation of own-account trading from trading on behalf of indirect bidders?

Other

0

Question 45

If the primary participants' model is used, what conflict of interest requirements should be imposed?

Separation of client registration and trading on behalf of clients from all own account trading activities.

Separation of collateral management, payment and delivery on behalf of clients from all own account trading activities.

Separation of anything else.

0

Question 46

What obligations should apply to primary participants acting in EU-wide auctions as:

Intermediaries

Market makers

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Ans:

Question 47

Under what conditions should auctioning through exchanges be allowed:

Only for futures auctions open to established members of the exchange?

Also for spot auctions open to established members of the exchange?

Only when the exchange-based auction is open to non-established members on a non-discriminatory cost-effective basis?

Other.

0

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Ans: The regulation should stipulate that exchanges must allow access to all participants (provided that they pass the Know Your Customer checks).

Question 48

Should direct auctions be allowed through:

1) Third party service providers?
Yes

2) Public authorities?
Yes

Please comment on your selection:

Ans: Both types of entity should be required to provide a robust auctioning process and set of procedures.

Question 49

Do the general rules for auctioning EUAs suffice for ensuring full, fair and equitable access to allowances to SMEs covered by the EU ETS and small emitters?

Yes

If not, why not?

Ans:

Question 50

Is allowing non-competitive bids necessary for ensuring access to allowances to SMEs covered by the EU ETS and small emitters in case of:

discriminatory-price auctions?

uniform-price auctions?

Question 51

If non-competitive bids are provided for in spot auctions, what maximum share of allowances could be allocated through this route?

Ans: No Response

0

Please comment on your choice.

Ans:

Question 52

What rule should apply for accessing non-competitive bids:

Participants should only be allowed to use one of the two bidding routes?

Non-competitive bids should be restricted to SMEs covered by the EU ETS and small emitters only?

Other?

0

Please comment on your choice.

Ans:

Question 53

What should be the maximum bid-size allowed for SMEs covered by the EU ETS and small emitters submitting non-competitive bids?

Ans: No Response

0

Question 54

Are there any other specific measures not mentioned in this consultation that may be necessary for ensuring full, fair and equitable access to allowances for SMEs covered by the EU ETS and small emitters?

No Response

If so, please specify:

Ans:

Question 55

What should be the minimum period of time before the auction date for the release of the notice to auction?

Ans: Other

Please Specify: One month prior to auction; however, the auction calendar should be released one year ahead.

Please comment on your proposal.

Ans: The sooner the information is provided the better; this provides greater certainty that allowances will be made available. If the auctions were to be regular (i.e. weekly or daily), then this would not be such an issue.

Question 56

What should be the minimum period of time before the auction date for the submission of the intention to bid?

Ans: Other

Please Specify: One day.

Please comment on your proposal.

Ans: This will depend on the hedging position of the participant at the time of the auction.

Question 57

Are there any specific provisions that need to be highlighted in:

Ans: The notice to auction?

Please specify what they are.

Ans: The number of allowances available.

Question 58

What information should be disclosed after the auction:

- Clearing price (if allowances are awarded on a uniform-price basis or in the case of non-competitive bids being allowed)?
- Average price (if allowances are awarded on a discriminatory-price basis)?
- Any relevant information to solve tied bids?
- Total volume of EUAs auctioned?
- Total volume of bids submitted distinguishing between competitive and non-competitive bids (if applicable)?
- Total volume of allowances allocated?

Anything else?

0

Question 59

What should be the maximum delay for the announcement of auction results?

- 5 minutes
 15 minutes
 30 minutes
 1 hour
 Other.

0

Please comment on your proposal.

Ans: The maximum delay in the results being communicated should be one hour; however, the results should be communicated as soon as possible. Under the UK auctions in Phase 2, the results have been posted in less than fifteen minutes.

Question 60

Do you feel that any specific additional provisions should be adopted in the Regulation for the granting of fair and equal access to auction information?

