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

This document is the questionnaire for this consultation. The survey contains 4 initial questions (A-D) to identify respondents, 86 questions for which responses will be made public and 4 questions that are classified confidential, must be sent directly to the European Commission and will not be made public. The questions that are classified potentially confidential are on two separate pages (2 questions on each page) and highlighted in green boxes.

#### Period of consultation

From 3 June 2009 to 3 August 2009 inclusive

# How to submit your contribution

This consultation seeks to obtain feedback from all categories of stakeholders regarding the different aspects of auction design and implementation covered in the Consultation Paper.

We are sorry for the inconvenience, but the web-based survey is not available yet. If participants wish to complete the survey on this document and send their contributions back to **contact\_ets\_auctions\_consultation@icfi.com** their responses can be accepted in this format. The web-based survey will be available as soon as possible if participants wish to wait till that is available.

Received contributions will be published on the Internet. It is important to read the specific privacy statement attached to this consultation for information on how your personal data and contribution will be dealt with.

#### **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 Otherwise, the contribution will not be published nor will, in principle, its content be taken into account.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."

# Instructions to filling out the questionnaire

•	Questions may only be answered in designated response fields
•	For certain multiple choice questions, simply click on box to indicate choice
•	Answer [Y/N] questions by typing "y" / "Y" or "n" / "N" on underlined area ()
•	Some responses require explanations, additional comments and detailed answers These will either by identified by underline ( ) or an answer section (A: ). The amount of text that can be entered here is unlimited.
•	After completing the survey, please save and send to <a href="mailto:contact_ets_auctions_consultation@icfi.com">contact_ets_auctions_consultation@icfi.com</a>
•	If any questions seem unclear in context or for method of response, please mail contact ets auctions consultation@icfi.com to clarify

# Thank you

# **Section 1: Questions to categorize participants**

Questi	ion A
Name	of Company/Organization: International Power plc
Princip	oal nature of activities:Electricity Generation
Numbe	er of employees in 2008:
World	-wide <u>3,000</u> Europe-wide
Turnov	ver in 2008:
World	-wide Europe-wide
Questi	ion B
Type o	of respondent:
	Member State
	Company operating one or more installations covered by the EU ETS  Electricity generators  Energy companies other than electricity generators  Industrial sectors  Aviation  Other. Please specify:  Approx Annual Emissions: tCO <sub>2</sub>
	Intermediary   ☐ Financial institution   ☐ Trading arm of non-financial institution   ☐ Other. Please specify   Trader on own account   ☐ Financial institution   ☐ Trading arm of non-financial institution   ☐ Other Please specify

			ne (ETS) – rganisation of emissions allowance auctions	
	Regulated market			
		Carbon	n only	
		Carbon	and electricity	
		Carbon	and other energy products	
	Other o	carbon 1	market	
		Multila	ateral trading facility trading carbon derivatives	
		Carbon	n exchange trading spot carbon	
		Other.	Please specify	
	Clearin	ring house		
	Centra	al counterparty		
	Other (multiple choices apply)			
			Non-governmental organisation	
			Trade association	
			Carbon analyst	
			Carbon publication	
			Academic	
			Other. Please specify	
Questi	on C			

Contact details will not be made public.

Page 4

# **Question D**

Questions relating to the "Specific privacy statement" above.

O Do you object to publication of your personal data because it would harm your legitimate interests? [Y/N] N

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

A:

o Are any of your responses confidential? [Y/N]  $\underline{N}$ 

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

A:

### Section 2: Survey questions (86) and potentially confidential questions (4)

_	
_	eneral rule throughout the trading period, in your opinion, are early auctions ary? [Y/N] $\underline{Y}$
If so, v	what should the profile of EUA auctions be?
	5-10% in year n-2, 10-20% in year n-1, remainder in year n
	10-20% in year n-2, 20-30% in year n-1, remainder in year n
	20-30% in year n-2, 30-35% in year n-1, remainder in year n
	Other? Please specify: 20% n-4, 20% n-3, 20% n-2, 20% n-1

It is important to release the allowances to the market as soon as practicable. Generators look to begin hedging their power output 3-4 years ahead of delivery and carbon is one of the key determinants of the cost of generation. Given that, in Phase III, generators will have to source all of their allowances from the market (either primary or secondary markets) the early auction of allowances must be a priority. This is the case not only in advance of the start of Phase III but also throughout Phase III. Auctioning 3-4 years ahead will aid the liquidity of the secondary market and allow for efficient hedging strategies - the lack of early auctioning risks limiting the liquidity of both the power and carbon sectors.

# **Question 2**

**Ouestion 1** 

Do you think there is a need to auction futures?  $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$ 

If so, why?

A:Electricity generators need early access to allowances in order to hedge their risks-without such early access the price risk exposure will increase and this will raise costs for consumers. This seems unnecessarily inefficient. Futures contracts offer a simple way to navigate this issue. Further, given that it seems likely that the CITL will not be available before 2012 this will restrict the ability to issue spot allowances. The requirement for early access to auctions leads to the conclusion that futures contracts must be auctioned.

### **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	:	<u>20</u> %	0%

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

year n-1
year n-2
%
20%
20%

Please provide evidence to support your case.

A: As suggested above auctions should be 3-4 years ahead, therefore we suggest the following trajectory for futures: 20% n-4, 20% n-3, 20% n-2, 20% n-1. It is argued in answer to question 1 that early access to allowances is necessary in order for the electrcity industry to manage its exposure to price risk. This implies a high level of early auctioning through the use of futures: ideally auctioning should occur earlier than year n-2.

*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)? [Y/N]

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

A:Yes

# This page contains two questions that will not be made public. These questions cannot be completed on this document

<b>Request for</b>
potentially
confidential
information 1

Please send the answer to this question in paper and electronic format, marked on the envelope "Strictly Private and Confidential – Auctioning consultation", directly to the European Commission, DG ENV, Directorate C, Unit C2, to the attention of the Head of Unit, Office BU-5 2/1, 1049 Brussels, Belgium. It will be treated confidentially and will not be disclosed publicly.

For ETS operators: what share of your expected emissions covered by the EU ETS in a given year n do you hedge and how much in advance?

year n
 year n-1
 year n-2
 earlier years (please specify)

# Request for potentially confidential information 2

Please send the answer to this question in paper and electronic format, marked on the envelope "Strictly Private and Confidential – Auctioning consultation", directly to the European Commission, DG ENV, Directorate C, Unit C2, to the attention of the Head of Unit, Office BU-5 2/1, 1049 Brussels, Belgium. It will be treated confidentially and will not be disclosed publicly.

What share of the annual quantity of allowances you intend to purchase *via* auctions would you wish to buy spot or futures respectively?

		SPOT	FU	FUTURES	
•	year n	:%		%	
•	year n-1	:%		%	
•	year n-2	:	5	%	

Please specify whether you are an:

- ETS operator; or
- Other participant.

For spot auctions:		
What s	hould be the <b>optimum</b> frequency of auctions?	
$\boxtimes$	Weekly?	
	Fortnightly?	
	Monthly?	
	Quarterly?	
	Other? Please specify:	
What s	hould be the <b>minimum</b> frequency of auctions?	
	Weekly?	
	Fortnightly?	
$\boxtimes$	Monthly?	
	Quarterly?	
	Other? Please specify:	
What s	hould be the <b>maximum</b> frequency of auctions?	
$\boxtimes$	Weekly?	
	Fortnightly?	
	Monthly?	
	Quarterly?	
	Other? Please specify:	

Please provide arguments to support your case.

A:To a large extent the optimum frequency will depend upon the number of platforms. If there is one platform (the ideal solution) then auctions can be as frequent as weekly and there should be sufficient depth for an efficient outcome to be achieved. If there are many platforms then, for the benefits of simplicity, auctions should be less often than for the one platform solution. In both cases the guiding princple should be for regular and predictable auctions.

# **Question 6**

For spot auctions, what should be the:

- Optimum auction size? annual allowances to be auctioned / number of auctions
- Minimum auction size? <u>annual allowances to be auctioned / number of auction</u>

• Maximum auction size? <u>annual allowances to be auctioned / number of auction</u>
If deemed appropriate, please indicate a range and/or distribution over different sizes.
Please provide arguments to support your case.

A:Simply dividing the number of allowances to be auctioned by the number of auctions to be held that year should produce a simple and effective answer to this question.

For futures auctions:		
What s	should be the <b>optimum</b> frequency of auctions?	
$\boxtimes$	Weekly?	
	Fortnightly?	
	Monthly?	
	Quarterly?	
	Other? Please specify:	
What s	should be the <b>minimum</b> frequency of auctions?	
	Weekly?	
	Fortnightly?	
	Monthly?	
	Quarterly?	
	Other? Please specify:	
What s	should be the <b>maximum</b> frequency of auctions?	
	Weekly?	
	Fortnightly?	
	Monthly?	
	Quarterly?	
	Other? Please specify:	

Please provide arguments to support your case.

A:This depends on the the number of platforms - if there is only one platform then there should be no problem in having weekly auctions. Given the number of allowances that must be auctioned then weekly auctions would provide predictability, stability and liquidity. Less frequent auctions may produce 'lumpy' results, which would be negative from a price discovery and predictability perspective.

Questi	ion 8	
For fut	tures auctions, what should	be the:
•	Optimum auction size?	annual allowances to be auctioned / number of auctions
•	Minimum auction size?	annual allowances to be auctioned / number of auctions
•	Maximum auction size?	annual allowances to be auctioned / number of auctions
If deen	ned appropriate, please inc	licate a range and/or distribution over different sizes.
Please	provide evidence to suppo	ort your case.
		f allowances to be auctioned by the number of auctions ce a simple and effective answer to this question.
Questi	ion 9	
Should	l volumes of spot allowand	tes be auctioned evenly throughout the year? $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$
If not, specify		stributed? (more than one answer possible) Please
	A larger proportion in the	e first 4 months of the year?
	A larger proportion in De	cember?
	A smaller proportion in J	uly and August?
	Other? Please specify:	
Questi	ion 10	
	e futures are auctioned, sho ne year in the same manner	ould the volumes for spot and futures auctions be spread $? [Y/N] \underline{Y}$
If not,	how should they differ? (r	nore than one answer possible)
	No futures auctions less t	han six months before the maturity date.
	A larger proportion in De	cember.
	A smaller proportion in J	uly and August.

Otherwise? Please specify how and comment:\_\_\_\_\_

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)? $[Y/N] N$
If yes, how long should this period be:
One week
In case futures are auctioned, should there be similar provisions with respect to the perior immediately prior to the maturity date? [Y/N] $\underline{N}$
If yes, how long should this period be:
One week
Question 12
Which dates should be avoided? (more than one answer possible)
Public holidays common in most Member States?
Days where important relevant economic data is released?
Days where emissions data are released?
Other? Please specify:
Please specify the dates you have in mind in your answers.
Question 13
Is a harmonised 10-12 hrs CET auction slot desirable? [Y/N] <u>Y</u>
If not, what alternative(s) would you suggest?
A:
Question 14
How long in advance should each element of the calendar be determined?
Annual volumes to be auctioned:
1 year in advance
2 years in advance
3 years in advance
more years in advance

Distrib	oution of annual volumes over spot and futures (if applicable):
	1 year in advance
	2 years in advance
	3 years in advance
	more years in advance
Dates of	of individual auctions:
	1 year in advance
	2 years in advance
	3 years in advance
	more years in advance
Volum	e and product type for individual auctions:
	1 year in advance
	2 years in advance
	3 years in advance
	more years in advance
Each a	uctioneer carrying out auction process (if more than one):
	1 year in advance
	2 years in advance
	3 years in advance
	more years in advance
Please	provide arguments to support your case.
	re should be as much predictability as possible, therefore, this implies setting es and product types as early as possible. Specific dates for auctions could be set

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

• in 2011:<u>60</u> % of the 2013 volume and <u>40</u>% of the 2014 volume

closer to the time so long as the volume and product types are known.

• in 2012:<u>20</u>% of the 2013 volume and <u>40</u>% of the 2014 volume

What percentage of these shares should be auctioned as futures?

• in 2011: <u>100</u>% of the 2013 share and <u>100</u>% of the 2014 share

Please provide evidence to support your case.

• in 2012: <u>100</u>% of the 2013 share and <u>100</u>% of the 2014 share

A:It is necessary to release the allowances into the market as soon as possible in order that price risks can be managed through efficient and liquid primary and secondary

markets. This implies a high level of auctioning as soon as possible in the pre-2013 period. Given the timing of the CITL then futures will have to be used for most of the allowances that are to be auctioned in the pre-Phase III period with the exception of a small percentage for within year spot auctions.

$\sim$	4 •	4	_
	uestion		h

What s	should be the rule with respect to allowances not auctioned due to force majeure
	They should automatically be added to the next auction on the calendar, irrespective of the auction process.
	They should be auctioned within one month, though leaving flexibility as to which auction(s) the EUAs should be added.
	They should be auctioned within three months, though leaving flexibility as to which auction(s) the EUAs should be added.
	Other? Please specify:
0 4	
Quest	ion 17
Is 1,00	0 allowances the most appropriate lot size? $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$
If not,	why not?
A:	

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

Is a single-round sealed-bid auction the most appropriate auction format for auctioning EU allowances? $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$		
If not, please comment on your alternative proposal?		
A:		
Question 19		
What is the most appropriate pricing rule for the auctioning of EU allowances?		
□ Uniform-pricing.		
Discriminatory-pricing.		
Indifferent.		
Please provide arguments to support your case.		
A:Uniform pricing increases predictability and minimises the risk of distorting the secondary market, it produces an unambiguous price signal.		
Owertion 20		
Question 20 Should the rules for coloring ties in the Population has		
Should the rules for solving ties in the Regulation be:		
random selection; or		
pro-rata re-scaling of bids?		
Please comment on your choice.		
A:This would seem the fairest solution.		
Question 21		
Should a reserve price apply?		
A:No. A reserve price distorts the price signal and may lead to inefficiencies. Further, the risk of intervention increases costs as it increases uncertainty. This seems both undesirable and unnecessary if the market design is sufficiently robust.		
Question 22		
In case a reserve price would apply, should the methodology/formula for calculating it be kept secret? [Y/N] $\underline{N}$		
Please comment on your choice.		

A:Any reserve price should be transparent and predictable so as to minimise the risk that a reserve price introduces. Therefore, the formula for determining a reserve price should be published.

Question 23		
Is a maximum bid-size per single entity desirable in a Uniform-price auction?		
$[Y/N] \underline{N}$		
Is a maximum bid-size per single entity desirable in a discriminatory-price auction? $[Y/N] \underline{N}$		
Please comment on your choice.		
A:A well designed market should produce a predictable and liquid market. In turn this will bolster liquidity in the secondary market. If these two conditions apply then there is no need for either restriction as no one company could achieve a dominant position.		
Question 24		
If so, what is the desirable bid-size limit (as a percentage of the volume of allowances auctioned per auction – only one choice is possible):		
10%:		
25%: More than 30%: Please specify: None		
Please comment on your choice.		
A:See answer to Question 23.		
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?		
A discriminatory-price auction format?		
A maximum bid-size per single entity?		
Please comment on your choice.		
A:Neither- intervention is not required.		

# **Question 26**

Are the following pre-registration requirements appropriate and adequate? *Identity:*  $\boxtimes$ Natural or legal person;  $\boxtimes$ 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;  $\boxtimes$ Contact details of authorised representatives and proof of authorisation; and  $\boxtimes$ CITL-Registry account details. Anything else? Please specify: *Declarations with respect to the past 5 years on absence of:*  $\boxtimes$ Indictment or conviction of serious crimes: check corporate officers, directors, principals, members or partners;  $\boxtimes$ Infringement of the rules of any regulated or unregulated market;  $\boxtimes$ Permits to conduct business being revoked or suspended;  $\boxtimes$ Infringement of procurement rules; and  $\boxtimes$ Infringement of disclosure of confidential information. Anything else? Please specify: Declarations and submission of documentation relating to:  $\boxtimes$ Proof of identity;  $\boxtimes$ Type of business;  $\boxtimes$ Participation in EU ETS or not;  $\boxtimes$ EU ETS registered installations, if any;  $\boxtimes$ Bank account contact details; Intended auctioning activity;  $\boxtimes$ Whether bidding on own account or on behalf of another beneficial owner;  $\boxtimes$ Corporate and business affiliations;  $\boxtimes$ Creditworthiness;  $\boxtimes$ Collateral; and  $\boxtimes$ Whether it carries out transactions subject to VAT or transactions exempted from VAT. Anything else? Please specify:

Question 27
Do you agree that the pre-registration requirements for admittance to EU auctions should be harmonised throughout the EU?
Yes ⊠ No □
Please comment on your choice.
A:Harmonisation is one of the key drivers of the Directive and there seems no reason to abandon this principle in this matter.
Question 28 Should the amount of information to be supplied in order to satisfy the new registration
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? Please specify:
If so, what should the differences be?
A:Pre-registration requirements should be harmonised across the EU.
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? [Y/N] _
A:
If not, why not?
A:
Please provide arguments to support your case.

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: $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$		
Other auctioneers?		
Credit and/or financial institutions?		
Other? Please specify:		
Please comment on your choice.		
A:In order to facilitate an early start to auctioning and reduce costs then it should be possible to employ third parties.		
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 No		
Please comment on your choice:		
A:If the pre-registration terms are harmonised and sufficiently robust then there should be recognition of pre-qualification agents. Where Member States do not trust or recognise one another's pre-qualification processes, the Commission should step in to offer an EU-wide level pre-qualification option, thereby transcending any inter-Member State trust issues.		
If so, should such entities be:		
Covered by the AML rules?		
Covered by MiFID?		
Covered by both?		
Other? Please specify:		
Please comment on your choice:		
A:		

