

# Questions and Answers

## On the Benchmarks Regulation (BMR)



## Table of Contents

1. Purpose and status .....	3
2. Legislative references and abbreviations .....	3
3. Summary table .....	4
4. Questions and Answers on the scope of the Regulation .....	7
5. Questions and Answers on definitions .....	14
6. Questions and Answers on supervised contributors .....	24
7. Questions and Answers on authorisation, registration, recognition and endorsement ...	26
8. Questions and Answers on requirements for users of benchmarks .....	30
9. Questions and Answers on transitional provisions.....	34
10. Questions and Answers on EU Climate Transition Benchmarks, EU Paris-aligned Benchmarks and sustainability-related disclosures for benchmarks .....	36

## 1. Purpose and status

1. The purpose of this document is to promote common, uniform and consistent supervisory approaches and practices in the day-to-day application of [Benchmarks Regulation](#) ((EU) 2016/1011, “BMR”). It does this by providing responses to questions asked by the public, financial market participants, competent authorities and other stakeholders. The question and answer (Q&A) tool is a practical convergence tool used to promote common supervisory approaches and practices under Article 29(2) of the ESMA Regulation. Further information on ESMA’s Q&A process is available on our website.
2. ESMA intends to update this document on a regular basis and, for ease of reference, ESMA provides the date each question was first published as well as the date/s of amendment beside each question. A table of all questions in this document and dates is provided in Section I.
3. Additional questions on BMR may be submitted to ESMA through the Q&A tool on our website ([here](#)). Please see the guidance available on our website before submitting your question.

## 2. Legislative references and abbreviations

### Legislative references

<i>ESMA Regulation</i>	Regulation (EU) No 1095/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 establishing a European Supervisory Authority (European Securities and Markets Authority), amending Decision No 716/2009/EC and repealing Commission Decision 2009/77/EC <sup>1</sup>
<i>BMR</i>	Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2016 on indices used as benchmarks in financial instruments and financial contracts or to measure the performance of investment funds and amending Directives 2008/48/EC and 2014/17/EU and Regulation (EU) No 596/2014 (Text with EEA relevance) <sup>2</sup>

### Abbreviations

<i>EU</i>	European Union
<i>ESMA</i>	European Securities and Markets Authority

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 331, 15.12.2010, p. 84

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 171, 29.6.2016, p. 1–65

### 3. Summary table

Subject	Q	Topic of the question	Level 1 / Level 2 provision	Last updated
Scope of BMR				
	4.1	Central banks	Article 2(2)(a) BMR	29/09/2017
	4.2	Contribution to the €STR	Article 3(1)(8) BMR	11/07/2019
	4.3	Single reference price	Article 2(2)(d) BMR	29/09/2017
	4.4	BMR outside the EU	Article 2(1) BMR	08/11/2017
	4.5	Commodity benchmarks	Article 2(2)(g) BMR	05/02/2018
	4.6	Delegated Regulations	Title III BMR	30/01/2019
	4.7	Public authorities	Article 2(2)(b) BMR	29/07/2021
<u>Answer provided by the European Commission in accordance with article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation</u>				
Definitions				
	5.1	Family of benchmarks	Article 3(1)(4) BMR	29/09/2017
	5.2	Use of a benchmark	Article 3(1)(7) BMR	29/09/2017
	5.3	Calculation agent	Article 3(1)(7) BMR	11/07/2018
	5.4/5/6	Investment funds	Article 3(1)(3) BMR	05/02/2018
	5.7	Regulated data benchmark	Article 3(1)(24) BMR	11/07/2018
	5.8	Systematic internalisers	Article 3(1)(16) BMR	26/09/2018
	5.9	Certificates	Article 3(1)(7) BMR	26/09/2018
	5.10	NAV	Article 3(1)(24) BMR	26/09/2018
	5.11	Bilateral agreement on exchanged collateral	Article 3(1)(7) BMR	07/11/2018
	5.12/	Methodology and input	Article 3(1)(14) BMR	18/12/2018
	5.13	data	Article 3(1)(24) BMR	18/12/2018
	5.14	Commodity benchmark	Article 3(1)(23) BMR	11/07/2019
	5.15	Readily available data	Article 3(1)(8) BMR	23/06/2022
<u>Answer provided by the European Commission in accordance with article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation</u>				
Supervised contributors				
	6.1	Requirements during transitional period	Article 16 BMR	22/03/2018
Authorisation, registration, recognition and endorsement				
	7.1	Requirements for		

	administrators	Article 34(4) BMR	14/12/2017
7.2	Endorsment application	Article 33(1) BMR	26/09/2018
7.3	Benchmark statement	Article 27 BMR	26/09/2018
7.4	Member State of reference	Article 32(4) BMR	23/05/2019
7.5	IOSCO Principles	Article 32(2) BMR	23/05/2019
7.6	IOSCO Principles for PRAs	Annex II BMR	03/12/2019
7.7	Legal representative	Article 32(3) BMR	03/12/2019

#### Requirements for users

8.1	Written plans timing	Article 28(2) BMR	14/12/2017
8.2/3	Written plans features	Article 28(2) BMR	26/09/2018
8.4	Prospectuses	Article 29(2) BMR	24/05/2018
8.5	Register of administrators	Article 36 BMR	23/05/2019
8.6	Temporary disruptions	Article 28(2) BMR	28/01/2022

#### Transitional provisions

9.1	EU index providers providing benchmarks as of 30/06/16	Article 51(1) BMR	05/07/2017
9.2	EU index providers providing benchmarks after 30/06/16	Article 51(3) BMR	05/07/2017
9.3	Third country benchmarks	Article 51(5) BMR	31/03/2021
9.4	Critical benchmarks	Article 51(4a) and Article 51(4b) BMR	06/11/2020

#### EU Climate Transition Benchmarks, EU Paris-aligned Benchmarks and sustainability-related disclosures for benchmarks

10.1	Transparency of methodology	Article 13(1)(d) BMR	28/05/2021
10.2	Transparency of methodology	Article 13(1)(d) BMR	28/05/2021
10.3	Transparency of methodology	Article 13(1)(d) BMR	28/05/2021
10.4	Benchmark Statement	Article 27(2a) BMR	28/05/2021
10.5	Benchmark Statement	Article 27(2a) BMR	28/05/2021
10.6	Benchmark Statement	Article 27(2a) BMR	01/04/2022
10.7	Benchmark Statement / Transparency of methodology	Article 27(2a) and Article 13(1)(d) BMR	28/05/2021
10.8	Benchmark Statement	Article 27(2a) BMR	28/05/2021
10.9	Transparency of methodology	Article 13(1)(d) BMR	28/05/2021
10.10	Benchmark Statement	Article 27(2a) BMR	28/05/2021
10.11	EU CTB and EU PAB	Article 19a(2) and Article 27(2a) BMR	16/07/2021
10.12	Benchmark Statement	Article 27(2a) BMR	19/11/2021
10.13	Benchmark Statement	Article 27(2a) BMR	19/11/2021

Answer provided by the European Commission in accordance with  
article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation

---

## 4. Questions and Answers on the scope of the Regulation

### Application of the Regulation to EU and third country central banks

Updated: 29/09/2017

**Q4.1 Does the BMR apply to EU and third country central banks and the benchmarks they provide?**

**A4.1** Point (a) of Article 2(2) of the BMR states that the BMR does not apply to “a central bank”. ESMA considers that the term “a central bank” encompasses both EU central banks (i.e. members of the European System of Central Banks) and non-EU central banks, and therefore that the BMR does not apply to EU nor to third country central banks.

Benchmarks provided by EU and third country central banks are not to be included in the register referred in Article 36 of the BMR, but ESMA considers that supervised entities in the Union are nevertheless allowed to use such benchmarks.

Where a supervised entity in the Union uses a benchmark provided by a central bank, ESMA considers that the supervised entity should, in relation to such benchmark, produce and maintain the written plans referred to in Article 28(2) of the BMR.

Finally, ESMA considers that Article 16 of the BMR is to be applied to EU supervised contributors contributing input data (according to Article 3(1)(8)) to a central bank.

### The contribution to the euro short-term rate (€STR)

Updated: 11/07/2019

**Q4.2 Is the euro short-term rate (€STR) based on contributions of input data as defined in Article 3(1)(8)?**

**A4.2** No, the €STR is not based on contributions of input data as defined in Article 3(1)(8).

The ECB is the administrator of €STR and has overall responsibility for providing the rate. €STR is exclusively based on borrowing transactions in euro conducted with financial counterparties that banks report to the ECB in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 1333/2014 concerning statistics on the money markets ([MMSR Regulation](#))<sup>3</sup>. In particular, €STR is based on daily confidential statistical information relating to (unsecured) money market transactions collected in accordance with the MMSR

---

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.ecb.europa.eu/ecb/legal/pdf/oj\\_jol\\_2014\\_359\\_r\\_0006\\_en\\_txt.pdf](https://www.ecb.europa.eu/ecb/legal/pdf/oj_jol_2014_359_r_0006_en_txt.pdf)

Regulation. Additional details on the methodology of €STR are available on the dedicated ECB document "[The euro short-term rate \(€STR\) methodology and policies](https://www.ecb.europa.eu/paym/initiatives/interest_rate_benchmarks/shared/pdf/ecb.ESTER_methodology_and_policies.en.pdf)"<sup>4</sup>.

€STR is therefore not produced with "contribution of input data" as defined in Article 3(1)(8) of BMR. This is because the data is already available to the administrator of €STR (the ECB), and this data is provided to the ECB for regulatory purposes, in compliance with the MMSR Regulation. BMR Article 3(1)(8) requires input data to be provided for the purpose of determining the benchmark and this is not factually the case for €STR.