Yes

If so, what may they be?

Ans:

Question 61

Should an auction monitor be appointed centrally to monitor all EU auctions?

Yes

If not, why not?

Ans:

Question 62

Do you agree that the Regulation should contain general principles on:

- the designation and mandate of the auction monitor; and
 cooperation between the auctioneer(s) and the auction monitor?
 Neither

If not, why not?

Ans:

Should these be supplemented by operational guidance, possibly through Commission guidelines? [Y/N]

Yes

If not, why not?

Ans:

Question 63

Is there a need for harmonised market abuse provisions in the Regulation to prevent insider dealing and market manipulation?

Yes

If not, why not?

Ans:

Please comment on your choice outlining the provisions you deem necessary and stating the reasons why.

Ans:

Question 64

Should the Regulation provide for harmonised enforcement measures to sanction:

Non-compliance with its provisions?

Market abuse?

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Ans:

Question 65

Should the enforcement measures include:

The suspension of the auctioneer(s) and/or bidders from the EU-wide auctions?

If so, for how long should such suspension last?

Ans:

Financial penalties?

If so, at what level should such penalties be fixed?

Ans:

The power to address binding interim decisions to the auctioneer(s) and/or bidders to avert any urgent, imminent threat of breach of the Regulation with likely irreversible adverse consequences?

Anything else?

0

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Ans: Drax is not in a position to comment.

Question 66

Should such enforcement measures apply at:

EU level?

National level?

Both?

Please comment on your choice.

Ans:

Question 67

Who should enforce compliance with the Regulation:

- The auction monitor?
- The auctioneer?
- A competent authority at EU level?
- A competent authority at national level?
- Other?

0

Please provide evidence to support your case.

Ans: All parties should have a duty to enforce compliance with the regulation.

Question 68

Which of the three approaches for an overall EU auction model do you prefer? Please rate the options below (1 being the most preferable, 3 being the least preferable)

- [3] Limited number of coordinated auction processes.
- [1] Full centralisation based on a single EU-wide auction process.
- [2] The hybrid approach where different auction processes are cleared through a centralised system.

Please give arguments to support your case.

Ans: A frequent, centralised auctioning process would eliminate a number of issues highlighted above. See answers to previous questions.

Question 69

If a limited number of coordinated auction processes develops, what should be the maximum number?

Ans: No Response

0

Please give arguments to support your case.

Ans:

Question 70

Is there a need for a transitional phase in order to develop gradually the optimal auction infrastructure?

No

If so, what kind of transitional arrangements would you recommend?

Ans:

Question 71

Should the Regulation impose the following requirements for the auctioneer(s) and auction processes? [mark those that apply]:

Technical capabilities of auctioneers:

- capacity and experience to conduct auctions (or a specific part of the auction process) in an open, fair, transparent, cost-effective and non-discriminatory manner;
- appropriate investment in keeping the system up-to-date and in line with ongoing market and technological developments; and
- relevant professional licences, high ethical and quality control standards, compliance with financial and market integrity rules.

Integrity:

- guarantee confidentiality of bids, ability to manage market sensitive information in an appropriate manner;
- duly protected electronic systems and appropriate security procedures with regards to identification and data transmission;
- appropriate rules on avoiding and monitoring conflicts of interest; and
- full cooperation with the auction monitor.

Reliability:

- robust organisation and IT systems;
- adequate fallback measures in case of unexpected events;
- minimisation of the risk of cancelling an individual auction once announced;
- minimisation of the risk of failing functionalities (e.g. access to the bidding platform for certain potential bidders); and
- fallback system in case of IT problems on the bidder side.

Accessibility and user friendliness:

- fair, concise, comprehensible and easily accessible information on how to participate in auctions;
- short and simple pre-registration forms;
- clear and simple electronic tools;
- (option of) accessibility of platforms through a dedicated internet interface;
- ability of the auction platform to connect to and communicate with proprietary trading systems used by bidders;
- adequate and regular training (including mock auctions);
- detailed user guidance on how to participate in the auction; and
- ability to test identification and access to the auction.