Question 32
Should the Regulation prohibit the multiplicity of pre-registration checks in the case of Member States auctioning jointly?
Yes ⊠ No □
Please comment on your choice.
A:See answer to question 31.
Question 33
Do you agree that the $level$ of collateral accepted in EUA auctions should be harmonised for all EU ETS auctions? [Y/N] $\underline{Y}$
If so, how should they be harmonised?
A:The level of collateral should be aligned with that required in the secondary market, for example, the standard terms and conditions as used by the ICE exchange.
If not, why not?
A:
Question 34
Do you agree that the <i>type</i> of collateral accepted in EUA auctions should be harmonised for all EU ETS auctions? $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$
If so, how should they be harmonised?
A:The type of collateral accepted should be aligned with the secondary market.
If not, why not?
A:

Consultation on design and organisation of emissions allowance additions
Do you agree that 100% collateral in electronic money transfer ought to be deposited upfront at a central counterparty or credit institution designated by the auctioneer to access spot auctions? [Y/N] $\underline{N}$
If not, why not?
A:This is not necessary for spot. Therefore, there should be no obligation to provide collateral for spot transactions. If one party defaults, then there should be some form of participation deterrent, but no collateral obligation. Quantities unsold can be transferred to the next auction.
What alternative(s) would you suggest? Please provide arguments to support your case:
A:
Question 36
In case futures are auctioned, should a clearing house be involved to mitigate credit and market risks? [Y/N] $\underline{Y}$
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:
A:The rules as currently utilised by exchange clearing houses should be employed - these rules are well-understood and there seems no reason why the requirements for primary and secondary markets should not be aligned.
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.

A:In accordance with the prevailing practice in the secondary market, payment should be made within 7 to 10 days.

Irrespective of the payment procedure, should the Regulation fix a maximum delay time for payment and delivery to take place? $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$	y of
If yes; what should it be?	
4 working days	
5 working days	
6 working days	
7 working days	
Other? Please specify: 7 to 10 days	

# **Question 39**

Should the Regulation provide any specific provisions for the handling of payment and delivery incidents or failures?  $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$ 

If yes, what should they be?

A:Practice should be aligned with the secondary market.

# **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?  $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$ 

If not, why not?

A:

If so, are the matters enumerated below complete? [Y/N]

- The designation of the parties' to the trade.
- The characteristics of the auctioned product:
  - o <u>Nature</u>: EUAs or EUAAs, trading period concerned.
  - o <u>Date of delivery: date at which winning bidders will receive the allowances on</u> their registry account.
  - o <u>Date of payment</u>: date at which payment will be required from winning bidders.
  - o Lot size: number of allowances associated with one unit of the auctioned good.
- Events of `force majeure' and resulting consequences.

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

- 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.

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

A:Practice should be aligned with the secondary market.

Λ.,	estion	11
Qu	esuon	41

Quest	1011 41
	d the Regulation provide for rules on jurisdiction and the mutual recognition and tement of judgments? $[Y/N]_{-}$
If so, s	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:
A:	
If not,	why not?
A:	
Questi	ion 42
Which	a auction model is preferable?
$\boxtimes$	Direct bidding?
	Indirect bidding?
	Both?
Please	comment on your choice.
A:Any	party should be able to participate in the auction subject to being able to

demonstrate its creditworthiness. Any further restrictions on participation should be

clearly objective, and must not be based on nationality and/or on organisation type or size. Therefore, there should be no requirement to use intermediaries.

# **Question 43**

If an indirect model is used, what share of the total volume of EU allowances could be auctioned through indirect bidding?  $\underline{0\%}$ 

Please provide arguments to support your case.

A:A direct model should be used.

# **Question 44**

If the primary participants model is used, what provisions would be desirable for mitigating disadvantages of restricting direct access (more than one answer is possible):

$\boxtimes$	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? 250,000tn p.a.
	Disallow primary participants trading on their own account?
	Impose strict separation of own-account trading from trading on behalf of indirect bidders?
	Other? Please specify:

# **Question 45**

-	primary participants' model is used, what conflict of interest requirements should posed? (more than one answer possible)
	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, please specify:
Quest	ion 46
_	obligations should apply to primary participants acting in EU-wide auctions as:
vviiat	Intermediaries? A:
•	Market makers? A:
Dlassa	
Piease	provide arguments to support your case.
Quest	ion 47
	what conditions should auctioning through exchanges be allowed (more than one r possible):
	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? Please specify:
Please	provide arguments to support your case.
A:Bid it is ou	ders must have some form of contractual relationship with the exchange, given that it view that the requirement for trading in the primary market should be aligned ne secondary market, this implies membership.

O	uestion	48
v	ucsuon	70

Should direct auctions	be	allowed	through:
------------------------	----	---------	----------

- 1) Third party service providers?  $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$
- 2) Public authorities? [Y/N] Y

Please comment on your selection:

A:Either possibility is acceptable providing that the rules for participation are harmonised and the auctions are conducted appropriately.

# **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?  $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$ 

If not, why not?

A:

#### **Ouestion 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? A:Small amounts of volumes allocated to non-competive bids might be considered appropriate for spot auctions.
- uniform-price auctions? A:Small amounts of volumes allocated to non-competive bids might be considered appropriate for spot auctions.

# **Question 51**

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

5%
10%
Other? Please specify:

Please comment on your choice.

A:If access is non-discriminatory then small emitters should be able to participate easily (this will be further faciliated by lot sizes of 1000 allowances). If correctly designed, the

primary marklet will enable a robust secondary market and this will also provide an easy means by which small emitters can secure their required allowances. Therefore, any share of spot auctions allocated through non-competitive bids should be small.

Question 52
What rule should apply for accessing non-competitive bids (more than one answer possible):
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? Please specify:
Please comment on your choice.
A:
Question 53
What should be the maximum bid-size allowed for SMEs covered by the EU ETS and small emitters submitting non-competitive bids?
5 000 EUAs
☐ 10 000 EUAs
25 000 EUAs
Over 25 000 EUAs, please specify exact size and give reasons for your answer:
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? $[Y/N] N$
If so, please specify:
A:

Question 55
What should be the minimum period of time before the auction date for the release of the notice to auction?
2 weeks  1 month  2 months
Other Please specify: Greater than 2 months should be possible
Please comment on your proposal.
A:As much notice as possible should be provided.
Question 56
What should be the minimum period of time before the auction date for the submission of the intention to bid?
1 week
Other $\boxtimes$ Please specify: $\underline{0}$
Please comment on your proposal.
A:If pre-qualification requirements are met then it is unnecessary to give an 'intention to bid'. Given the frequency of auctions that will be required the use of an 'intention to bid' system is unnecessarily cumbersome and will add to the costs of running the auctions.
Question 57
Are there any specific provisions that need to be highlighted in:
The notice to auction?
The intention to bid?
Both?
Please specify what they are.
A:If rules are not harmonised EU-wide, the applicable auction rules would need to be presented clearly (including any restrictions). The notice should also say when results will be released.
Question 58

What information should be disclosed after the auction:
Clearing price (if allowances are awarded on a uniform-price basis or in the car 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 no competitive bids (if applicable)?
☐ Total volume of allowances allocated?
Anything else? Please specify: The price stack of bids (including unsatisfied bid with associated volumes. The total amount of any unsold allowances that are to carried into another auction.
Question 59
What should be the maximum delay for the announcement of auction results?
5 minutes 30 minutes 3
1 hour
Other Please specify:
Please comment on your proposal.
A:The potential for uncertainty to affect the secondary market should be minimised.
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? [Y/N] $\underline{Y}$
If so, what may they be? <u>Provided that information is not commercially sensitive, all information should be provided at the same time, in English and the relevant national language</u> . The unauthorised, discriminatory release of information should be prohibited.
Question 61
Should an auction monitor be appointed centrally to monitor all EU auctions?
$[Y/N] \underline{Y}$
If not, why not?

EU Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) – Consultation on design and organisation of emissions allowance auctions
A:
Question 62
Do you agree that the Regulation should contain general principles on [mark those that you agree with, $\square$ ]:
the designation and mandate of the auction monitor; and
cooperation between the auctioneer(s) and the auction monitor?
If not, why not?
A:
Should these be supplemented by operational guidance, possibly through Commission guidelines? [Y/N] $\underline{Y}$
If not, why not?
A:
Question 63
Is there a need for harmonised market abuse provisions in the Regulation to prevent insider dealing and market manipulation? $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$
If not, why not?
A:
Please comment on your choice outlining the provisions you deem necessary and stating the reasons why.
A:Currently, discussions are ongoing on the desirability of having a market-abuse regime for the energy sector. It remains unclear whether a specific regime for the energy sector this will cover EUAs or not. Any provisions for EUAs should be aligned with the outcome of these discussions.
Question 64
Should the Regulation provide for harmonised enforcement measures to sanction [mark those that you agree with, $\boxtimes$ ]:
Non-compliance with its provisions?
Market abuse?

Please provide arguments to support your case.

A:Harmonised measures are necessary in order to ensure a level playing field across the EU- this is the only way to ensure a robust market.

Ques	tion 65	
Shoul	ld the enforcement measures include [mark those that you agree with, ⊠]:	
	The suspension of the auctioneer(s) and/or bidders from the EU-wide auctions? If so, for how long should such suspension last?	
	Financial penalties? If so, at what level should such penalties be fixed?	
	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?	
$\boxtimes$	Anything else? Please specify:	
Please	e provide arguments to support your case.	
A:Currently, discussions are ongoing on the desirability of having a market-abuse regime for the energy sector. It remains unclear whether this will cover EUAs or not. However, any rules which apply should be enforced with equal weight EU-wide. Only then will a level-playing field exist.		
_	tion 66	
	ld such enforcement measures apply at:	
	EU level?	
	National level?	
	Both?	
Please	e comment on your choice.	
	y rules which apply should be enforced with equal weight EU-wide. Only then will el-playing field exist.	
Ques	tion 67	
Who	should enforce compliance with the Regulation (more than one answer is possible):	
	The auction monitor?	

EU Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) – Consultation on design and organisation of emissions allowance auctions		
A competent authority at EU level?		
A competent authority at national level?		
Other? Please specify:		
Please provide evidence to support your case.		
A:A competent authority at EU level, with the auctioneer being the front-line compliance monitor.		
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)		
<u>3</u> Limited number of coordinated auction processes.		
<u>1</u> Full centralisation based on a single EU-wide auction process.		
The hybrid approach where different auction processes are cleared through a centralised system.		
Please give arguments to support your case.		
A:Full centralisation will allow for the speedy introduction of auctioning and ensure that price signals are robust (this in turn will facilitate the secondary market). It is the simplest and most transparent method of arranging for the auctioning of allowances. However, the hybrid approach could be a good temporary approach which could be changed to a central approach later.		
Question 69		
If a limited number of coordinated auction processes develops, what should be the maximum number?		
⊠ 2		
□ 3		
7		
more than 7, please specify:		
Please give arguments to support your case.		
A:If co-ordinated auctions are necessary then the number of auction processes should be minimised.		

Is there a need for a transitional phase in order to develop gradually the optimal auction infrastructure? [Y/N] \_

If so, what kind of transitional arrangements would you recommend? <u>If the Commission</u> is not confident that EUA auctioning processes will function, and allowances will not be auctioned early then the fall-back option should be for a simple issuance of EUAs into the market as is done in Germany at present.

# **Question 71**

Accessibility and user friendliness:

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

*Technical capabilities of auctioneers:*  $\boxtimes$ 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;  $\boxtimes$ appropriate investment in keeping the system up-to-date and in line with ongoing market and technological developments; and  $\boxtimes$ relevant professional licences, high ethical and quality control standards, compliance with financial and market integrity rules. Integrity:  $\boxtimes$ guarantee confidentiality of bids, ability to manage market sensitive information in an appropriate manner;  $\boxtimes$ duly protected electronic systems and appropriate security procedures with regards to identification and data transmission;  $\boxtimes$ appropriate rules on avoiding and monitoring conflicts of interest; and  $\boxtimes$ full cooperation with the auction monitor. Reliability:  $\boxtimes$ robust organisation and IT systems;  $\boxtimes$ adequate fallback measures in case of unexpected events;  $\boxtimes$ minimisation of the risk of cancelling an individual auction once announced;  $\boxtimes$ minimisation of the risk of failing functionalities (e.g. access to the bidding platform for certain potential bidders); and  $\boxtimes$ fallback system in case of IT problems on the bidder side.

Consultation on design and organisation of emissions allowance auctions  $\bowtie$ fair, concise, comprehensible and easily accessible information on how to participate in auctions;  $\boxtimes$ short and simple pre-registration forms;  $\boxtimes$ clear and simple electronic tools;  $\boxtimes$ (option of) accessibility of platforms through a dedicated internet interface;  $\boxtimes$ ability of the auction platform to connect to and communicate with proprietary trading systems used by bidders;  $\boxtimes$ adequate and regular training (including mock auctions);  $\boxtimes$ detailed user guidance on how to participate in the auction; and  $\boxtimes$ ability to test identification and access to the auction. Please elaborate if any of these requirements need not be included. A: Please elaborate what additional requirements would be desirable. A: Neither auctioneers nor Member States should be able to purchase allowances in the auction. Credit rating for auctioneers (if not state entities) should be high enough to cover delivery risk. **Question 72** What provisions on administrative fees should the Regulation include (more than one answer is possible)? General principles on proportionality, fairness and non-discrimination. Rules on fee structure. Rules on the amount of admissible fees.  $\boxtimes$ Other? Please specify: Please provide arguments to support your case. A:The administrative fees should be recovered from the auction proceeds.

#### **Question 73**

EU Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) -

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

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

A:Any potential changes should be clearly identified with a reasonable notice for the implementation of changes.