Against this background, banks providing data to the ECB in accordance with MMSR should not be considered supervised contributors under BMR because the BMR definition of "contribution of input data" is not met and therefore these banks are not required to apply Article 16 of BMR.

## Exemption on single reference price

Updated: 29/09/2017

**Q4.3 Article 2(2)(d) BMR exempts the application of the BMR for "the provision of a single reference price for any financial instrument listed in Section C of Annex I to Directive 2014/65/EU". What does "single reference price" mean?**

**A4.3** Article 2(2)(d) BMR excludes prices from the scope of the Benchmarks Regulation that are only reflecting the value of "any financial instrument." With its singular use of the term, the exclusion would not cover e.g. a basket of securities or an index based on the price of more than one financial instrument.

Similarly, Recital 18 of the BMR states that single prices or single value reference prices should not be considered benchmarks under the BMR and it includes the example of a price of a single security the provision of which does not include any calculation, input data or discretion.

Following Recital 13 of the BMR on the types of use of a benchmark, the setting and reviewing weights within a combination of benchmarks, which is generally also only based on a simple average or similar figure if any, should not amount to the provision of a benchmark as such an activity does not involve discretion. This discrimination

<sup>4</sup> [https://www.ecb.europa.eu/paym/initiatives/interest\\_rate\\_benchmarks/shared/pdf/ecb.ESTER\\_methodology\\_and\\_policies.en.pdf](https://www.ecb.europa.eu/paym/initiatives/interest_rate_benchmarks/shared/pdf/ecb.ESTER_methodology_and_policies.en.pdf)



further supports the exemption of single reference prices, based on little or no calculation and with no discretion involved, by way of analogy.

Other EU legislation refers to a price of a financial instrument published by one trading venue and referred to by another trading venue as a “reference price” (Article 4(1)(a) of Regulation (EU) 600/2014 (MiFIR)). Such “reference prices” as published by trading venues may also include a simple calculation, e.g. a re-calculation as a “per unit” price or an averaging, but no complex methodology is applied, nor is additional data being processed. ESMA considers that the term “single reference price” should be interpreted similarly.

## Application of the Regulation outside the EU

Updated: 08/11/2017

### **Q4.4 Does the provision of and contribution to benchmarks that are used outside the European Union only fall within the scope of the BMR?**

**A4.4** The scope of the Benchmarks Regulation is defined in Article 2(1) of the BMR. As a general rule Article 2(1) of the BMR provides that the BMR “*applies to the provision of benchmarks, the contribution of input data to a benchmark and the use of a benchmark within the Union*”. The term “*provision of a benchmark*” is defined in point (5) Article 3(1) of the BMR.

The BMR’s objective is to ensure the proper functioning of the European market and a high degree of consumer and investor protection vis-à-vis benchmarks *at Union level*, as underlined in Recital 6 of the BMR. In contrast, it is not the ambition of the BMR to protect users of benchmarks worldwide, possibly conflicting with any applicable third country regimes. Accordingly, Article 29 of the BMR refers to the use of a benchmark *in the Union*.

ESMA therefore considers that the BMR does not apply to the provision of benchmarks that are exclusively used outside the Union. The same reasoning would apply to the contribution of input data with respect to a benchmark that is exclusively used outside the Union. An administrator providing a benchmark exclusively to users outside the Union would have to comply with any applicable third country regimes with respect to benchmarks.

## Commodity benchmarks

Updated: 05/02/2018

### **Q4.5 How should the threshold for the exemption for commodity benchmarks under Article 2(2)(g)(ii) of the BMR be calculated?**

**A4.5** Article 2(2)(g) of the BMR excludes from the scope of the BMR a commodity benchmark that is based on submissions from contributors the majority of which are non-supervised entities and which both of the following conditions apply:

- I. it is referenced by financial instruments for which a request for admission to trading has been made on only one trading venue or which are traded on only one such trading venue; and
- II. the total notional value of financial instruments referencing the benchmark does not exceed EUR 100 million.

The last condition refers to the “*total notional value of financial instruments*”. Financial instruments is defined in Article 3(1)(16) of the BMR as any of the instruments listed in Section C of Annex I of MiFID II for which a request for admission to trading on a trading venue has been made or which are traded on a trading venue or systematic internaliser. Unlike the thresholds mentioned in Article 20 (*critical benchmarks*) and Article 24 (*significant benchmarks*) of the BMR, the second condition in Article 2(2)(g) does not refer to financial contracts (a term defined in Article 3(1)(18) of the BMR).

In order to perform the calculation for the thresholds of critical benchmarks (Article 20(1)(a)) and of significant benchmarks (Article 24(1)(a)), Article 20(6)(a) of the BMR empowers the Commission to adopt delegated acts to specify how the nominal amount of financial instruments other than derivatives, the notional amount of derivatives and the net asset value of investment funds are to be assessed.

The Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/66<sup>5</sup> on this matter has been published in the EU Official Journal on 17/01/2018 and does not directly apply to commodity benchmarks. Nevertheless, ESMA considers that the methodology to be used for calculating the total value of financial instruments referencing a commodity benchmark under Art.2(2)(g)(ii) of the BMR should follow the specifications included in Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/66.

**Scope of application of the Commission Delegated Regulations adopted under the BMR**  
Updated: 30/01/2019

---

<sup>5</sup> The text of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/66 is available here:  
[http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L\\_.2018.012.01.0011.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:012:TOC](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2018.012.01.0011.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:012:TOC)

**Q4.6 Is the scope of application of the Commission Delegated Regulations adopted pursuant to the BMR identical to the scope of the related requirements in the BMR?**

**A4.6** Yes, the scope of application of the Commission Delegated Regulations adopted pursuant to the BMR (the “Delegated Regulations”) is identical to the scope of the corresponding requirement specified in the BMR, including the transitional provisions of Article 51 of the BMR<sup>6</sup>.

Title III of the BMR provides specific requirements for different types of benchmarks. In particular,

- Article 17 of the BMR provides the requirements for **regulated-data benchmarks** and specifies that some of the requirements on input data, and in particular Article 11(3) of the BMR, do not apply. Therefore, Article 3 of the Delegated Regulation on input data<sup>7</sup> does not apply to those benchmarks. Further, the governance and control requirements for supervised contributors (Article 16 of the BMR) and the requirements on the code of conduct (Article 15 of the BMR) are not applicable to regulated-data benchmarks. Therefore, the related Delegated Regulations on supervised contributors<sup>8</sup> and on code of conduct<sup>9</sup> also do not apply to regulated-data benchmarks;
- Article 18 of the BMR defines the requirements for **interest rate benchmarks**. It specifies that Annex I shall apply to the provision of, and contribution to, interest rate benchmarks in addition to, or as a substitute for, the requirements of Title II. Therefore, all of the Delegated Regulations adopted pursuant to the BMR apply to interest rate benchmarks, except for:
  - the Delegated Regulation on the oversight function<sup>10</sup>, and

---

<sup>6</sup> See question on “Article 16 during transitional period”

<sup>7</sup> The Commission delegated regulation (EU) 2018/1638 of 13 July 2018 supplementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to regulatory technical standards specifying further how to ensure that input data is appropriate and verifiable, and the internal oversight and verification procedures of a contributor that the administrator of a critical or significant benchmark has to ensure are in place where the input data is contributed from a front office function: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L\\_.2018.274.01.0006.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:274:TOC](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2018.274.01.0006.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:274:TOC)

<sup>8</sup> The Commission delegated regulation (EU) 2018/1640 of 13 July 2018 supplementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to regulatory technical standards specifying further the governance and control requirements for supervised contributors: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L\\_.2018.274.01.0016.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:274:TOC](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2018.274.01.0016.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:274:TOC)

<sup>9</sup> The Commission delegated regulation (EU) 2018/1639 of 13 July 2018 supplementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to regulatory technical standards specifying further the elements of the code of conduct to be developed by administrators of benchmarks that are based on input data from contributors: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L\\_.2018.274.01.0011.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:274:TOC](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2018.274.01.0011.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:274:TOC)

<sup>10</sup> The Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/1637 of 13 July 2018 supplementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to regulatory technical standards for the procedures and characteristics of the oversight function: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L\\_.2018.274.01.0001.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:274:TOC](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2018.274.01.0001.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:274:TOC)

- the Delegated Regulation on supervised contributors.

Instead, paragraph 3 of Annex I on the oversight function and paragraphs 6 to 12 of Annex I on the contributor systems and controls apply.

- Article 19 of the BMR defines the requirements for **commodity benchmarks**. It specifies that Annex II shall apply instead of the requirements of Title II to the provision of, and contribution to, commodity benchmarks, unless the benchmark in question is a regulated-data benchmark or is based on submissions by contributors the majority of which are supervised entities. Moreover, for critical commodity benchmarks whose underlying asset is gold, silver or platinum, the requirements of Title II shall apply instead of Annex II. Accordingly, the Delegated Regulations related to the requirements of Title II shall apply only to commodity benchmarks subject to the corresponding requirements in Title II.
- Article 25 of the BMR defines the requirements that an administrator may choose not to apply for **significant benchmarks**. In particular, administrators of significant benchmarks may opt out from the requirements related to the contribution of input data from a front office function (Article 11(3) of the BMR) and the minimum elements of the code of conduct (Article 15(2) of the BMR). Therefore, the corresponding provisions in the Delegated Regulations may not apply to significant benchmarks. These provisions are:
  - Article 3 of the Delegated Regulation on input data;
  - the Delegated Regulation on the code of conduct, as it is a further specification of the elements listed in Article 15(2) of the BMR.