Please elaborate if any of these requirements need not be included.

Ans:

Please elaborate what additional requirements would be desirable.

Ans:

Question 72

What provisions on administrative fees should the Regulation include?

- General principles on proportionality, fairness and non-discrimination.
- Rules on fee structure.
- Rules on the amount of admissible fees.
- Other?

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Ans: Without knowing the form of the final model, it is not easy to determine what should be included at this stage.

Question 73

Should there be provisions for public disclosure of material steps when introducing new (or adapted) auction processes?

Yes

Should new (or adapted) auction process be notified to and authorised by the Commission before inclusion in the auction calendar?

Yes

Question 74

Which one of the following options is the most appropriate in case a Member State does not hold auctions (on time)?

Auctions by an auctioneer authorised by the Commission.

Automatic addition of the delayed quantities to those foreseen for the next two or three auctions.

What other option would you envisage? Please specify:

Ans: This would depend upon access to other Member States' auctions. A centralised auction process would avoid this issue.

Question 75

Should a sanction apply to a Member State that does not auction allowances in line with its commitments?

Yes

If so, what form should that sanction take?

Ans: Sanctions should be on a par (in terms of severity) to those imposed on participants that do not keep their payment or collateral commitments.

Question 76

As a general rule throughout the trading period, in your opinion, are early auctions necessary?

No Response

If so, what should the profile of EUAA auctions be:

Ans: No Response

Question 77

Do you think there is a need to auction EUAA futures?

No Response

If so, why?

Ans:

Question 78

What should be the optimal frequency and size of EUAA auctions:

Ans: No Response

0

Please comment on your choice.

Ans:

Question 79

What would be your preferred timing for EUAA auctions:

Ans: No Response

0

Question 80

Should any of the EUAA auction design elements be different compared to EUA auctions (see section 3)?

No Response

If so, please specify and comment on your choice.

Ans:

Question 81

Do you agree there is no need for a maximum bid-size?

No Response

If not, why not?

Ans:

Question 82

Is there any information regarding aircraft operators made available as part of the regulatory process to the competent authorities that could facilitate the KYC checks performed by the auctioneer(s)?

No Response

If so, please describe what information is concerned and whether it should be referred to in the Regulation or any operational guidance published by the Commission.

Ans:

Question 83

In your opinion, is there a specific need to allow for non-competitive bids in EUAA auctions?

No Response

Would this be the case even when applying a uniform clearing price format?

No Response

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Ans:

Question 84

Do you agree that there is no need for any specific provisions for EUAA auctions as regards:

- Involvement of primary participants, exchanges or third party service providers?
- Guarantees and financial assurance?
- Payment and delivery?
- Information disclosure?
- Auction monitoring?
- Preventing anti-competitive behaviour and/or market manipulation?
- Enforcement?
- None of the above?

If not, please describe in detail what rules would be needed and why.

Ans:

Question 85

Taking into account the smaller volume of EUAA allowances to be auctioned compared to EUAs, which of the three approaches for an overall EUAA auctioning model do you prefer? Please rate the options below (1 being the most preferable, 3 being the least preferable)

- [3] Limited number of coordinated auction processes.
- [1] Full centralisation based on a single EU-wide auction process.
- [2] Hybrid approach where different auction processes are cleared through a centralised system.

Does your choice differ from the approach preferred for EUAs?

No Response

Please provide arguments to support your case.

Ans:

Question 86

Do you agree that there is no need for any specific provisions for EUAA auctions as regards:

- Requirements for the auctioneer(s) and auction processes?
- Administrative fees?

- Rules to ensure appropriate and timely preparation of the auctions?
- None of the above?

If not, please describe in detail what rules would be needed and why.

Ans: