

# Public consultation on the review of the alternative investment fund managers directive (AIFMD)

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

The **short version** of this consultation is now available in **23 European Union official languages**.

Please use the language selector at the top of this page to choose your language for this consultation.

In the European Union, alternative investment funds (AIFs) are collective investment funds that are not covered by [Directive 2009/65/EC on undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities \(UCITS\)](#). AIFs vary in terms of their investment strategies, markets, asset types and legal forms. Alternative investment fund managers (AIFMs) manage the AIFs, which are often established for saving or income generating purposes while supporting broader economic activity, and include venture capital and private equity funds, real estate funds, hedge funds and fund of funds. The activities of AIFMs are governed by the [alternative investment fund managers Directive 2011/61/EU \(AIFMD\)](#).

The AIFMD aims to facilitate greater AIF market integration, improve coherence in the actions taken by supervisory authorities to address potential risks posed to the financial system while ensuring appropriate levels of investor protection. To this end, an AIFM is required to obtain licence from its home supervisor and adhere to the operational requirements laid down in the AIFMD and its supplementing [AIFMR](#), including taking measures to manage risks and to ensure the requisite transparency regarding the activities of their managed AIFs.

On 10 June 2020, the European Commission submitted its [report to the European Parliament and the Council on the scope and the application of the AIFMD](#). The report concludes that while the AIFMD has contributed to the creation of the EU AIF market, provided a high-level protection to investors and facilitated monitoring of risks to financial stability, there are a number of areas where the legal framework could be improved. Given the European Commission's ongoing efforts to develop the capital markets union (CMU), this consultation seeks the views of stakeholders on how to achieve a more effective and efficient functioning of the EU AIF market as part of the overall financial system.

## Structure of the public consultation

First, this public consultation focuses on improving the utility of the AIFM passport and the overall competitiveness of the EU AIF industry. The analysed data indicates that the appropriate and balanced regulation of financial markets

benefits investors as well as the overall economy. The questions in the section on **authorisation/scope** seek views from stakeholders on the scope of the AIFM licence, its potential extension to smaller AIFMs and level playing field concerns in relation to the regulation of other financial intermediaries, like MiFID firms, credit institutions or UCITS managers that provide similar services.

The **investor protection** section raises questions on investor access that take into account the differences between retail and professional investors. The same consideration is raised in the questions on a potential EU law pre-calibration of an AIF that would be suitable for marketing to retail. Adequacy of disclosure requirements are covered including the specific requirements that could be added, changed or removed from the current rulebook. Other questions address the alleged ambiguities in the depositary regime and the lack of the depositary passport. Stakeholders are also invited to comment on potential improvements to the AIFMD rules on valuation.

The issue of a level playing field is also covered in the section dedicated to **international issues**. Views are sought on how best to achieve the equitable treatment of non-EU AIFs and securing a wider choice of AIFs for investors while at the same time ensuring that EU AIFMs are not exposed to unfair competition or are otherwise disadvantaged.

The section dedicated to **financial stability** seeks stakeholder views on how to ensure NCAs and AIFMs have the tools necessary to effectively mitigate and deal with systemic risks. Specific input regarding improvements to the supervisory reporting template provided in the AIFMR is requested with a particular focus on the increased activities of AIFs in the credit market. The consultation suggests the potential for more centralised supervisory reporting and improved information sharing among the relevant supervisors. A revised supervisory setup and cooperation measures among the competent authorities are another focus of this consultation.

The rules on **investment in private companies** are examined with a view to potential improvements and comments are sought on the effectiveness of the current rules and their potential enhancement.

The **sustainability** related section seeks input on how the alternative investment sector can participate effectively in the areas of responsible investing and the preservation of our planet.

Questions are posed as regards the treatment of **UCITS**, particularly where a more coherent approach may be warranted. This includes the question of a single licence for AIF and UCITS managers, harmonised metrics for leverage calculation and reporting on the use of liquidity management tools.

Finally, stakeholders are welcome to raise other AIFMD related issues and submit proposals on how to otherwise improve the AIFMD legal framework with regard to any issues not directly addressed in the consultation.

Given the broad nature of the questions, well-substantiated, evidence/data backed answers and proposals will be particularly instructive. Clearly linking responses to the contributions already received in the [public consultation reviewing MiFID II](#), informing digital strategy of the EU or any other relevant consultations would be particularly useful.

This public consultation aims to gather views from all interested parties, in particular collective investment fund managers and investment firms, AIF distributors, industry representatives, investors and investor protection associations. The questions 1, 2 and 3 as well as the section Investor protection, except for part (b) thereof, are available in all the EU official languages to gather citizens' views on these matters.

The consultation will be open for fourteen weeks.

---

**Please note:** In order to ensure a fair and transparent consultation process **only responses received through our online questionnaire will be taken into account** and included in the report summarising the responses. Should you have a problem completing this questionnaire or if you require particular assistance, please contact [fisma-aifmd-public-consultation@ec.europa.eu](mailto:fisma-aifmd-public-consultation@ec.europa.eu).

More information on

- [this consultation](#)
- [the consultation document](#)
- [the consultation strategy](#)
- [the acronyms used in this consultation](#)
- [investment funds](#)
- [the protection of personal data regime for this consultation](#)

## About you

---

### \* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- Gaelic
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian

- Spanish
- Swedish

\* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

\* First name

\* Surname

\* Email (this won't be published)

\* Scope

- International
- Local
- National
- Regional

\* Organisation name

*255 character(s) maximum*

\* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

## Transparency register number

*255 character(s) maximum*

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

## \* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- |   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan         | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti           | <input type="radio"/> Libya            | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands       | <input type="radio"/> Dominica           | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein    | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon        |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania             | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania        | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria             | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador            | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg       | <input type="radio"/> Samoa                            |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa      | <input type="radio"/> Egypt              | <input type="radio"/> Macau            | <input type="radio"/> San Marino                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra             | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador        | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar       | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe            |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola              | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea  | <input type="radio"/> Malawi           | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla            | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea            | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia         | <input type="radio"/> Senegal                          |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica          | <input type="radio"/> Estonia            | <input type="radio"/> Maldives         | <input type="radio"/> Serbia                           |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini           | <input type="radio"/> Mali             | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina           | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia           | <input type="radio"/> Malta            | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia             | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands   | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Singapore                        |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba               | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands      | <input type="radio"/> Martinique       | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia           | <input type="radio"/> Fiji               | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania       | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia                         |

- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar /Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo

- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara

- Cyprus
- Latvia
- Saint Barthélemy
- Yemen
- Czechia
- Lebanon
- Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Zambia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Lesotho
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Zimbabwe
- Denmark
- Liberia
- Saint Lucia

\* Field of activity or sector (if applicable):

*at least 1 choice(s)*

- Accounting
- Auditing
- Banking
- Credit rating agencies
- Insurance
- Pension provision
- Investment management (e.g. hedge funds, private equity funds, venture capital funds, money market funds, securities)
- Market infrastructure operation (e.g. CCPs, CSDs, Stock exchanges)
- Social entrepreneurship
- Other
- Not applicable

\* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

**Anonymous**

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

**Public**

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.