It must be noted, however, that, pursuant to Article 25(3) of the BMR, a competent authority may decide that the administrator of a significant benchmark has nevertheless to apply one of these requirements. In such case, the corresponding provisions in the Delegated Regulations also apply.

- Article 26 of the BMR sets out the requirements that the administrator may choose not to apply for **non-significant benchmarks**. In particular, such administrator may choose not to apply the required minimum elements of the code of conduct (Article 15(2) of the BMR). The Delegated Regulation on the code of conduct is a further specification of Article 15(2) of the BMR, it shall therefore not apply to non-significant benchmarks whose administrators have opted not to apply Article 15(2) of the BMR. In addition, Article 5(5), Article 11(5), Article 13(3) and Article 16(5) of the BMR specify that the corresponding Delegated Regulations shall not cover or apply to

the provision of, or contribution to non-significant benchmarks. Instead, ESMA's guidelines on non-significant benchmarks apply.

## Application of the Regulation to EU and third country public authorities

*Answer provided by the European Commission in accordance with article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation*

Updated: 29/07/2021

**Q4.7 Can supervised entities in the Union use benchmarks provided by 3rd country public authorities after the end of the transitional period applicable to 3rd country benchmarks?**

**A4.7** Article 2(2)(b) of the Benchmark Regulation excludes from the scope of application public authorities where they contribute data, provide or have control over the provision of, benchmarks for public policy purposes, including measures of employment, economic activity, and inflation.

The concept of “public authority” is defined in article 3(1)(29) of the Benchmark Regulation as:

*“(a) any government or other public administration, including the entities charged with or intervening in the management of the public debt;*

*(b) any entity or person either performing public administrative functions under national law or having public responsibilities or functions or providing public services, including measures of employment, economic activities and inflation, under the control of an entity within the meaning of point (a)”.*

No provision of the Benchmark Regulation specifies that only public authorities located in the Union may be excluded from the scope of application of the Benchmark Regulation. Hence, supervised entities in the Union can continue to use benchmarks provided by public authorities located in third countries also after the end of the transitional period applicable to third country benchmarks where those public authorities meet the definition in article 3(1)(29) of the Benchmark Regulation and comply with the conditions set out in Article 2(2)(b) of that Regulation.

**“Disclaimer:**

*The answer clarifies provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. It does not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor does it introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answer is merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in*

*clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.”*

## 5. Questions and Answers on definitions

### Family of benchmarks

Updated: 29/09/2017

#### **Q5.1 How can benchmarks be grouped into a family? Can critical, significant and non-significant benchmarks be part of the same family of benchmarks?**

**A5.1** The BMR allows administrators to group benchmarks into families when they publish the benchmark statement (as per Article 27(1) BMR) and, provided that the benchmarks are based on a similar methodology, when they publish the key elements of the benchmarks' methodology (as per Article 13(1) BMR). Furthermore, administrators may also develop a single code of conduct for a family of benchmarks (as per Article 15(3) BMR), and third country benchmarks may be grouped into families when an administrator or any other supervised entity located in the Union applies to the relevant competent authority for their endorsement (as per Article 33(1) BMR).

Art. 3(1)(4) BMR states that benchmarks by the same administrator may be grouped into a family:

- (i) if they are determined from input data of the same nature, and
- (ii) if this input data provides specific measures of the same or similar market or economic reality.

In ESMA's view, examples of input data of the same nature can be:

- input data of identical type (e.g. reported transactions, quoted prices, committed quotes or expert judgement). Consequently, the proportionality concept of grouping benchmarks into families would not apply to an administrator's benchmarks if one of them is based on expert judgement and another on raw transaction data;
- input data qualifying the benchmark as a particular type of benchmark as defined by the BMR (interest rate or commodity benchmark).

Examples of input data providing specific measures of the same or similar market or economic reality can be:

- input data relating to markets trading comparable assets (e.g. precious metals or other specific types of commodities, equity shares of the same sector or the same geographical region, sovereign bonds, cash deposits);
- input data measuring different aspects of the same economic reality (e.g. household income, GDP, or rent).

Finally, ESMA considers that benchmarks of all levels of reference values (i.e. critical, significant and non-significant) can be grouped into the same family because a benchmark's degree of use is not part of any of the elements of Article 3(1)(4) of the BMR defining a family of benchmarks.

#### Use of a benchmark

Updated: 29/09/2017

**Q5.2** In Article 3(1)(7), “use of a benchmark”, is defined, in paragraph (b), as meaning “determination of the amount payable under a financial instrument . . . by referencing an index or a combination of indices”. In which circumstances would one or more supervised entities be viewed as using a benchmark under paragraph (b) in relation to a derivative, i.e. a financial instrument in Section C of Annex I to Directive 2014/65/EU, paragraphs (4) – (10)?

**A5.2** The following supervised entities would be viewed as using a benchmark under paragraph (b) in relation to the determination of an amount which is payable by reference to an index or a combination of indices under a derivative in the scope of the BMR (see definition for relevant financial instruments in Article 3(1)(16)):

- a) a trading venue, where the derivative is the subject of a request for admission to trading on such trading venue or is traded on such trading venue (each as defined in point (24) of Article 4(1) of Directive 2014/65/EU), to the extent the applicable trading venue has set the relevant terms of the derivative and thus chosen the specific benchmark to be referenced;
- b) the investment firm acting in the capacity of a systematic internaliser, where the derivative is traded via a systematic internaliser (as defined in point (20) of Article 4(1) of Directive 2014/65/EU), to the extent such systematic internaliser has set the relevant terms of the derivative and thus chosen the specific benchmark to be referenced;
- c) a CCP, where the derivative is cleared by such CCP, to the extent that the CCP has set the relevant terms of the derivative and thus chosen the specific benchmark to be referenced; or



- d) each party to a transaction of a derivative, where none of points (a) to (c) applies, particularly if the parties trade on an OTF that has not set the terms of the contract.

### Calculation agents

Updated: 11/07/2018

#### **Q5.3 Is a calculation agent to be considered a user of benchmarks if it is appointed by an issuer of securities?**

**A5.3** Issuers of securities frequently appoint third parties to perform the calculation of payments due under a financial instrument, e.g. under floating rate notes. These third parties, often referred to as “calculation agents”, usually do not set the terms of the financial instrument and do not decide which benchmark is referred to by the instrument. Their role is simply to calculate, on behalf of the issuer, the payment due on the basis of pre-determined terms (including the benchmark to be used), which they cannot amend.

ESMA considers that calculation agents are not users of benchmarks under Article 3(1)(7) of the BMR if the issuer of securities has set the terms of the financial instrument that references the benchmark<sup>11</sup>.

### Definition of a benchmark in relation to investment funds

Updated: 05/02/2018

#### **Q5.4 What types of investment funds are considered to be using an index for the purpose of “tracking the return of [an] index”?**

**A5.4** Article 3(1)(3) of the BMR defines a benchmark, inter alia, as an index that is used to measure the performance of an investment fund with the purpose of tracking the return of such index.

ESMA considers that investment funds using indices to measure their performance with the purpose of tracking the return of such indices include:

---

<sup>11</sup> See also BMR Q&A on “*use of a benchmark*” and the relevance of setting the terms of a derivative contract.



1. investment funds the strategy of which is to replicate or track the performances of an index or indices e.g. through synthetic or physical replication; and
2. structured investment funds that provide investors with algorithm-based payoffs that are linked to the performance, or to the realisation of price changes or other conditions, of indices.

**Q5.5 What types of investment funds are considered to be using an index for the purpose of “defining the asset allocation of a portfolio”?**

**A5.5** Article 3(1)(3) of the BMR defines a benchmark, inter alia, as an index that is used to measure the performance of an investment fund with the purpose of defining the asset allocation of a portfolio.

ESMA considers that an index is used to measure the performance of an investment fund with the purpose of defining its asset allocation when the documentation, and in particular its investment policy or investment strategy, define constraints on the asset allocation of the portfolio in relation to an index. For example the investment policy or strategy may require the investment fund to invest a percentage or the whole portfolio in securities that are constituents of an index. Investment funds using indices to measure their performance with the purpose of defining the asset allocation thus may include investment funds that are actively managed (where the manager has discretion over the composition of its portfolio subject to the investment objectives and strategies as opposed to a fund that tracks the return of the index).

**Q5.6 Does the use of a benchmark to measure the performance of an investment fund include the sole mentioning of an index as a comparison?**

**A5.6** No. ESMA considers that indices referenced in the documentation of an investment fund solely to compare the performance of the investment fund should not be included in the scope of this definition, where no investment constraint on the asset allocation of the portfolio is established in relation to the index. This is without prejudice to other European or national rules governing the mentioning of indices in fund documentation.

### Regulated data benchmarks

Updated: 11/07/2018

**Q5.7 Can a benchmark qualify as a ‘regulated-data benchmark’ if a third party is involved in the process of obtaining the data?**

**A5.7** The BMR subjects the provision of regulated-data benchmarks to fewer requirements, given that the input data stems entirely from sources which are themselves subject to regulation. The notion of “*entirely and directly*” in Article 3(1)(24)(a) precludes, in

principle, the involvement of any third party in the data collection process. The data should be sourced entirely and directly from a trading venue without the involvement of third parties, even if these third parties function as a pass-through and do not modify the raw data. However, pursuant to Article 3(1)(24)(a)(vii), if an administrator obtains regulated data through a third party service provider (such as a data vendor) and has in place arrangements with such service provider that meet the outsourcing requirements in Article 10 of the BMR, the benchmark still qualifies as regulated data benchmark.

## Financial instruments and systematic internalisers

Updated: 26/09/2018

### **Q5.8 When are financial instruments traded on a systematic internaliser in scope of the BMR?**

**A5.8** ESMA considers that “*traded via a systematic internaliser*” as referred to in Article 3(1)(16) BMR should be read to cover:

- a) all instruments described in reference data provided by a systematic internaliser in compliance with Article 27 of Regulation (EU) No 600/2014 (MiFIR) (even if traded outside that systematic internaliser); and
- b) all other instruments that are actually traded on a systematic internaliser, regardless of any requirement of the systematic internaliser to provide reference data.

## Use of benchmarks in certificates

Updated: 26/09/2018

### **Q5.9 When are banks issuing certificates “users of benchmarks”?**

**A5.9** Many banks issue certificates where the underlying is a portfolio composed of different components. The value of the portfolio is regularly determined and may also be regularly published pursuant to the Prospectus Regulation (Commission Regulation (EC) No 809/2004)<sup>12</sup>. The terms index, basket, reference portfolio, reference index,

---

<sup>12</sup> Commission Regulation (EC) No 809/2004:

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A02004R0809-20130828>

See item 4.2.2 of Annex XII of Commission Regulation (EC) No 809/2004 states: “A statement setting out the type of the underlying and details of where information on the underlying can be obtained: (...) an indication where information about the past and the further performance of the underlying and its volatility can be obtained”.

benchmark and variations of these terms are used by market participants in a manner that does not reflect the BMR terminology.

There may be cases where the used portfolio fulfills the BMR definition of an index in Article 3(1)(1), provided that the level of the portfolio is “*published or made available to the public*” as required by point (a) in the definition of an index. In these cases, if the certificate is a financial instrument in the sense of Article 3(1)(16), a referenced portfolio should be considered a benchmark under Article 3(1)(3) and its provider should be considered an administrator under the Regulation.

In these cases, the bank’s activity of issuance of a certificate referencing the portfolio (which is selected by the same bank), fulfills the BMR definition of use of a benchmark in Article 3(1)(7). The fact that the benchmark is both provided and used by the same supervised entity does not preclude the fulfillment of the definition of “*use of a benchmark*”, as there is no requirement for the provider and the user of a benchmark to be distinct entities.

## NAV of investment funds

Updated: 26/09/2018

### Q5.10 Can NAV of investment funds qualify as benchmarks?

**A5.10** No. The net asset value (NAV) of an investment fund is its value per share or unit on a given date or at a given time. It is calculated by subtracting the fund’s liabilities from its assets, the result of which is divided by the number of units to arrive at the per share value. It is the most widely used determinant of the fund’s market value and very often, particularly for exchange traded funds (ETF), it is published on any trading day.

But, according to BMR Article 3(1)(24) point (b), the NAVs of investment funds are data that, if used solely or in conjunction with regulated-data as a basis to calculate a benchmark, qualify the resulting benchmark as a regulated-data benchmark. The Regulation thereby treats NAVs as a form of input data that is regulated and, consequently, ESMA considers that NAVs should not be themselves considered indices as defined in Article 3(1)(1) of BMR.

Investment funds providing NAVs for regulatory purposes (e.g. UCITS Directive - Directive 2009/65/EC) should therefore be considered, from the perspective of the BMR, providers of potential input for regulated-data benchmarks and not providers of benchmarks.

## Use of benchmarks: bilateral agreement on exchanged collateral

Updated: 07/11/2018

### **Q5.11 Does the reference to an index in a bilateral agreement on the interest to be paid on exchanged collateral under various OTC derivatives amount to “use of a benchmark”?**

**A5.11** No. According to Article 3(1)(7)(b) BMR “*use of a benchmark*” can be the determination of the amount payable under a financial instrument or a financial contract by referencing an index or a combination of indices. Counterparties often exchange collateral under a bilateral agreement for a variety of OTC derivatives (some of which may be “*financial instruments*” as specified by Article 3(1)(16) BMR). ESMA considers that the calculation of interest to be paid on these exchanged collateral is not equal to the determination of the amount payable under a financial instrument and therefore does not amount to “*use of a benchmark*”.

## Methodology and input data

Updated: 18/12/2018

### **Q5.12 Can the methodology of a benchmark include factors that are not input data?**

**A5.12** Yes, the methodology of a benchmark can include factors that are not input data.

These factors should not measure the underlying market or economic reality that the benchmark intends to measure, but should instead be elements that improve the reliability and representativeness of the benchmark. This should be considered as the essential distinction between the factors embedded in the methodology and input data.

For instance, the methodology of an equity benchmark may include, together with the values of the underlying shares, a number of other elements, such as the free-float quotas, dividends, volatility of the underlying shares etc. These factors are included in the methodology to adjust the formula in order to get a more precise quantification of the equity market that the benchmark intends to measure, but they do not represent the price of the shares part of the equity benchmark.

A possible way to distinguish these parameters of the methodology (i.e. factors that are not input data) from the underlying input data is to consider the following difference between the two. Input data changes are taken into account by the methodology every time the value of the benchmark is to be updated, as they reflect the changes in the underlying economic reality measured by the benchmark. By contrast, changing

values of the factors are not taken into account in every computation of the benchmark, but only in instances pre-determined by the methodology.

For example, the methodology of an equity benchmark could state that every quarter (i.e. four times a year) the market capitalisation of an issuer could be considered in order to decide whether its shares should still be part of the benchmark or not. Similarly, the methodology could include liquidity, volatility or free-float tests to be performed on the constituents of the benchmark e.g. on an annual basis. These and similar parameters when included in the methodology should not be considered input data. If instead, for instance, the methodology of an equity benchmark includes the use of one or multiple FX rate(s) every time the value of the benchmark is updated, then such FX rate(s) should be considered as input data and treated accordingly (see obligations in BMR Article 11 on input data).

Factors that are not considered input data are relevant elements of the methodology, it is important that such factors comply with the requirements of Article 12 BMR on Methodology (e.g. benchmark being robust and reliable, clear rules on the exercise of any discretion, traceability and verifiability of the benchmark etc.) on an ongoing basis. Administrators are expected to use these factors in accordance with the pre-defined and BMR-compliant methodology and to ensure that all of the requirements of Article 12 are met whenever the methodology is implemented and the benchmark is determined.

**Q5.13 Can the methodology of a regulated-data benchmark include factors that are not covered by Article 3(1)(24) BMR?**

**A5.13** Article 3(1)(24) BMR defines a regulated-data benchmark as a benchmark determined by the application of a formula from specific input data. Thus, regulated-data benchmarks cannot include input data that are not covered by this definition.

However, the methodology of a regulated-data benchmark can include factors that are not covered by Article 3(1)(24) BMR only if those factors are not considered input data i.e. they do not measure the underlying market or economic reality that the benchmark intends to measure, but instead are elements that improve the reliability and representativeness of the benchmark (see previous Q&A).

## Commodity benchmark definition

Updated: 11/07/2019

**Q5.14 Is the scope of the definition of commodity benchmarks for the purposes of the BMR identical to the scope of the definition of commodity derivatives for the purposes of MiFID II and MiFIR?**

**A5.14** No, the scope of the definition of commodity benchmarks for the purposes of BMR is not identical to the scope of the definition of commodity derivatives for the purposes of MiFID II / MiFIR.

Pursuant to Article 19 of BMR, some commodity benchmarks<sup>13</sup> should apply specific requirements laid down in Annex II of the same regulation. Further, Recital (34) of the BMR mentions in relation to the provisions in Annex II of BMR that “*Physical commodities markets have unique characteristics which should be taken into account*”.

Pursuant to Article 3(1)(23) of BMR a commodity benchmark refers to the underlying asset of the benchmark that is a commodity as defined in Article 2(6) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/565<sup>14</sup>: “*any goods of a fungible nature that are capable of being delivered, including metals and their ores and alloys, agricultural products, and energy such as electricity*”. The scope of this definition is limited compared to the definition of commodity derivatives pursuant to Article 2(1)(30) of MiFIR<sup>15</sup>: “*those financial instruments defined in point (44)(c) of Article 4(1) of Directive 2014/65/EU; which relate to a commodity or an underlying referred to in Section C(10) of Annex I to Directive 2014/65/EU; or in points (5), (6), (7) and (10) of Section C of Annex I thereto*”.

In addition, the BMR definition of a commodity benchmark does not refer to the underlying in Section C(10) of Annex I to Directive 2014/65/EU (MiFID II)<sup>16</sup> but only mentions the exclusion of emission allowances as referred to in point (11) of Section C(10) of Annex I to MiFID II.

Therefore, ESMA considers that the underlying asset of a commodity benchmark should be a fungible physical commodity. As a consequence, the underlying referred to in Section C(10) of Annex I to MiFID II, for example freight rates, are not included within the scope of commodity benchmarks and therefore should not be considered as a commodity benchmark under the BMR.

## Readily available data

*Answer provided by the European Commission in accordance with article 16b(5) of the ESMA Regulation*

Updated: 23/06/2022

<sup>13</sup> Commodity benchmarks that are not regulated-data benchmarks or are not based on submissions by contributors the majority of which are supervised entity or are not critical benchmarks with an underlying asset of gold, silver or platinum.

<sup>14</sup> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32017R0565&from=EN>

<sup>15</sup> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014R0600&from=FR>

<sup>16</sup> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014L0065&from=EN>

**Q5.15** What does “readily available” data according to Article 3(1)(8) of the BMR mean? What is the difference with the other types of input data such as regulated data?

**A5.15** Input data is defined in Article 3(1)(14) BMR as the data in respect of the value of one or more underlying assets, or prices, including estimated prices, quotes, committed quotes or other values, used by an administrator to determine a benchmark.

The concept of readily available data is not defined in the BMR. The BMR states only that the data is either contributed to the administrator for the purposes of determining a benchmark or it is readily available. Whether input data is contributed or is readily available has no bearing on the administrator’s responsibility as defined in Title II of the BMR. At the same time, the BMR accepts that it cannot impose rules (e.g., code of conduct by a benchmark administrator) on data sources that simply publish data which are later used to piece together a benchmark.

The summary table below sets out the consequences of this categorisation of input data.

Summary table:

Types of input data		
Readily available data	Contribution of input data	
	Regulated data	Non regulated data
Not provided to an administrator for the purpose of determination of a benchmark	Provided to an administrator for the purpose of determination of a benchmark  Contributed entirely and directly from the entities listed in Article 3(1)(24)	Provided to an administrator for the purpose of determination of a benchmark
Exemptions applicable to the benchmark		
Readily available data	Regulated data	Non regulated data
Article 11(1)(d) and (e), (2) (a) and (b) and (3) - Input data	Article 8(1)(a) –record keeping of all input data	None - other exemptions may apply depending on the type of the benchmark (interest rate, commodity, significant or non-significant)
Article 15 – code of conduct for contributors	Article 11(1)(d) and (e), (2) (a) and (b) and (3) - Input data	
Article 16 – governance and control requirements for supervised contributors	Article 14(1) and (2) – integrity of input data, and detection and reporting of manipulation or attempted manipulation	
	Article 15 – code of conduct for contributors	
	Article 16 – governance and control requirements for supervised contributors	

Examples		
Transaction data made publicly available (for example by a DRSP)	Transaction data sourced directly from an EU trading platform or data service provider	Input data contributed to commodity benchmark administrators or an administrator of an interest rate benchmark
MMSR data provided to the ECB which is used to calculate €STR	Transaction data provided by a TV on a real time basis	Transaction data sourced from a non-EU trading platform with no equivalence decision, provided to an administrator for the purpose of determination of the benchmark
Data collected and published by a central bank or other public authority as part of normal regulatory data-gathering		
Transaction data sourced from a non-EU trading platform with no equivalence decision, not provided to an administrator for the purpose of determination of the benchmark		

**“Disclaimer:**

*The answer clarifies provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. It does not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor does it introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answer is merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.”*

## 6. Questions and Answers on supervised contributors

### Article 16 during the transitional period

Updated: 22/03/2018

**Q6.1** How should supervised contributors apply Article 16 during the transitional period?



**A6.1** During the transitional period (i.e. as long as the transitional provisions of Article 51 apply), and until the administrator of a benchmark is authorised or registered, there may be cases where it is not clear to a supervised entity that provides data used in an index which BMR provisions apply to it and how they should be complied with. It is therefore important to clarify how Article 16 of the BMR “*Governance and control requirements for supervised contributors*” should be applied in this period and how it interacts with any code of conduct of the administrator.

Article 16 sets out a number of requirements that apply directly to supervised entities when they contribute input data to an administrator located in the Union, i.e. when they are “*supervised contributors*”, as defined in point (10) of Article 3(1). Article 16 is relevant only to those supervised entities which “*contribute input data*” as defined in point (8) of Article 3(1).

For supervised contributors to interest rate benchmarks, points 5 to 12 of Annex I BMR apply in addition to Article 16, while Article 16(5), re. the regulatory technical standards under this Article, does not apply.

The provisions of Article 16 and of Annex I of the BMR apply from 1 January 2018, as Article 51 of the BMR does not contain transitional provisions applicable to governance and control requirements for supervised contributors. The provisions of Article 16(1) include elements that refer to the “*code of conduct referred to in Article 15*” of the BMR. Also points 6 and 12 of Annex I of the BMR refer to the “*code of conduct*”.

Supervised contributors are not responsible for the compliance of a code of conduct with the requirements of Article 15, as this provision applies to administrators. The development of a code of conduct in line with the provisions of Article 15 is an obligation that only administrators can comply with.

The administrator’s compliance with Article 15 is subject to scrutiny by the relevant National Competent Authority during the application process for authorisation or registration and to ongoing supervision once the administrator has obtained either.

ESMA considers that the adherence by supervised contributors to a code of conduct not yet considered as compliant by the relevant National Competent Authority (because the administrator is not authorised or registered) does not impede a supervised contributor to be compliant with the BMR. In this case, supervised contributors should comply with Article 16, and where applicable points 5 to 12 of Annex I, also where such BMR requirements are more stringent than the elements included in the code of conduct.

In case no code of conduct exists, ESMA considers that supervised contributors should comply with Article 16, and where applicable points 5 to 12 of Annex I, only to the extent that these provisions are applicable without a code of conduct.

## 7. Questions and Answers on authorisation, registration, recognition and endorsement

### Authorisation and registration vis-à-vis the applicability of the requirements of the BMR

Updated: 14/12/2017

#### **Q7.1** Are EU index providers required to comply with the obligations laid down in the BMR before they are authorised or registered?

**A7.1** Article 34(2) of the BMR “Authorisation and registration of an administrators” states that *“an authorised or registered administrator shall comply ‘at all times’ with the conditions laid down in the Regulation”*. This wording suggests that only an authorised or registered administrator is required to comply with the BMR’s conditions. “Conditions”, in this context, should be understood as encompassing the requirements imposed by the BMR on administrators.

Paragraph (4) of the same Article states that *“the applicant [index provider] shall provide all information necessary to satisfy the competent authority that the applicant has established, at the time of authorisation or registration, all the necessary arrangements to meet the requirements laid down in this Regulation”*. Also this paragraph clearly indicates that index providers, in order to be authorised or registered as administrators, must be in a position to meet the requirements of the BMR at the time of authorisation or registration, i.e. not before that date. Therefore EU index providers are required to comply with the obligations laid down in the BMR only at the time of authorisation or registration.

### Family of benchmarks in the application for endorsement

Updated: 26/09/2018

#### **Q7.2** Can a single application for endorsement include family of benchmarks?

**A7.2** Yes. ESMA is of the view that BMR Article 33(1) on “endorsement” grants administrators and other supervised entities the right to provide the relevant NCA with a single application for a family of benchmarks but that the applicant needs to disclose all members thereof. This is to ensure that the NCA can submit to ESMA a list of all

endorsed benchmarks to allow ESMA to publish in its register all information required by BMR Article 36(1). At the same time, ESMA considers that administrators do not have to apply anew whenever benchmarks change within the endorsed family. Instead, the endorser should notify the NCA and demonstrate e.g. why a new benchmark would belong to an endorsed family.

### Language of the benchmark statement

Updated: 26/09/2018

#### **Q7.3 In which language benchmark statements should be published?**

**A7.3** ESMA believes that benchmark statements should be published in a language that is accepted by the NCA of the relevant Member State. Administrators are clearly free to publish the benchmark statements also in other additional languages for commercial reasons.

### Determination of the Member State of reference

Updated: 23/05/2019

#### **Q7.4 What time is relevant to determine the Member State of reference in an application for recognition under Article 32(4)?**

**A7.4** ESMA considers that the determination of the Member State of reference of an administrator located in a third country for the purpose of applying for recognition in accordance with Article 32(4) should be performed at the date of application for recognition.

Item 2(a) of the Annex to Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/1645<sup>17</sup> requires the applicant to include in its application a documented evidence supporting the choice of the Member State of reference. The determination of the Member State of reference of an administrator located in a third country, for the purpose of applying for recognition in accordance with Article 32(4), should therefore be performed at the date of such administrator's application for recognition.

This point-in-time determination depends, and should be based, on the situation of the administrator as at the date of submission of its application to the relevant National Competent Authority.

<sup>17</sup> [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L\\_.2018.274.01.0036.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:274:TOC](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2018.274.01.0036.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:274:TOC)

## IOSCO Principles assessment of compliance

Updated: 23/05/2019

### **Q7.5 What information may National Competent Authorities rely on in an external audit report of compliance to IOSCO Principles under Article 32(2) of BMR?**

**A7.5** Article 32(2) of BMR states that in order to assess compliance with the IOSCO principles for financial benchmarks or the IOSCO principles for Oil Price Reporting Agencies (PRAs), as applicable, national competent authority of the Member State of reference may rely on an assessment by an independent external auditor.

ESMA considers that the BMR does not require national competent authorities to rely on this assessment by an independent external auditor, rather national competent authorities may use the assessment as a piece of evidence.

The remit of the auditors in an IOSCO principles external audit may vary. The following is a non-exhaustive list of the elements that could be included in such an audit report:

- The level of assurance provided. For example, a Limited Assurance external audit report provides a more restricted view of a firm's compliance and is likely to provide less evidence of compliance under Article 32(2) and the IOSCO principles, whereas a Reasonable Assurance audit report will provide a greater level of evidence<sup>18</sup>.
- The time period covered by the IOSCO principles audit.
- Whether the administrator is complying with all IOSCO Principles or just a limited number of principles.
- Whether the audit report covers the operating effectiveness of the principles for example in relation to the systems and controls in place.

## Annual review of IOSCO principles for Oil Pricing Reporting Agencies (PRAs)

Updated: 03/12/2019

---

<sup>18</sup> See the International Standard on Assurance Engagements 3000, as issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB) <http://www.ifac.org/system/files/downloads/b012-2010-iaasb-handbook-isae-3000.pdf>

**Q7.6 Is the annual review of IOSCO principles for PRAs sufficient for the purpose of paragraph 18 of Annex II of BMR?**

**A7.6** The BMR introduces specific provisions for commodity benchmarks since such benchmarks are widely used and can have sector-specific characteristics. Pursuant to Article 19 of the BMR, for those commodity benchmarks applying Annex II of the BMR instead of Title II of BMR, ESMA considers that an annual review of IOSCO principles for PRAs by an independent external auditor is sufficient to ensure compliance with paragraph 18 of Annex II of BMR.

**The legal representative under Article 32(3) of BMR**

Updated: 03/12/2019

**Q7.7 What should be the role and responsibilities of a legal representative under Article 32(3) of BMR?**

**A7.7** Pursuant to Article 32(3) of the BMR, the legal representative should be a natural or legal person that is not required to be part of the administrator's group or a supervised entity, except where the administrator is part of a group which contains one or more supervised entities located in the Union as provided for in Article 32(4)(a) and (b) of the BMR.

It is to be noticed that Article 32(3) of the BMR does not include any further indication regarding the organisational structure of such legal representative, noticeably when this is a legal person. In light of the duties to be performed by it (see below) but taking also into consideration the principle of proportionality, ESMA believes that the legal representative should have an organisational structure that is adequate in respect of (i) the functions it has to perform, (ii) the characteristics and the dimension of the administrator it represents and (iii) the number and significance of the benchmarks that the administrator provides and that are allowed for use in the Union.

Article 32(3) of the BMR further states that the legal representative should perform the oversight function relating to the provision of benchmarks performed by the administrator under the BMR together with the administrator. It is recalled that the oversight function must "[...] constitute a part of the organisational structure of the administrator, or of the parent company to which it belongs [...]" pursuant to Article 2(1) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/1637<sup>19</sup>.

---

<sup>19</sup> [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L\\_.2018.274.01.0001.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:274:TOC](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2018.274.01.0001.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2018:274:TOC)

ESMA considers that in order to be able to perform the oversight function together with the administrator for the benchmarks used or allowed for use in the Union, the legal representative should at least be a member of the oversight function.

In addition, pursuant to Article 1(3) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/1637, the legal representative should, together with the other members of the oversight function, have appropriate knowledge of the underlying market or economic reality that the benchmark seeks to measure and have the skills and expertise appropriate to the oversight of the provision of a particular benchmark. ESMA further considers that pursuant to Article 32(3) of the BMR and in order to be able to perform the oversight function together with the administrator, representatives of the legal representative and the administrator should have the power to determine jointly the decision making of the oversight function.

Accordingly, ESMA considers that the legal representative should ensure that the oversight function relating to the provision of benchmarks complies with the requirements in Article 5 of the BMR and Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/1637.

According to Article 2(2) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/1637, the oversight function shall assess, and where appropriate challenge, the decisions of the management body of the administrator with regard to the provision of benchmarks to ensure the fulfilment of the requirements of the BMR. Therefore, the legal representative should be able to ask and obtain from the administrator all the necessary information in this respect. ESMA considers that a possible way to achieve that is for the legal representative to have agreements in place with the administrator.

Finally, according to Article 5(3)(i) of the BMR, the oversight function must report to the relevant competent authorities any misconduct by administrators, of which the oversight function becomes aware. The legal representative should hence be able to inform the relevant competent authority in the event that it finds that the third country administrator does not comply with the relevant legal requirements.

## **8. Questions and Answers on requirements for users of benchmarks**

**Q8.1 Are supervised entities, other than administrators, required to have robust written plans for cessation or material changes of a benchmark and to reflect them in the contractual relationship with clients as of 1 January 2018?**

**A8.1** Yes, Article 28(2) of the BMR applies as of 1 January 2018. Therefore, as of this date, supervised entities, other than administrators, are required to produce and maintain robust written plans setting out the actions that they would take in the event that a benchmark they are using materially changes or ceases to be provided.

ESMA considers that supervised entities, other than administrators, are required to reflect such plans in the contractual relationship with clients in contracts entered into after 1 January 2018. In relation to contracts entered into prior to 1 January 2018 and still existing at that date, ESMA expects supervised entities, other than administrators, to amend them where practicable and on a best-effort basis.

**Written plans under Article 28(2)**

Updated: 26/09/2018

**Q8.2 When are the written plans robust?**

**A8.2** ESMA considers that written plans are robust if they determine operational procedures in writing and if they include detailed courses of action, relevant communication channels and arrangements for different scenarios and contingencies. Written plans should be thorough and adequate. They should reflect the nature and size of the individual benchmark and the scale of its use in the markets. ESMA further considers that maintaining the robust written plans requires supervised entities to continuously monitor relevant factors and update arrangements as appropriate.

**Q8.3 How should users reflect written plans in the contractual relationship with clients?**

**A8.3** The contractual relationships with clients are governed by national contract law and, accordingly, the legally adequate reflection of the written plans may vary among Member States. However, ESMA considers that supervised entities should be able to demonstrate to the NCA that they have communicated their written plans to their clients and that the written plans are legally effective under applicable Member States law.

For example, prospectuses may be contractual documents under national law and supervised entities may then opt to update outstanding prospectuses approved prior to 1 January 2018 in order to guarantee that all new investors in an investment fund are subject to such terms. In other cases, supervised entities may opt to include a

reference to their written plans in other contractual documents that they formalise with new investors.

#### **Update of prospectuses as per Article 29(2)**

Updated: 24/05/2018

#### **Q8.4 Should prospectuses include reference to the register of administrators and benchmarks?**

**A8.4** ESMA considers that prospectuses should include reference to ESMA register of administrators and benchmarks (*“the register”*) as follows.

In relation to prospectuses approved on or after 1 January 2018:

- Where the register already includes the relevant administrator by the time a prospectus under Directive 2003/71/EC or Directive 2009/65/EC is published, ESMA considers that such prospectus should include a reference to the fact that the administrator is listed in the register.
- Where the register does not include the relevant administrator by the time a prospectus is published, ESMA considers that such prospectus should include a statement to that effect. Additionally:
  - Prospectuses published under Directive 2009/65/EC should be updated at the first occasion once the relevant administrator is included in the register.
  - Prospectuses approved under Directive 2003/71/EC are not required under BMR to be systematically updated by means of a supplement once the relevant administrator is included in the register. This is without prejudice to the obligation under Directive 2003/71/EC of the issuer, offeror or person asking for admission to trading on a regulated market to assess on a case-by-case basis the significance and/or materiality of the specific situation.

In relation to prospectuses approved prior to 1 January 2018:

- Prospectuses approved under Directive 2009/65/EC should be updated at the first occasion or at the latest within 12 months after 1 January 2018. If by 1 January 2019 the relevant administrator is not included in the register, ESMA considers that these prospectuses should be updated to include a statement to that effect.
- Prospectuses approved under Directive 2003/71/EC are not required under BMR to be systematically updated by means of a supplement once the relevant administrator is included in the register. This is without prejudice to



the obligation under Directive 2003/71/EC of the issuer, offeror or person asking for admission to trading on a regulated market to assess on a case-by-case basis the significance and/or materiality of the specific situation.

## **ESMA's register of administrators**

Updated: 23/05/2019

**Q8.5** What type of information should be included in the field “contact info” of the register?

**A8.5** ESMA considers that the field “contact info” of the register of administrators<sup>20</sup> should, where available, include the website of the administrator and in particular, the link to the web page where the administrator publishes or will publish the benchmark statements pursuant to Article 27 of BMR.

Indeed, according to Article 36 of BMR, the register does not include the EU benchmarks but only the administrators providing those benchmarks in the Union. The link to the webpage where the administrator publishes or will publish its benchmark statements would ease the search of benchmarks provided by that administrator for users of benchmarks. Further, this field should be updated regularly to ensure the accuracy of the information in the register

## **Temporary disruptions to the provision of a benchmark in the context of Article 28(2) of the BMR**

Updated: 28/01/2022

**Q8.6** Do temporary disruptions to the provision of a benchmark require supervised entities to initiate their written plans established for the event of cessation of a benchmark pursuant to Article 28(2) of the BMR?

**A8.6** No

A temporary disruption to the provision of a benchmark does not constitute by itself a cessation<sup>21</sup> of the benchmark. Therefore, in case of a temporary disruption of a benchmark, supervised entities are not required to initiate the written plans established pursuant to Article 28(2) of the BMR.

---

<sup>20</sup> [https://registers.esma.europa.eu/publication/searchRegister?core=esma\\_registers\\_bench\\_entities](https://registers.esma.europa.eu/publication/searchRegister?core=esma_registers_bench_entities)

<sup>21</sup> For clarity, please note that the BMR uses interchangeably the terms 'cessation' (e.g. Articles 23b, 23c and 28 of the BMR) and 'discontinuation' (e.g. Recital 25 of Regulation (EU) 2019/2089); those terms are considered as synonyms for the purpose of the BMR.

## 9. Questions and Answers on transitional provisions

### Transitional provisions applicable to EU index providers already providing a benchmark on 30 June 2016

Updated: 05/07/2017

**Q9.1** Where an EU index provider, that already provided a benchmark on 30 June 2016 and that has not yet been authorised or registered, provides a new benchmark after 1 January 2018, could such a benchmark be used by supervised entities in the Union under the transitional provisions of the Benchmarks Regulation?

**A9.1** Article 51(1) allows an EU index provider, already providing a benchmark on 30 June 2016, to apply for authorisation or registration until 1 January 2020. This transitional provision applies at the entity level.

ESMA considers that during such period, the EU index provider is allowed to continue its activity of provision of benchmarks in full and supervised entities in the Union are able to use all the benchmarks provided by EU index providers that qualify for the transitional provisions in Article 51(1).

This includes benchmarks already provided before 1 January 2018, updates and modifications of benchmarks already provided before 1 January 2018, as well as the provision of new benchmarks for the first time after 1 January 2018. The transitional provisions of Article 51(1) are to be applied unless and until the authorisation or registration of the EU index provider is refused.

### Transitional provisions applicable to EU index providers starting to provide a benchmark between 1 July 2016 and 31 December 2017

Updated: 05/07/2017

**Q9.2** Where an EU index provider that was not providing a benchmark on 30 June 2016 starts to provide benchmarks between 1 July 2016 and 31 December 2017, can these benchmarks be used by supervised entities in the Union? Can the same index provider provide new benchmarks after 1 January 2018 and before it is authorised or registered?

**A9.2** Article 51(3) allows an EU index provider to continue to provide an existing benchmark which may be used by supervised entities until 1 January 2020 or unless and until authorisation or registration is refused.

ESMA considers that the term “*existing benchmark*” used in Article 51(3) should be understood as “*existing on or before 1 January 2018*”, in light of the fact that Article 51(3) will be applicable as of 1 January 2018.

On this ground, ESMA’s understanding of the transitional provisions in Article 51(3) is the following: all benchmarks provided for the first time on or before 1 January 2018 by an EU index provider can be used by a supervised entity until 1 January 2020 or until and unless the authorisation or registration of the EU index provider is refused.

Therefore, if an EU index provider starts to provide benchmarks between 30 June 2016 and 1 January 2018, such benchmarks, including their updates and modifications, can be used by supervised entities on and after 1 January 2018 (even if the authorisation or registration is not yet granted) and until 1 January 2020 or until and unless the authorisation or registration of the EU index provider is refused.

However, in the case that an EU index provider starts to provide benchmarks after 30 June 2016 and provides a new benchmark after 1 January 2018, supervised entities will not be allowed to use such newly provided benchmark, unless the EU index provider obtains first authorisation or registration.

#### Transitional provisions applicable to third country benchmarks

Updated: 31/03/2021 \*modified\*

**Q9.3** In Article 51(5) of the BMR, what does “*where the benchmark is already used in the Union*” mean?

**A9.3** ESMA considers that the meaning of the term “*where the benchmark is already used in the Union*” in Article 51(5) of the BMR is “*where the benchmark is already used in the Union on or before 1 January 2020 31 December 2021 31 December 2023*”.

#### Transitional provisions applicable to EU index providers that provides a benchmark that has been recognised as a critical benchmark in accordance with Article 20 of the BMR

Updated: 06/11/2020

**Q9.4** For how long a critical benchmark can be used by supervised entities in the Union if the index provider has not been granted authorisation?

**A9.4** Article 51(4a) of the BMR allows an EU index provider to continue to provide an existing benchmark that has been recognised as a critical benchmark by an implementing act adopted by the Commission in accordance with Article 20 of the BMR, until 31 December 2021 or unless and until the EU index provider’s authorisation is refused.

Article 51(4b) of the BMR allows supervised entities to use critical benchmarks provided for the first time on or before 10 December 2019 by an EU index provider for existing and new financial instruments, financial contracts, or for measuring the performance of an investment fund until 31 December 2021 or until and unless the authorisation of the EU index provider is refused.

In line with Q&A 9.2, the term “existing benchmark” used in Article 51(4a) of the BMR should be understood as “existing on or before 10 December 2019”, in light of the fact that Article 51(4a) of the BMR was applicable as of 10 December 2019<sup>22</sup>.

A critical benchmark existing on or before 10 December 2019, including its updates and modifications, can be used by supervised entities (even if the critical benchmark is transferred to a new index provider after 10 December 2019) until 31 December 2021. In order for this benchmark to continue to be used after 31 December 2021, its index provider has to apply for an authorisation before 31 December 2021. If the authorisation however, is refused before the 31 December 2021, then the relevant critical benchmark can no longer be used.

---

## 10. Questions and Answers on EU Climate Transition Benchmarks, EU Paris-aligned Benchmarks and sustainability-related disclosures for benchmarks

### ESG factors reflected in the benchmark statement and methodology

Updated: 01/04/2022 \*modified\*

**Q.10.1** Does an administrator have to take into account in the key elements of the methodology all the ESG factors listed in Annex II of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816<sup>23</sup>?

**A.10.1** No

Article 13(1)(d) of BMR requires that administrators publish or make available an explanation of how the key elements of the methodology reflect ESG factors for each benchmark or family

---

<sup>22</sup> Date of entry into application of Regulation (EU) 2019/2089 of the European Parliament and of the council of 27 November 2019 amending Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 as regards EU Climate Transition Benchmarks, EU Paris-aligned Benchmarks and sustainability-related disclosures for benchmarks

<sup>23</sup> COMMISSION DELEGATED REGULATION (EU) 2020/1816 of 17 July 2020 supplementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the explanation in the benchmark statement of how environmental, social and governance factors are reflected in each benchmark provided and published

of benchmarks, with the exception of interest rate and foreign exchange benchmarks. Recital 4 of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817<sup>24</sup> mentions that different ways of explaining how the key elements of the benchmark methodology reflect ESG factors, could lead to a lack of comparability between benchmarks and a lack of clarity as to the scope and the objectives of the ESG factors.

Therefore, when an administrator takes into account ESG factors in the methodology of the calculation of the benchmark, it should not provide information on all, voluntary and non-voluntary, ESG factors listed in Annex II of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 but only on those factors that are taken into account in the benchmark methodology for the selection, the weighting and any exclusion of the underlying assets.

**Q.10.2 Does the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817 allow an administrator to take into account in the key elements of the methodology additional ESG factors not listed in the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816?**

**A.10.2** Yes.

Article 1(4) of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817 allows administrators to include in the explanation provided additional ESG factors that the administrator takes into account in its methodology together with the related information.

Further, items 5 and 6 of the Annex of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817 require administrators to list those ESG factors that are taken into account in the benchmark methodology, taking into account the ESG factors listed in Annex II of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816.

Therefore, ESMA considers that the list of ESG factors in Annex II of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 is not an exhaustive list to be considered for the methodology and that an administrator can take into account in the key elements of the methodology additional ESG factors that are not included in that list.

**Q.10.3 What should an administrator disclose in the key elements of the methodology if it provides benchmarks that do not take into account any of the ESG factors listed in Annex II of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816?**

**A.10.3** Article 1(1) of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817 requires administrators, when designing their benchmark methodology, to explain which of the ESG factors referred to in Annex II to the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 they have taken into account. Further, Article 1(4) of this same regulation allows administrators to include additional ESG factors and related information.

---

<sup>24</sup> COMMISSION DELEGATED REGULATION (EU) 2020/1817 of 17 July 2020 supplementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the minimum content of the explanation on how environmental, social and governance factors are reflected in the benchmark methodology

Therefore, in case an administrator does not take into account any of the factors listed in Annex II of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816, but takes into account other ESG factors not listed in the said Annex, then this administrator can disclose the information on these other ESG factors in the template of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817 detailing how these factors are taken into account for the selection, weighting or exclusion of the underlying assets.

In addition, this administrator should disclose in the benchmark statement the score of these other ESG factors as referred to in Q10.5.

**Q.10.4 Should the details provided under item 6 and item 7 of Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) No 2020/1816 include scores for each of the ESG factors listed in Annex II of that same regulation?**

**A.10.4** Yes.

Article 2(2) of the Delegated Regulation (EU) No 2020/1816 provides that an administrator has to provide the scores of the ESG factors listed in Annex II of the said regulation when responding to items 6 and 7 of Annex I of the same regulation.

As a consequence, when a benchmark's methodology pursues ESG objectives, the administrator should provide in its benchmark statement as a minimum all the ESG factors listed in Annex II of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 that are not flagged as voluntary, in order to ensure the comparability of the information provided for different benchmarks and to allow investors to make informed choices.

In addition, administrators providing such information are expected to hold the necessary data to comply with this disclosure obligation.

**Q.10.5 What should an administrator disclose in the benchmark statement if it provides benchmarks that pursue ESG objectives but do not take into account any ESG factor listed in Annex II of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816?**

**A.10.5** Article 2(6) of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 provides that administrators that disclose additional ESG factors in accordance with Article 1(4) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817 shall include the score of those additional ESG factors in the benchmark statement.

Therefore, in case a benchmark pursues ESG objectives without taking into account any of the factors listed in Annex II of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816, then the administrator of such benchmark should nevertheless disclose the score of the list of ESG factors that are not flagged as voluntary according to the said Annex.

In addition, in case the administrator discloses additional ESG factors in the key elements of the methodology (as stated in Q10.3) then this administrator should also disclose the score of these additional ESG factors in the benchmark statement.

**Q.10.6** Can administrators at the same time disclose that the benchmarks they provide do not pursue ESG objectives in item 5 of the Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 but still disclose the information listed in items 6 and 7 of the same Annex?