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

A:Any potential changes should be clearly identified with a reasonable notice for the implementation of changes.

Questi	on 74
	one of the following options is the most appropriate in case a Member State does d 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 o	ther option would you envisage? Please specify:
A:The	allowances should be released to the market as soon as possible.
Questi	on 75
its com	a sanction apply to a Member State that does not auction allowances in line with mitments? $[Y/N] \underline{Y}$ what form should that sanction take?
	allowances should be released to the market as soon as possible with any costs by the Member State.
Aviatio	on
Questi	on 76
•	eneral rule throughout the trading period, in your opinion, are early auctions ary? $[Y/N]_{-}$

5-10% in year n-2, 10-20% in year n-1, remainder in year n

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

	sions Trading Scheme (ETS) – tion on design and organisation of emissions allowance auctions
	10-20% in year n-2, 20-30% in year n-1, remainder in year n 20-30% in year n-2, 30-35% in year n-1, remainder in year n Other? Please specify:
Questi	on 77
Do you If so, v	a think there is a need to auction EUAA futures? [Y/N] _ why?
A:	

# This page contains two questions that will not be made public. These questions cannot be completed on this document

<b>Request for</b>
potentially
confidential
information 3

Please send the answer to this question in paper and electronic format, marked on the envelope "Strictly Private and Confidential – Auctioning consultation", directly to the European Commission, DG ENV, Directorate C, Unit C2, to the attention of the Head of Unit, Office BU-5 2/1, 1049 Brussels, Belgium. It will be treated confidentially and will not be disclosed publicly.

For aircraft operators covered by the EU ETS:

Have you determined a corporate hedging strategy for carbon needs? Yes [ ] No [ ]

If so, what share of your expected emissions covered by the EU ETS in a given year n do you (intend to) hedge and how much in advance?

year n : \_\_\_\_%
year n-1 : \_\_\_\_%
year n-2 : \_\_\_\_%

# Request for potentially confidential information 4

Please send the answer to this question in paper and electronic format, marked on the envelope "Strictly Private and Confidential – Auctioning consultation", directly to the European Commission, DG ENV, Directorate C, Unit C2, to the attention of the Head of Unit, Office BU-5 2/1, 1049 Brussels, Belgium. It will be treated confidentially and will not be disclosed publicly.

What share of the annual quantity of allowances you intend to purchase *via* auctions would you wish to buy spot or futures respectively?

		SPOT	FUTURES
•	year n	:%	%
•	year n-1	:%	%
•	year n-2	:	

Question 78
What should be the optimal frequency and size of EUAA auctions:
2 auctions per year of around 15 million EUAAs?
3 auctions per year of around 10 million EUAAs?
More than 3 auctions per year? Please specify:
Please comment on your choice.
A:
Question 79
What would be your preferred timing for EUAA auctions:
Equally spread throughout the year?
November – March?
Other? Please specify:
Question 80
Should any of the EUAA auction design elements be different compared to EUA auctions (see section 3)? [Y/N] _
If so, please specify and comment on your choice.
A:
Question 81  Do you agree there is no need for a maximum bid-size? [Y/N] _  If not, why not?
A:
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 checkperformed by the auctioneer(s)? [Y/N] _

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.
A:
Question 83
In your opinion, is there a specific need to allow for non-competitive bids in EUAA auctions?
A:
Would this be the case even when applying a uniform clearing price format?
A:
Please provide arguments to support your case.
Question 84
Do you agree that there is no need for any specific provisions for EUAA auctions as regards [mark those that you agree with, $\boxtimes$ ]:
Involvement of primary participants, exchanges or third party service providers?
Guarantees and financial assurance?
Payment and delivery?
☐ Information disclosure?
Auction monitoring?
Auction monitoring?  Preventing anti-competitive behaviour and/or market manipulation?
Preventing anti-competitive behaviour and/or market manipulation?
Preventing anti-competitive behaviour and/or market manipulation?  Enforcement?

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)

_	Limited number of coordinated auction processes.	
_	Full centralisation based on a single EU-wide auction process.	
_	Hybrid approach where different auction processes are cleared through a centralised system.	
Does y	our choice differ from the approach preferred for EUAs? [Y/N]_	
Please	provide arguments to support your case.	
A:		
Question 86		
	agree that there is no need for any specific provisions for EUAA auctions as . [mark those that you agree with, $\boxtimes$ ]:	
	Requirements for the auctioneer(s) and auction processes?	
	Administrative fees?	
	Rules to ensure appropriate and timely preparation of the auctions?	
If not, 1	please describe in detail what rules would be needed and why.	
A:		