I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

## Choose your questionnaire

---

Please indicate whether you wish to respond to the citizens' version (3 general questions and 14 investor protection questions) or full version (102 questions) of the questionnaire.

The short version only covers the general aspects of the AIFMD regime and investor protection matters under the AIFMD.

The full version contains 85 additional questions addressing more technical features of the AIFMD regulatory regime.

Note that only the questions that are part of the short version are also available in all EU languages.

- I want to respond only to the **short version of the questionnaire** (3 + 14 questions)
- I want to respond to the **full version of the questionnaire** (102 questions)

## I. Functioning of the AIFMD regulatory framework, scope and authorisation requirements

---

The central pillar of the AIFMD regulatory regime is a European licence or a so-called AIFM passport. EU AIFMs are able to manage and market EU AIFs to professional investors across the Union with a single authorisation. This section seeks to gather views on potential improvements to the AIFMD legal framework to facilitate further integration of the EU AIF market. The objective is to look at the specific regulatory aspects where their potential refining could enhance utility of the AIFM passport, gathering data on concrete costs and benefits of the suggested improvements, at the same time ensuring that the investor and financial stability interests are served in the best way. A number of questions focus on the level playing field between AIFMs and other financial intermediaries.

**Question 1. What is your overall experience with the functioning of the AIFMD legal framework?**

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neutral
- Unsatisfied
- Very unsatisfied
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 2. Do you believe that the effectiveness of the AIFMD is impaired by national legislation or existing market practices?**

- Fully agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Fully disagree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 2.1 Please explain your answer to question 2, providing concrete examples and data to substantiate it:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

In general, the AIFMD legal framework is functioning well, therefore we are not in favour of significant changes to level-1 legislation. In light of the evaluation of the AIFMD, however, we provide answers to most of the questions.

Despite that the AIFMD functions well, there are aspects that impair its effectiveness. For example, NCAs and Member States interpret and apply definitions of the AIFMD differently. This may result in a tendency of market parties towards those Member States that make use of broad interpretations (regulatory arbitrage). For instance, there are differences in the interpretations of the activities of the depository and the delegation rules.

Furthermore, one of the objectives of the AIFMD is achieving an internal market within the Union for EU AIFMs. To reach a fully internal market for EU AIFMs, it is necessary to ensure a level playing field and to remove restrictions to the free movement of financial services in the Union. The new rules on the cross border distribution of funds (as set out in the Cross Border Fund Distribution Directive and Regulation) which are part of the Capital Markets Union package are a crucial step forward. We would welcome further harmonization efforts on the specific rules for market access in the relevant member states, on the information to be produced by EU AIFMs and the relevant fees and charges levied by competent authorities for supervision of cross-border activities so as to procure that AIFMD services can be offered more seamlessly on a cross border basis.

**Question 3. Please specify to what extent you agree with the statements below:**

**The AIFMD has been successful in achieving its objectives as follows:**

	1 (fully disagree)	2 (somewhat disagree)	3 (neutral)	4 (somewhat agree)	5 (fully agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
creating internal market for AIFs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
enabling monitoring risks to the financial stability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
providing high level investor protection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Other statements:**

	1 (fully disagree)	2 (somewhat disagree)	3 (neutral)	4 (somewhat agree)	5 (fully agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
The scope of the AIFM license is clear and appropriate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The AIFMD costs and benefits are balanced (in particular regarding the regulatory and administrative burden)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
The different components of the AIFMD legal framework operate well together to achieve the AIFMD objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The AIFMD objectives correspond to the needs and problems in EU asset management and financial markets	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The AIFMD has provided EU AIFs and AIFMs added Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Question 3.1 Please explain your answer to question 3, providing quantitative and qualitative reasons to substantiate it:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We are generally satisfied with the AIFMD and the way it works out in practice. However, in our assessment whether the objectives of the AIFMD are fully achieved, we still see room for improvements in some areas.

For European capital markets it is key to remain open and attractive for foreign investments. To achieve this we think it is important to re-start the work on the Third Country passport (as foreseen in the AIFMD). This enables Third Country managers to circulate their funds freely throughout the EU. However, we recommend that National Private Placement Regime's (NPPRs) could be used until it is clear that the Third Country passport works adequate in practice.

Furthermore, the availability of a broad range of liquidity management tools in every member state is very important for a level playing field in Europe and prevents risks not properly managed within one jurisdiction to transmit to the wider European market.

Specifically with regard to financial stability, we think that the AIFMD has sufficed until now when it comes to monitoring and preventing risks to the financial system, however, there is room for improvement. This is even more true given that the asset management sector, and AIFs in particular, has gained in importance to the financial system since the introduction of AIFMD. This warrants an update to keep the directive fit for purpose. We believe that supervisory reporting could be improved by requiring more granular portfolio data thereby enabling supervisors to enhance their monitoring capabilities. Furthermore, the availability of a broad range of liquidity management tools in every member state is very important for a level playing field in Europe and prevents risks not properly managed within one member state to transmit to the wider European market.

**Question 4. Is the coverage of the AIFM licence appropriate?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 5. Should AIFMs be permitted to invest on own account?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 5.1 Please explain your answer to question 5:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

In our opinion investing on own account does not contribute to the alignment of interest of the AIFM and its investors.

**Question 6. Are securitisation vehicles effectively excluded from the scope of the AIFMD?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 7. Is the AIFMD provision providing that it does not apply to employee participation schemes or employee savings schemes effective?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 8. Should the AIFM capital requirements be made more risk-sensitive and proportionate to the risk-profile of the managed AIFs?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 9. Are the own funds requirements of the AIFMD appropriate given the existing initial capital limit of EUR 10 million although not less than one quarter of the preceding year's fixed overheads?**

- Yes

- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 9.1 Please explain your answer to question 9, detailing any suggestion of an alternative policy option, and presenting benefits and disadvantages of the entertained options as well as costs:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Question 8. The assets of the alternative investment funds (AIFs) and its manager (AIFMD) should be segregated, therefore we do not see why the risk-profile of the managed AIF should be linked to the capital requirements of the AIFM.

Question 9. In general, the own funds requirements should be based on relevant risks. If those relevant risks justify higher capital than the limit of EUR 10 million we think this should be addressed appropriately. However, in our view the (operational) risks do not grow proportionate to the size of the managed AIFs.

**Question 10. Would the AIFMD benefit from further clarification or harmonisation of the requirements concerning AIFM authorisation to provide ancillary services under Article 6 of the AIFMD?**

- Fully agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Fully disagree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 10.1 Please explain your answer to question 10, presenting benefits and disadvantages of the entertained options as well as costs:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.



We believe that further clarifications on the scope of permissible business activities listed in Article 6(4) of the AIFMD (and Article 6(3) of the UCITS Directive) are needed to ensure appropriate and consistent interpretation of the regulatory requirements across Member States. This includes clarifications on the circumstances in which activities should be seen as investment services (to which MiFID rules would apply) or as activities that are part of managing AIFs.