**A.10.6** Pursuant to items 6 and 7 of Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816, when the response to Item 5 is positive, i.e. the benchmark or family of benchmarks pursues ESG objectives **or, interchangeably, takes into account ESG factors (please refer to Q&A 10.13)**, the administrator should provide the details in relation to the ESG factors listed in Annex II of the same regulation. Therefore, it is only when the benchmark pursues ESG objectives **or, interchangeably, takes into account ESG factors** that the BMR requires the administrator to disclose in the benchmark statement the details in relation to the ESG factors.

So, when the benchmark does not pursue ESG objectives **or, interchangeably, does not take into account ESG factors**, the administrator should not disclose in the benchmark statement template the details of the ESG factors for the purpose of compliance with the BMR in order not to undermine the comparability of the information provided for different benchmarks and to allow investors to make informed choices.

#### **Templates in the benchmark statement and the methodology**

Updated: 28/05/2021

**Q.10.7** Does an administrator have to use the templates provided in the Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 and the Annex of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817 when it chooses to make the information available on its website?

**A.10.7** No.

Pursuant to Article 1(2) of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817 and Article 2(3) of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816, for individual benchmarks, administrators may, rather than providing all the information required in the template laid down in the Annexes of the said regulations, replace that information by a hyperlink to a website that contains all that information. This hyperlink can be included in the benchmark statement or in the key elements of the methodology.

ESMA believes that these provisions aim at reducing the burden on administrators, who for example, provide a significant number of benchmarks or they have already in place a system that allows for the disclosure of the ESG factors.

Therefore, with regard to item 6 of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817 and item 7 of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816, administrators are not required to amend the benchmark statement or the key elements of the methodology of each individual benchmark to include the templates as provided in the Annexes of the delegated regulations but they can simply provide a link to where the information can be found on their website.



**Q.10.8 Do all administrators have to disclose the elements detailed in Section 3 of Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 by 31 December 2021?**

**A.10.8** Yes.

Pursuant to Article 27(2a) of the BMR, by 31 December 2021, all benchmark administrators, with the exception of administrators of interest rate and foreign exchange benchmarks, should indicate in their benchmark statement how their methodology takes into account the target of carbon emissions or how it attains the objective of the Paris Agreement.

To this end, and at the latest by 31 December 2021, all administrators, with the exception of administrators of interest rate and foreign exchange benchmarks, should disclose the elements detailed in Section 3 of Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816.

These elements include whether the benchmark aligns with the target of reducing carbon emissions or the attainment of the objectives of the Paris Agreement together with additional information on the temperature scenario used. Further, administrators should disclose all the information listed in Section 3 even if the answer to item 10 (a) of the Section 3 of the Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 is negative.

**Q.10.9 How can administrators comply with the requirement to clearly state whether they do or do not pursue ESG objectives pursuant to Article 1(5) of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817?**

**A.10.9** Pursuant to Article 1(5) of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817, benchmark administrators shall clearly state in the explanation provided whether they do or do not pursue ESG objectives.

Under item 4 of the Annex of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817, an administrator has to disclose whether the benchmark provided takes into account ESG factors, however, there is no identified field in the template for disclosing whether such benchmark pursues ESG objectives.

Therefore, and in order to comply with Article 1(5) of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817, administrators should disclose separately in the key elements of the methodology whether they do or do not pursue ESG objectives. For example, if the administrator does pursue ESG objectives, it should indicate this in the key elements of the methodology and should provide details on the different ESG objectives pursued in items 5 or 6 of the Annex of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1817.

**Q.10.10 What standards should the administrators use for the calculation of the ESG factors listed in Annex II of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816?**

**A.10.10** Pursuant to Article 2(5) of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816, administrators shall include in the explanation provided according to the Annex of that Regulation a reference to the sources of data and standards used for the ESG factors



disclosed. Further, item 8 of the Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 requires administrators providing the details on the ESG factors to list the supporting standards used for the reporting under item 6 and/or item 7 of that same annex.

Therefore, while the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 leaves flexibility to the administrator and does not specify the methodology to be used for the calculation of the ESG factors, it requires administrators to disclose the standards used and the source of the data used.

ESMA believes that these standards could include, where relevant,

- the details of the key elements of the methodology used to compute the ESG factors and the main assumptions and the precautionary principles underlying the estimations;
- the international standards on which the computation is based;
- the percentage of reported vs estimated data used for the calculation;
- any specific definition used in the calculation of the ESG factors.

## **EU Climate Transition Benchmarks and EU Paris-Aligned Benchmarks**

Updated: 16/07/2021

### **Q10.11 What are the disclosure requirements that an administrator of an EU Climate Transition Benchmark (EU CTB) or an EU Paris-aligned Benchmark (EU PAB) should comply with?**

**A10.11** Chapter III of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1818 on the minimum standards for EU CTB and EU PAB includes transparency requirements for administrators of EU CTB and EU PAB on the methodology used for the estimation, the decarbonisation trajectory and the data sources.

Further, pursuant to Articles 3(1)(23a) and (23b) of the BMR<sup>25</sup>, the underlying assets of such benchmarks are selected, weighted or excluded in such a manner that the resulting portfolio of an EU CTB is on a decarbonisation trajectory whereas the resulting portfolio's carbon emissions of an EU PAB are aligned with the objectives of the Paris Agreement.

As a consequence, the EU CTB and EU PAB pursue ESG objectives according to item 5 of Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 on the disclosure in the benchmark statement of the ESG factors.

Therefore, in addition to the aforementioned requirements laid down in Chapter III of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1818, administrators of EU CTB and administrators of EU

---

<sup>25</sup> Regulation (EU) 2019/2089 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 November 2019 amending Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 as regards EU Climate Transition Benchmarks, EU Paris-aligned benchmarks and sustainability-related disclosures for benchmarks

PAB should disclose in their benchmark statement also the ESG factors listed in, and in accordance with, Annex II of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816.

## **Disclosure requirements in Section 3 of Annex I of the benchmark statement**

Updated: 19/11/2021

### **Q10.12 What should an administrator disclose in items 10 (b) to (e) of the Section 3 of the Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816?**

**A10.12** Pursuant to Article 27(2a) of the Benchmarks Regulation (BMR) and as outlined in Q&A 10.8, at the latest by 31 December 2021, all administrators, with the exception of administrators of interest rate and foreign exchange benchmarks, should disclose the elements detailed in Section 3 of Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816. Q&A 10.8 further explains that administrators should disclose all the information listed in Section 3 even if the answer to item 10 (a) of the Section 3 of the Annex I of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1816 is negative.

Items 10(b) to 10(e) of that section require a benchmark administrator to specify:

- the temperature scenario used for the alignment with the target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions or the attainment of the objectives of the Paris Agreement (item 10(b));
- the provider of such temperature scenario (item 10(c));
- the methodology used (item 10(d));
- the link to the website of the temperature scenario (item 10(e)).

With regard to the disclosure, applicable to the temperature scenario and the corresponding provider, an indicative example is available in Article 2 of the Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1818 which establishes the reference temperature scenario that administrators of EU CTB and EU PAB shall use when designing the benchmark methodology. That article sets the degree of the temperature scenario (1,5 °C scenario), the type of the scenario (with no or limited overshoot) and the provider (the Special Report on Global Warming of 1,5 °C from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)).

For benchmarks that are neither EU CTB nor EU PAB, the BMR does not establish a specific temperature scenario that administrators should use as part of the benchmark methodology. When the benchmark aligns with the target of reducing carbon emissions or the attainment of the objectives of the Paris Agreement, the administrator shall disclose the related information in accordance with the aforementioned Section 3. For instance, in addition to the temperature scenario used for the EU CTB and EU PAB, other categories of emissions pathways can be used for the calculation of a benchmark that meet other temperature goals.

Notwithstanding the above, administrators of such benchmarks should avoid any sort of confusion either in the disclosed information or in the labelling of the benchmark that could lead benchmark users to think that those benchmarks are EU PAB or EU CTB where they are not.

Finally, where the benchmark does not align with the target of reducing carbon emissions or attaining the objectives of the Paris Agreement, it should be sufficient to indicate in items 10(b) to 10(e) of Section 3 that the benchmark does not use any temperature scenario for the alignment with the target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions or attaining the objectives of the Paris Agreement.

## ESG factors and ESG objectives

[Answer provided by the European Commission in accordance with article 16b\(5\) of the ESMA Regulation](#)

Updated: 19/11/2021

### **Q10.13 What is the difference between taking into account ESG factors and pursuing ESG objectives?**

**A10.13** When it comes to the consideration of ESG factors by benchmarks, the Benchmark Regulation (BMR) refers to benchmarks that “take into account ESG factors” or benchmarks that “pursue ESG objectives”. Both terms refer to the same situation, a benchmark that integrates ESG factors within its methodology. Both sets of terms can be used interchangeably, and should be understood as substitutable.

In practical terms, the BMR provides for two scenarios:

- either the benchmark or family of benchmarks does not integrate ESG factors in its design: benchmark administrators should clearly mention this as part of methodological and benchmark statement disclosures; or
- the benchmark or family of benchmarks integrates ESG factors in its design: the benchmark is considered to be taking into account ESG factors or, interchangeably, pursuing ESG objectives, and should therefore comply with all relevant methodological and benchmark statement and transparency requirements.

**“Disclaimer:**

*The answer clarifies provisions already contained in the applicable legislation. It does not extend in any way the rights and obligations deriving from such legislation nor does it introduce any additional requirements for the concerned operators and competent authorities. The answer is merely intended to assist natural or legal persons, including competent authorities and Union institutions and bodies in clarifying the application or implementation of the relevant legal provisions. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union law. The views expressed in the internal Commission Decision cannot prejudice the position that the European Commission might take before the Union and national courts.”*