In addition, we see merit in providing clarifications on the application of rules when providing services pursuant to Article 6(4) of the AIFMD (and Article 6(3) of the UCITS Directive). We believe that updating the references in Article 6(6) of AIFMD (and 6(4) of the UCITS Directive), which currently refer to MiFID I, would already provide a helpful step forward. Additionally, the applicability of rules in specific and common scenarios, should be clarified, one example is the extent to which MiFID rules apply when AIFMs offer services pursuant to Article 6(4) of the AIFMD (and Article 6(3) of the UCITS Directive) on assets that do not qualify as 'financial instruments' pursuant to Section C of Annex I of MiFID.

**Question 11. Should the capital requirements for AIFMs authorised to carry out ancillary services under Article 6 of the AIFMD be calculated in a more risk-sensitive manner?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 11.1 Please explain your answer to question 11, presenting benefits and disadvantages of your suggested approach as well as potential costs of the change, where possible:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Please refer to our response on Question 12.

**Question 12. Should the capital requirements established for AIFMs carrying out ancillary services under Article 6 of the AIFMD correspond to the capital requirements applicable to the investment firms carrying out identical services?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 12.1 Please explain your answer to question 12, presenting benefits and disadvantages of your suggested approach as well as potential costs of the change, where possible:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

There is currently a difference between the capital requirements for investment firms and AIFMs that offer investment services pursuant to article 6(4) AIFMD. In our opinion, the differences between those frameworks cannot be justified and that further harmonization between both frameworks is necessary to create a level playing field and to avoid regulatory arbitrage. We would like to stipulate the importance of avoidance of duplications of capital requirements for AIFMs that also offer investment services pursuant to article 6(4) of the AIFMD.

**Question 13. What are the changes to the AIFMD legal framework needed to ensure a level playing field between investment firms and AIFMs providing competing services?**

**Please present benefits and disadvantages of your suggested approach as well as potential costs of the change, where possible:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We believe that a level playing field between investment firms and AIFMs providing investment services pursuant to article 6(4) of the AIFMD is crucial to ensure a coherent supervisory approach to the risks of the financial system and to provide a high level protection to investors. Specifically, in terms of transparency, reporting and resilience requirements the MiFID regime is more stringent than it currently is for AIFMs that conduct similar activities on the financial markets. We think that this could gradually lead to a shift from MiFID license holders to AIFMD license holders. Further harmonization, where possible and appropriate, would contribute to a level playing field in the European Union.

**Question 14. Would you see value in introducing in the AIFMD a Supervisory Review and Evaluation Process (SREP) similar to that applicable to the credit institutions?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 14.1 Please explain your answer to question 14, presenting benefits and disadvantages of your suggested approach as well as potential costs of the change, where possible:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

When AIFMs offer investment services pursuant to article 6(4) of the AIFMD, we recognize that harmonization with relevant requirements of investment firms is appropriate. Proportionality is a key factor for introducing SREP for AIFMs. It also depends of the assets of the funds if the introduction of SREP has additional value; e.g. for information about loan originating funds it could be a valuable tool for gaining information of the prudential risks.

**Question 15. Is a professional indemnity insurance option available under the AIFMD useful?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 15.1 Please explain your answer to question 15, presenting benefits and disadvantages of your suggested approach as well as potential costs of the change, where possible:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Although the professional indemnity insurance option is not widely used in the Netherlands, we recognize that it can be of added value to AIFMs, and especially smaller AIFMs.

**Question 16. Are the assets under management thresholds laid down in Article 3 of the AIFMD appropriate?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 17. Does the lack of an EU passport for the sub-threshold AIFMs impede capital raising in other Member States?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 17.1 Please further detail your answer to question 17, substantiating it, also with examples of the alleged barriers:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Please refer to our response to Question 18.

**Question 18. Is it necessary to provide an EU level passport for sub-threshold AIFMs?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 18.1 Please explain your answer to question 18:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We do not believe an EU passport for sub-threshold AIFMs is appropriate. Due to the national implementation of article 3 of the AIFMD across Member States, an EU passport could, at most, be available for sub-threshold AIFMs that market to professional investors only. As Member States, including the Netherlands, have local requirements for sub-threshold AIFMs that market to non-professional investors, an EU passport would merely increase complexity of the sub-threshold regime.

**Question 19. What are the reasons for EuVECA managers to opt in the AIFMD regime instead of accessing investors across the EU with the EuVECA label?**

**Please explain your answer:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 20. Can the AIFM passport be improved to enhance cross-border marketing and investor access?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 20.1 If so, what specific measures would you suggest?**

**Please explain your suggestions, presenting benefits and disadvantages as well as potential costs thereof, where possible:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

First of all, we view the new rules on the cross border distribution of funds (as set out in the Cross Border Fund Distribution Directive and Regulation) as a crucial step forward to reach a fully internal market for EU AIFMs, a level playing field and to remove restrictions to the free movement of financial services in the Union.

However, we believe that there still are a number of things that can be done to improve the AIFM passport to enhance the cross border marketing and investor access. In our view the process of the AIFMD passport should be made more explicit and transparent and there should be more harmonization in the application of the AIFMD passport.

## II. Investor protection

---

The AIFMD aims to protect investors by requiring AIFMs to act with the requisite transparency before and after investors commit capital to a particular AIF. Conflicts of interest must be managed in the best interest of the investors in the AIF. AIFMs must also ensure that the AIF's assets are valued in accordance with appropriate and consistent valuation procedures established for each AIF. The AIF assets are then placed in safekeeping with an appointed depositary that also oversees AIF's cash flows and ensures regulatory compliance.

Questions in this section cover the topic of investor categorisation referencing to MiFID II, stopping short of repeating the same questions that have been raised in its [recent public consultation on MiFID II](#), rather inviting comments on the most appropriate way forward. Views are also sought on the conditions that would make it possible to open up the AIF universe to a larger pool of investors while considering their varying degrees of financial literacy and risk awareness. Examples of redundant or insufficient investor disclosures are invited.

Greater clarity on stakeholders' views of the AIFMD rules on depositaries is sought in particular where such rules may require clarification or amending. The introduction of the depositary passport is desirable from an internal market point of view, but stakeholders are invited to propose other potential legal solutions, if any, that could address the issue of the short supply and concentration of depositary services in smaller markets.

### a) Investor classification and investor access

**Question 21. Do you agree that the AIFMD should cross-refer to the client categories as defined in the MIFID II (Article 4(1)(ag) of the AIFMD)?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 21.1 Please explain your answer to question 21:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

In general, we believe that harmonization of the AIFMD and MiFID II regime, where possible, will result in a lower level of complexity, especially when it comes to central and key elements of the regulation, such as client categorization.

We are of the opinion that the current client categories provide an appropriate framework for the categorization of clients, especially as local implementation allows for further tailoring for specific client groups.

## **Question 22. How AIFM access to retail investors can be improved?**

**Please give examples where possible and present benefits and disadvantages of your suggested approach as well as potential costs of the change:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We emphasize that the AIFMD is fundamentally a framework for the marketing of AIFs to professional investors in the European Union. However, we also recognize that there is a great diversity of AIFs and also AIFs with nearly similar characteristics as UCITS funds (transferability, high quality and very limited or no net leverage) distributed to retail clients. In our view it should be possible that such funds are distributed to retail clients in other member states. However it is important to keep in mind that there is a difference between AIFs only distributed to professional clients and AIFs only distributed to retail clients. So also the rules for investor protection must be different.

## **Question 23. Is there a need to structure an AIF under the EU law that could be marketed to retail investors with a passport?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### **Question 23.1 If yes, what are the requirements that should be imposed on such AIFs?**

**Please give examples where possible and present benefits and disadvantages of your suggested approach as well as potential costs of the change:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Please refer to our response to question 22.

## **b) depositary regime**

**Question 24. What difficulties, if any, the depositaries face in exercising their functions in accordance with the AIFMD?**

**Please provide your answer by giving concrete examples identifying any barriers and associated costs.**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We see room for improvement of the rules regarding the cooperation between supervisory authorities in cases where a manager is located in a certain Member State and falls under the competence of the authorities of that Member State and where the fund and depositary are located in another Member State and fall under the competence of the authorities of that other Member State.

**Question 25. Is it necessary and appropriate to explicitly define in the AIFMD tri-party collateral management services?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 25.1 Please explain your answer to question 25:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.



We believe that in the case a tri-party collateral agreement is concluded between two counter parties and an independent third-party collateral agent, it would be out of scope of the AIFMD to define tri-party collateral management services.

**Question 26. Should there be more specific rules for the delegation process, where the assets are in the custody of tri-party collateral managers?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 26.1 Please explain your answer to question 26, presenting benefits and disadvantages of your suggested approach as well as potential costs of the change, where possible:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Article 21 AIFMD stipulates clearly which parties may keep financial instruments into custody. It is also clear that in case a tri-party collateral manager does not comply with Article 21, paragraph 3, AIFMD, than such manager cannot keep assets in custody.

**Question 27. Where AIFMs use tri-party collateral managers' services, which of the aspects should be explicitly regulated by the AIFMD?**

Please select as many answers as you like

- the obligation for the asset manager to provide the depositary with the contract it has concluded with the tri-party collateral manager
- the flow of information between the tri-party collateral manager and the depositary
- the frequency at which the tri-party collateral manager should transmit the positions on a fund-by-fund basis to the depositary in order to enable it to record the movements in the financial instruments accounts opened in its books

- no additional rules are necessary, the current regulation is appropriate
- other

**Question 28. Are the AIFMD rules on the prime brokers clear?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 29. Where applicable, are there any difficulties faced by depositaries in obtaining the required reporting from prime brokers?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 30. What additional measures are necessary at EU level to address the difficulties identified in the response to the preceding question?**

**Please explain your answer providing concrete examples:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 31. Does the lack of the depositary passport inhibit efficient functioning of the EU AIF market?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 31.1 Please explain your answer to question 31:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We are of the opinion that more research is required on the benefits and risks of a depositary passport before considering the introduction of such a passport.

**Question 32. What would be the potential benefits and risks associated with the introduction of the depositary passport?**

**Please explain your position, presenting benefits and disadvantages of your suggested approach as well as potential costs of the change, where possible:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

A potential benefit could be a larger market for depositories within the Union and it could support the competitiveness of the EU AIF industry. However, a depositary passport could also bring difficulties, for example difficulties in making a clear division of competences of supervisors. Another difficulty may be the interaction with the national rules of safekeeping. Therefore, we are of the opinion that more research is required on the benefits and risks of a depositary passport.

**Question 33. What barriers are precluding introducing the depositary passport?**

**Please explain your position providing concrete examples and evidence, where available, of the existing impediments:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Difficulties in making a clear division of competences of supervisors may preclude the introduction of a depositary passport.

**Question 34. Are there other options that could address the lack of supply of depositary services in smaller markets?**

**Please explain your position presenting benefits and disadvantages of your suggested approach as well as potential costs of the change:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 35. Should the investor CSDs be treated as delegates of the depositary?**

Yes

- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 35.1 Please explain your answer to question 35, providing concrete examples and suggesting improvements to the current rules and presenting benefits and disadvantages as well as costs:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

### **c) transparency and conflicts of interest**

**Question 36. Are the mandatory disclosures under the AIFMD sufficient for investors to make informed investment decisions?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 37. What elements of mandatory disclosure requirements, if any, should differ depending on the type of investor?**

**Please explain your position, presenting benefits and disadvantages of the potential changes as well as costs:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The AIFMD is fundamentally a framework for the marketing of AIFs to professional investors in the European Union and therefore the disclosure requirements must not differ depending on the type of investor. If AIFMD also becomes applicable to retail AIFs, additional disclosure requirements must be in place and these requirements must differ from the requirements for AIFs to professional investors.

The Netherlands currently has a regime in place that requires additional disclosures and transparency in case an AIF is marketed to retail investors.

**Question 38. Are there any additional disclosures that AIFMs could be obliged to make on an interim basis to the investors other than those required in the annual report?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 39. Are the AIFMD rules on conflicts of interest appropriate and proportionate?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 39.1 If not, how could the AIFMD rules on conflicts of interest be amended?**

**Please provide your suggestions, presenting benefits and disadvantages of the potential changes as well as costs:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We see merit in further harmonization of the AIFMD and the MiFID II rules on conflicts of interest.

#### **d) valuation rules**

**Question 40. Are the AIFMD rules on valuation appropriate?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 41. Should the AIFMD legal framework be improved further given the experience with asset valuation during the recent pandemic?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 42. Are the AIFMD rules on valuation clear?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 43. Are the AIFMD rules on valuation sufficient?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 44. Do you consider that it should be possible in the asset valuation process to combine input from internal and external valuers?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 44.1 Please substantiate your answer to question 44, also in terms of benefits, disadvantages and costs:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

If, under specific circumstances, input from internal and external valuers needs to be combined in order to obtain an accurate valuation, we believe this should be a possibility.

**Question 45. In your experience, which specific aspect(s) trigger liability of a v a l u e r ?**

**Please provide concrete examples, presenting costs linked to the described occurrence:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

In our opinion, the liability of a valuer should be limited to what would in general be referred to as 'gross negligence' (in Dutch: 'grove nalatigheid').

**Question 46. In your experience, what measures are taken to mitigate/offset the liability of valuers in the jurisdiction of your choice?**

**Please provide concrete examples, presenting benefits and disadvantages as well as costs of the described approach:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.



### III. International relations

---

Considering the global nature of financial services, the AIFMD interacts with the third country regulatory regimes. By adopting the AIFMD the EU co-legislators sought to put in place a legal framework for tackling risks emanating from AIF activities that may impact the EU financial stability, market integrity and investor protection. The questions below are seeking views on where to strike the balance of having a functioning, efficient AIF market and ensuring that it operates under the conditions of a fair competition without undermining financial stability. Besides posing general questions on the competitiveness of the EU AIF market, this section seeks views on how the EU market could interact with international partners in the area governed by the AIFMD. The focus is on the appropriateness of the AIFMD third country passport regime and delegation rules.

#### **Question 47. Which elements of the AIFMD regulatory framework support the competitiveness of the EU AIF industry?**

**Please explain providing concrete examples and referring to data where available:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Overall, we believe that the AIFMD has had a positive effect on the overall competitiveness of the EU AIF industry. Especially the introduction of a European Passport for marketing AIFs to professional investors across Member States has contributed to the competitiveness of EU AIF market, as it provides EU AIFMs enhanced accessibility to other Member States.

Also, with the AIFMD, regulatory requirements for AIFMs have been harmonized leading to a more even level playing field for AIFMs in the Union.

#### **Question 48. Which elements of the AIFMD regulatory framework could be altered to enhance competitiveness of the EU AIF industry?**

**Please explain providing concrete examples and referring to data where available:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We view the new rules on the cross border distribution of funds (as set out in the Cross Border Fund Distribution Directive and Regulation) as a crucial step forward.

However, NCAs and Member States interpret and apply definitions of the AIFMD differently. This may result in a tendency of market parties towards those Member States that make use of broad interpretations (regulatory arbitrage). For instance, there are differences in the interpretations of the activities of the depository and the delegation rules. We consider it undesirable that there are large variations in supervisory practices due to these different interpretations. This undermines the objective of establishing equal authorisation and supervision of AIFMs in order to provide a coherent approach within the EU.

**Question 49. Do you believe that national private placement regimes create an uneven playing field between EU and non-EU AIFMs?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 49.1 If you believe there is an uneven playing field between EU and non-EU AIFMs, which action would you suggest to address the issue?**

**Please explain your choice, presenting benefits and disadvantages of the potential changes to the AIFMD as well as potential costs associated with your preferred option:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

It is key that the European capital markets remain open and attractive for foreign investment. The interaction between European capital markets and the global capital markets becomes increasingly relevant now that the UK has left the EU. EU capital markets should remain accessible for third country asset managers (without compromising the integrity of the single market).

The Third Country passport (as foreseen in the AIFMD) enables Third Country managers to freely circulate their funds throughout the EU on a cross border basis. Currently – in the absence of the Third Country passport – Third Country managers have or may have market access on a country-per-country basis through the National Private Placement Regimes (NPPRs). NPPRs currently prove to be a crucial tool to arrange for effective access to national markets. Therefore, we recommend that NPPRs could be used until it is clear that the Third Country passport works adequately in practice.

**Question 50. Are the delegation rules sufficiently clear to prevent creation of letter-box entities in the EU?**

- Yes

- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 50.1 Please explain your answer to question 50:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

In contrast to MiFID or UCITS, Article 82 of the Delegated Regulation 231/2013 contains a comprehensive description whether a manager is deemed to be a letter-box entity or not. Especially the obligations regarding the ability to efficiently supervise the delegated tasks ensures that a manager is required to remain in control. However at the same time, the description of the rule regarding an AIFM delegating the performance of investment management functions in excess by a substantial margin could be improved.

**Question 51. Are the delegation rules under the AIFMD/AIFMR appropriate to ensure effective risk management?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 52. Should the AIFMD/AIFMR delegation rules, and in particular Article 82 of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 231/2013, be complemented?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 52.1 Should the delegation rules be complemented with:**

Please select as many answers as you like

- quantitative criteria
- a list of core or critical functions that would be always performed internally and may not be delegated to third parties
-

other requirements

**Please explain with what other requirements the AIFMD/AIFMR delegation rules should be complemented, presenting benefits and disadvantages of the potential changes as well as costs:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Article 82 of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 231/2013 should clearly state that a manager can't delegate the portfolio management and risk management functions at the same time. In the way, it will become clear that there is a limit to the activities that an AIFM is allowed to delegate. This includes the legal clarifications on the maximum extent of delegation to ensure supervisory convergence and ensure authorized AIFMs and UCITS management companies maintain sufficient substance in the EU.

**Question 53. Should the AIFMD standards apply regardless of the location of a third party, to which AIFM has delegated the collective portfolio management functions, in order to ensure investor protection and to prevent regulatory arbitrage?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 53.1 Please explain your answer to question 53:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We believe that the AIFMD standards should always apply in order to ensure investor protection and to prevent regulatory arbitrage, regardless of the location of the third party, to which the AIFM has delegated the collective portfolio management functions.

**Question 54. Do you consider that a consistent enforcement of the delegation rules throughout the EU should be improved?**

- Yes
- No

- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 55. Which elements of the AIFMR delegation rules could be applied to UCITS ?**

**Please explain your position, presenting benefits and disadvantages of the potential changes as well as costs:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

## **IV. Financial stability**

---

One of the main objectives of the AIFMD is to enable supervisors to appreciate and mitigate systemic risks building up in financial markets from different sources. To this end, AIFMs are subject to periodic reporting obligations and supervisors are equipped with certain market intervention powers to mitigate negative effects to the financial stability that may arise from the activities on the AIF market.

The section below invites opinions whether the intervention powers and a tool-kit available to the relevant supervisors are sufficient in times of severe market disruptions. Shared views on the adequacy of the AIFMR supervisory reporting template will be important in rethinking the AIFM supervisory reporting obligations. According to the FSB report, markets for leveraged loans and CLOs have grown significantly in recent years exceeding pre-crisis levels ([FSB, Vulnerabilities associated with leveraged loans and collateralised loan obligations \(CLOs\), PLEN/2019/91-REV, 22 November 2019](#)). While most leveraged loans are originated and held by banks, investment funds are also exposed to the leveraged loan and CLO markets. In order to assess risks to the financial stability and regulatory implications associated with leveraged loans and CLOs it would be commendable to continue collecting the relevant data and monitoring the market. The stakeholders are invited to cast their views on the matter.

With particular regard to the loan originating AIFs, suggestions on the optimal harmonisation of the rules that could apply to these collective investment vehicles are welcome. Finally, questions are raised whether leverage calculation methods could benefit from further standardisation of metrics across the AIF market and potentially also across the UCITS for the supervisors to have a complete picture of the level of leverage engaged by the collective investment funds.

## a) macroprudential tools

**Question 56. Should the AIFMD framework be further enhanced for more effectively addressing macroprudential concerns?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 56.1 If yes, which of the following amendments to the AIFMD legal framework would you suggest?**

Please select as many answers as you like

- improving supervisory reporting requirements
- harmonising availability of liquidity risk management tools for AIFMs across the EU
- further detailing cooperation of the NCAs in case of activating liquidity risk management tools, in particular in situations with cross-border implications
- further clarifying grounds for supervisory intervention when applying macroprudential tools
- defining an inherently liquid/illiquid asset
- granting ESMA strong and binding coordination powers in market stress situations
- other

**Please explain why you would suggest improving supervisory reporting requirements .**

**Please present benefits and disadvantages of the potential changes as well as costs:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Although the AIFMD has sufficed until now for monitoring and preventing risks to the financial system, there is certainly room for improvement. This is even more true given that the asset management sector, and AIFs in particular, has gained in importance to the financial system since the introduction of AIFMD. This warrants an update to keep the directive fit for purpose. We believe that supervisory reporting could be improved by requiring more granular portfolio data thereby enabling supervisors to enhance their monitoring capabilities.

A more granular view of the portfolio of the AIF would substantially improve the range of possible risk analysis and improve the NCAs' comprehension of the stability risks in the AIFs.

**Please explain why you would suggest harmonising availability of liquidity risk management tools for AIFMs across the EU.**

**Please present benefits and disadvantages of the potential changes as well as costs:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The availability of a broad range of liquidity management tools in every member state is very important for a level playing field in Europe and prevents risks not properly managed within one jurisdiction to transmit to the wider European market.

We very much appreciate the current legislative framework with its current intervening powers as a tool to prevent financial stability risks. Yet, in light of current discussions (at the ESRB, FSB and IOSCO) on the need for new macro prudential instruments, we would like to ask the Commission to take into account during (and after) the AIFMD review potential new instruments that specifically address liquidity risks more directly.

The broad range of liquidity management tools available for AIFMs would be a robust first defence line on the micro-level for preventing liquidity risks in AIFs transmitting to the wider financial systems and becoming stability risks.

**Question 57. Is there a need to clarify in the AIFMD that the NCAs' right to require the suspension of the issue, repurchase or redemption of units in the public interest includes financial stability reasons?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 57.1 Please explain your answer to question 57, presenting benefits and disadvantages of the potential changes to the existing rules and processes as well as costs:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

To avoid any doubt it could be clarified that the NCAs' right to require the suspension of the issue, repurchase or redemption of units in the public interest includes financial stability reasons.

**Question 58. Which data fields should be included in a template for NCAs to report relevant and timely data to ESMA during the period of the stressed market conditions?**

**Please provide your suggestions, presenting benefits and disadvantages of the potential changes as well as costs:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We would support a proposal for a predefined template to improve the availability of relevant and timely data to ESMA and NCAs. Such a template should in our opinion include at least the following items:

- The daily net flows of the AIF (or in accordance with the redemption frequency of the AIF)
- The availability of liquidity management tools to the AIFM
- The use of liquidity management tools
- The results of the latest liquidity stress test for the AIF

Having the data above available during a period of stressed market conditions would significantly improve the NCAs capability to closely monitor liquidity risks and stability risks and this would allow a more timely and better response by NCAs.

**Question 59. Should AIFMs be required to report to the relevant supervisory authorities when they activate liquidity risk management tools?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 60. Should the AIFMD rules on remuneration be adjusted to provide for the de minimis thresholds?**

- Yes
- No



- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## b) supervisory reporting requirements

**Question 61. Are the supervisory reporting requirements as provided in the AIFMD and AIFMR's Annex IV appropriate?**

- Fully agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Fully disagree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 61.1 If you disagree that the supervisory reporting requirements as provided in the AIFMD and AIFMR's Annex IV appropriate, it is because of:**

Please select as many answers as you like

- overlaps with other EU laws
- the reporting coverage is insufficient
- the reporting coverage is superfluous
- other

**Please detail as much as possible your answer providing examples of the insufficient reporting coverage.**

**Where possible, please provide concrete examples and where relevant information on costs and benefits in changing the currently applicable reporting requirements:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The reports become more valuable when more detailed information on the composition of assets and liabilities on the funds are provided. Therefore we support including a more granular view of the portfolio of the AIF which would provide insight in the actual positions held. We are of the opinion that a more granular view of the portfolio of the AIF would substantially improve the range of possible risk analysis and improve its comprehension of the stability risks in the AIFs. Other examples of a possible improvement would be the introduction of the mandatory use of LEI's and adding additional investment strategies (see below).

In order for the reporting requirement to be an appropriate and proportional burden, we would see benefit in reviewing all required fields as a whole to see what fields can be deleted. Which fields that should be is depend on the addition of new fields pursuant to the outcome of the AIFMD Review.

**Question 62. Should the AIFMR supervisory reporting template provide a more comprehensive portfolio breakdown?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 63. Should the identification of an AIF with a LEI identifier be mandatory?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 63.1 Please explain your answer to question 63, presenting benefits and disadvantages as well as costs associated with introducing such a requirement:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Identification of AIFM's and AIF's should mandatorily be with a LEI. This would strengthen the international harmonization of relevant data and would allow the combination of cross- analysis of data under different reporting regimes. Inter-linkage and cross-analyses is far easier to obtain when LEI's are mandatory which would enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the reporting regime. Having a unique identifier would benefit the quality of the reported data which contributes to the potential for data analyses (e.g. on counterparty risk).

**Question 64. Should the identification of an AIFM with a LEI identifier be mandatory?**

- Yes
- No

- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 64.1 Please explain your answer to question 64, presenting benefits and disadvantages as well as costs associated with introducing such a requirement:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Please refer to our response to Question 63.1.

**Question 65. Should the use of an LEI identifier for the purposes of identifying the counterparties and issuers of securities in an AIF's portfolio be mandatory for the Annex IV reporting of AIFMR?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 65.1 Please explain your answer to question 65, presenting benefits and disadvantages as well as costs associated with introducing such a requirement:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The use of LEI identifiers for the purpose of identifying the counterparties and issuers of securities in an AIF's portfolio would contribute to adequate monitoring of financial stability risks. It would allow analysis of fund structures (e.g. interconnectedness also on an international level) can be detected which would benefit adequate supervision.

**Question 66. Does the reporting data adequately cover activities of loan originating AIFs?**

- Yes

- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 66.1 Please explain your answer to question 66:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 67. Should the supervisory reporting by AIFMs be submitted to a single central authority?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 67.1 Please explain your answer to question 67:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 68. Should access to the AIFMD supervisory reporting data be granted to other relevant national and/or EU institutions with responsibilities in the area of financial stability?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 68.1 If yes, please specify which one:**

- ESRB
- ECB
- NCBs
- National macro-prudential authorities
- Other

**Please specify to which other relevant national and/or EU institutions the access to the AIFMD supervisory reporting data should be granted:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

NCA's and the ESRB.

**Question 68.2 Please explain your answer to question 68.1:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Given the large amounts of supervisory data which would become available to a larger number of institutions, a comprehensive analysis identifying information needs of the relevant parties in the area of financial stability cross referenced against already available information. If the outcome states this is needed, the Ministry of Finance supports the exchange of information and data to support NCA's and EU institutions to analyse financial stability-related risks in this sector (i.e. to the extent specifically relevant for the exercise of their specific FS mandate).

**Question 69. Does the AIFMR template effectively capture links between financial institutions?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 69.1 If not, what additional reporting should be required to better capture inter-linkages between AIFMs and other financial intermediaries?**

**Please provide your suggestion(s) providing information on the costs, benefits and disadvantages of each additional reporting:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 70. Should the fund classification under the AIFMR supervisory reporting template be improved to better identify the type of AIF?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 70.1 Please explain your answer to question 70:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 71. What additional data fields should be added to the AIFMR supervisory reporting template to improve capturing risks to financial stability:**

Please select as many answers as you like

- value at Risk (VaR)
- additional details used for calculating leverage
-

- additional details on the liquidity profile of the fund's portfolio
- details on initial margin and variation margin
- the geographical focus expressed in monetary values
- the extent of hedging through long/short positions by an AIFM/AIF expressed as a percentage
- liquidity risk management tools that are available to AIFMs
- data on non-EU master AIFs that are not marketed into the EU, but which have an EU feeder AIF or a non-EU feeder marketed into the EU if managed by the same AIFM
- the role of external credit ratings in investment mandates
- LEIs of all counterparties to provide detail on exposures
- sustainability-related data, in particular on exposure to climate and environmental risks, including physical and transition risks (e.g. shares of assets for which sustainability risks are assessed; types and magnitudes of risks; forward-looking, scenario-based data)
- other

**Question 72. What additional data fields should be added to the AIFMR supervisory reporting template to better capture AIF's exposure to leveraged loans and CLO market?**

**Please explain your answer providing as much detail as possible and relevant examples as well as the costs, benefits and disadvantages:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 73. Should any data fields be deleted from the AIFMR supervisory reporting template?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 74. Is the reporting frequency of the data required under Annex IV of the AIFMR appropriate?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 75. Which data fields should be included in a template requiring AIFMs to provide ad hoc information in accordance with Article 24(5) of the AIFMD during the period of the stressed market in a harmonised and proportionate way?**

**Please explain your answer presenting the costs, benefits and disadvantages of implementing the suggestions:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 76. Should supervisory reporting for UCITS funds be introduced?**



- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 76.1 Please explain your answer to question 78, also in terms of costs, benefits and disadvantages:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The supervisory reporting for UCITS funds should, where appropriate, be harmonized with the AIFMD reporting requirements. Furthermore the reporting should try avoid duplications or unnecessary burdens for the supervised entities.

**Question 77. Should the supervisory reporting requirements for UCITS and AIFs be harmonised?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 77.1 Please explain your answer to question 79, also in terms of costs, benefits and disadvantages:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The reporting requirements should be harmonized (where appropriate) with the AIFMD reporting requirements.

**Question 78. Should the formats and definitions be harmonised with other reporting regimes (e.g. for derivatives and repos, that the AIF could report using a straightforward transformation of the data that they already have to report under EMIR or SFTR)?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**c) leverage**

**Question 79. Are the leverage calculation methods – gross and commitment – as provided in AIFMR appropriate?**

- Fully agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Fully disagree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 79.1 Please explain your answer to question 79 in terms of the costs, benefits and disadvantages:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 80. Should the leverage calculation methods for UCITS and AIFs be harmonised?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 80.1 Please explain your answer to question 80:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 81. What is your assessment of the two-step approach as suggested by International Organisation of Securities Commissions ('IOSCO') in the [Framework Assessing Leverage in Investment Funds published in December 2019](#) to collect data on the asset by asset class to assess leverage in AIFs?**

**Please provide it, presenting costs, benefits and disadvantages of implementing the IOSCO approach:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 82. Should the leverage calculation metrics be harmonised at EU level?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 82.1 Please explain your answer to question 82, presenting the costs, benefits and disadvantages of your chosen approach:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 83. What additional measures may be required given the reported increase in CLO and leveraged loans in the financial system and the risks those may present to macro-prudential stability?**

**Please provide your suggestion(s) including information, where available, on the costs and benefits, advantages and disadvantages of the proposed measures:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 84. Are the current AIFMD rules permitting NCAs to cap the use of leverage appropriate?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 85. Should the requirements for loan originating AIFs be harmonised at EU level?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 85.1 Please explain your answer to question 85:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

## V. Investing in private companies

---

The AIFMD rules regulating investing in private companies aim to increase transparency and accountability of collective investment funds holding controlling stakes in non-listed companies. This section seeks insights whether these provisions are delivering on the stated objectives and whether there are other ways to achieve those objectives more efficiently and effectively. Private equity industry has been growing for years from a few boutique firms to € 3,7 T global industry. The questions are raised therefore whether the AIFMD contains all the relevant regulatory elements that are fit for purpose.

**Question 86. Are the rules provided in Section 2 of Chapter 5 of the AIFMD laying down the obligations for AIFMs managing AIFs, which acquire control of non-listed companies and issuers, adequate, proportionate and effective in enhancing transparency regarding the employees of the portfolio company and the AIF investors?**

- Fully agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Fully disagree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 86.1 Please explain your answer to question 86, providing concrete examples and data, where available:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Please refer to our response to Question 88.1.

**Question 87. Are the AIFMD rules provided in Section 2 of Chapter 5 of the AIFMD whereby the AIFM of an AIF, which acquires control over a non-listed company, is required to provide the NCA of its home Member State with information on the financing of the acquisition necessary, adequate and proportionate?**

- Fully agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Fully disagree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 87.1 Please explain your answer to question 87, providing concrete examples and data, where available:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 88. Are the AIFMD provisions against asset stripping in the case of an acquired control over a non-listed company or an issuer necessary, effective and proportionate?**

- Fully agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Fully disagree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 88.1 Please explain your answer to question 88, providing concrete examples and data, where available:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We believe that the asset stripping rules could be addressed in corporate law regulations so as to achieve a level playing field amongst private equity investors and other investors.

**Question 89. How can the AIFMD provisions against asset stripping in the case of an acquired control over a non-listed company or an issuer be improved?**

**Please provide your suggestion(s) including information, where available, on the costs and benefits, advantages and disadvantages of the proposed measures:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

## VI. Sustainability/ESG

---

Integrating sustainability factors in the portfolio selection and management has a double materiality perspective, in line with the [non-financial reporting directive \(2014/95\)](#) and the [European Commission's 2017 non-binding guidelines on non-financial](#). Financial materiality refers in a broad sense to the financial value and performance of an investment. In this context, sustainability risks refer to potential environmental, social or governance events or conditions that if occurring could cause a negative material impact on the value of the investment. For example, physical risks from the consequences of climate change may concern a single investment/company, e.g. due to potential supply chain disruptions or scarcity of raw materials, and may concern welfare losses for the economy as a whole. Non-financial materiality, also known as environmental and social materiality, refers to the impacts of an investment/corporate activity on the environment and society (i.e. negative externalities). Still, there is also a financial dimension to non-financial materiality. Notably, so-called transition risks arise from an insufficient consideration for environmental materiality, for instance due to potential policy changes for mitigating climate change (e.g. to regulatory frameworks, incentive structures, carbon pricing), shifts of supply chains and end-demand, as well as stakeholder actions for mitigating climate change.

The [disclosure regulation 2019/2088](#) requires a significant part of the financial services market, including AIFMs, to integrate in their processes, including in their due diligence processes, assessment of all relevant sustainability risks that might have a material negative impact on the financial return of an investment or advice. However, at the moment AIFMs are not required to integrate the quantification of sustainability risks. Regulatory technical standards under the disclosure regulation 2019/2088 will specify principal adverse impacts to be quantified or described. This section seeks to gather input permitting better understand and assess the appropriateness of the AIFMD rules in assessing the sustainability risks.

**Question 90. The [disclosure regulation 2019/2088](#) defines sustainability risks, and allows their disclosures either in quantitative or qualitative terms.**

**Should AIFMs only quantify such risks?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 90.1 Please substantiate your answer to question 90, also in terms of benefits, disadvantages and costs as well as in terms of available data:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.



Including qualitative descriptions of sustainability risk in investment decisions will lead to a better understanding of these risks. Qualitative data will also be more readily available especially for investment categories for which sustainability risk are harder to quantify (and in some cases less relevant).

**Question 91. Should investment decision processes of any AIFM integrate the assessment of non-financial materiality, i.e. potential principal adverse sustainability impacts?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 91.1 Please substantiate your answer to question 91, also in terms of benefits, disadvantages and costs. Please make a distinction between adverse impacts and principal adverse impacts and consider those types of adverse impacts for which data and methodologies are available as well as those where the competence is nascent or evolving:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The Ministry of Finance believes that sustainability risk should be an integral part of the risk management of the managers. We are also in favour of integrating the assessment of non-financial materiality, because in the long run, those risk can become financial and impact the performance.

**Question 92. Should the adverse impacts on sustainability factors be integrated in the quantification of sustainability risks (see the example in the introduction)?**

- Fully agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Fully disagree
-

Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 92.1 If you agree, please explain how and at which level the adverse impacts on sustainability factors should be integrated in the quantification of sustainability risks (AIFM or financial product level etc.).**

**Please explain your answer including concrete proposals, if any, and costs, advantages and disadvantages associated therewith. Please make a distinction between adverse impacts and principal adverse impacts and consider those types of adverse impacts for which data and methodologies are available as well as those where the competence is nascent or evolving**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Carbon accounting methods and scenario-analysis should be integrated in the quantification of sustainability risks.

**Question 93. Should AIFMs, when considering investment decisions, be required to take account of sustainability-related impacts beyond what is currently required by the EU law (such as environmental pollution and degradation, climate change, social impacts, human rights violations) alongside the interests and preferences of investors?**

- Yes
- No
- No, ESMA's current competences and powers are sufficient
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 93.1 Please explain your answer to question 93:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The (new) sustainability related requirements are challenging for AIFMs to implement in their investment process. When the EU law is implemented well other sustainability related impacts could be taken in account.

**Question 94. The [EU Taxonomy Regulation 2020/852](#) provides a framework for identifying economic activities that are in fact sustainable in order to establish a common understanding for market participants and prevent green-washing. To qualify as sustainable, an activity needs to make a substantial contribution to one of six environmental objectives, do no significant harm to any of the other five, and meet certain social minimum standards. In your view, should the EU Taxonomy play a role when AIFMs are making investment decisions, in particular regarding sustainability factors?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 94.1 Please explain your answer to question 94:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

When managers want to make sustainable investments they have to consider the taxonomy as a framework, at least to disclose how much of their investments are taxonomy aligned. The EU taxonomy should also play a role when AIFMs are making investment decisions concerning AIFs that are not distributed as a sustainable AIF. In that case it would be possible to investors to see how green an AIF is (for example: 40% sustainable assets).

**Question 95. Should other sustainability-related requirements or international principles beyond those laid down in Regulation (EU) 2020/852 be considered by AIFMs when making investment decisions?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 95.1 Please explain your answer to question 95, describing sustainability-related requirements or international principles that you would propose to consider.**

**Please indicate, where possible, costs, advantages and disadvantages associated therewith:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

No, at this moment the new sustainability related requirements are sufficient and challenging for the AIFMs.

## VII. Miscellaneous

---

This section contains a few questions on the competences and powers of supervisory authorities. It also opens up the floor for any other comments of the stakeholders on the AIFMD related regulatory issues that are raised in the preceding sections. Respondents are invited to provide relevant data to support their remarks/proposals.

**Question 96. Should ESMA be granted additional competences and powers beyond those already granted to them under the AIFMD?**

Please select as many answers as you like

- entrusting ESMA with authorisation and supervision of all AIFMs
- entrusting ESMA with authorisation and supervision of non-EU AIFMs and AIFs
- enhancing ESMA's powers in taking action against individual AIFMs and AIFs where their activities threaten integrity of the EU financial market or stability the financial system
- enhance ESMA's powers in getting information about national supervisory practices, including in relation to individual AIFM and AIFs
- no, there is no need to change competences and powers of ESMA
- other

**Question 97. Should NCAs be granted additional powers and competences beyond those already granted to them under the AIFMD?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 98. Are the AIFMD provisions for the supervision of intra-EU cross-border entities effective?**

- Fully agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Fully disagree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 98.1 Please explain your answer to question 98, providing concrete examples:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

**Question 99. What improvements to intra-EU cross-border supervisory cooperation would you suggest?**

**Please provide your answer presenting costs, advantages and disadvantages associated with the suggestions:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

There is still a lack of clarity in what the precise responsibilities of home and host supervisors are in some cross-border marketing, management and delegation cases. For example further clarity is useful on the depth of the analysis to be done by the host NCA when AIFs are marketed on a cross-border basis under Article 32 AIFMD. Clarify the roles and responsibilities of home and host NCAs where AIFs are managed on

a cross-border basis under Article 33 AIFMD. Furthermore it would be useful to further clarify the supervisory responsibilities and obligations to share information with other NCAs and ESMA.

**Question 100. Should the sanctioning regime under the AIFMD be changed?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 101. Should the UCITS and AIFM regulatory frameworks be merged into a single EU rulebook?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 102. Are there other regulatory issues related to the proportionality, efficiency and effectiveness of the AIFMD legal framework?**

**Please detail your answer, substantiating your answer in terms of costs /benefits/advantages, where possible:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

N.A.

## Additional information

---

Should you wish to provide additional information (e.g. a position paper, report) or raise specific points not covered by the questionnaire, you can upload your additional document(s) here:

The maximum file size is 1 MB.

You can upload several files.

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

### Useful links

[More on this consultation \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-aifmd-review\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-aifmd-review_en)

[Consultation document \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-aifmd-review-consultation-document\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-aifmd-review-consultation-document_en)

[Consultation strategy \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-aifmd-review-consultation-strategy\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-aifmd-review-consultation-strategy_en)

[List of acronyms used in this consultation \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-aifmd-review-acronyms\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-aifmd-review-acronyms_en)

[More on investment funds \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/growth-and-investment/investment-funds\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/growth-and-investment/investment-funds_en)

[Specific privacy statement \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/specific-privacy-statement\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/specific-privacy-statement_en)

[More on the Transparency register \(http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en\)](http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en)

### Contact

fisma-aifmd-public-consultation@ec.europa.eu