7. CCPs in the post-Brexit era

The future of market infrastructures after the UK departs from the EU

The importance of Central Counterparties (CCPs) has become greater since the last financial crisis. In the EU, a substantial volume of euro-denominated trades are cleared in the UK. Brexit is likely to have an impact on the current status-quo. In this regard, the European Commission (EC) has presented a proposal to grant ESMA and Central Banks, additional powers in the supervision and authorization of CCPs.

CCPs play an important role in the economy. They become the counterparty to each sides of an operation, and by netting the positions of multiple trades across agents and collecting collateral they are able to reduce counterparty and systemic risk. Nearly 62% of all OTC contracts are centrally cleared (75% for interest rates derivatives)¹.

In the EU, the European Market Infrastructure Regulation (<u>EMIR</u>) oversees the registration and supervision process for CCPs. After the implementation of this regulation, the clearing of some asset classes was mandatory. For the case of CCPs located in third countries, there are two requirements: first, that the third country's legal framework is granted equivalence for EMIR, and second, that the corresponding CCP is <u>authorised</u> and registered by ESMA. If otherwise, EU agents cannot use these CCPs services for regulatory purposes.

Currently, a substantial volume of trades in the EU is conducted through CCPs located in the UK (particularly, eurodenominated derivative transactions). Once the UK ceases to be a Member State, it will become a third country. Then, unless the EU and the UK are able to secure a transitional period, in March 2019 CCPs located in the UK will no longer be able to provide services to EU clients. Under the current situation, the UK will need to go through the third country equivalence process, and CCPs will need to be authorized by ESMA.

Considering that until now the UK has been a full member of the EU, and henceforth it has applied all of the EU regulations and directives, the equivalence process for EMIR should not pose a major difficulty from a technical perspective. Nevertheless, if the UK decides to modify its regulatory/supervisory framework, equivalence could be revoked. Considering the sheer volume of EU-based clients using UK-based CCPs, we would expect close scrutiny by EU authorities and this solution might not be a long term alternative.

Furthermore, the EC has recently issued a proposal to modify, among other issues, the authorisation and recognition process for third-country CCPs. The EC recognizes there is the "*risk that changes to the CCP…regulatory framework in a third-country could negatively affect regulatory or supervisory outcomes,…creating scope for regulatory…arbitrage*". In order to cope with this issue, the ESMA would be empowered to set additional requirements for third country CCPs, depending on their systemic importance (as measured by objective criteria such as size, complexity, membership structure, or the effect that failure would have on the EU).

^{1:} Bank for International Settlements (2016). OTC derivatives statistics at end-June 2016.



Non-systemically important CCPs (Tier 1 CCPs) would be subject to the same implementation of EMIR equivalence that is currently used. But systemically important CCPs (Tier 2 CCPs) would be subject to enhanced supervisory requirements (depending on the degree of systemic risk). These additional requirements include, among other aspects, ongoing compliance with prudential requirements for EU-CCPs, the ability of the ESMA to conduct on-site inspections upon request, or any other requirement that relevant central banks deem necessary to guarantee the correct implementation of their monetary policy tasks. Additionally, there might be cases in which ESMA determines that the risks posed by a specific non-EU CCP to the financial stability of the EU (or one of its Member States) are so significant that even full oversight and compliance with the enhanced framework would not be sufficient to reduce such risks. In such cases, the ESMA would recommend that the EC should not to recognise the CCP. If such a CCP decides to service EU clients, it would need to be established and authorised in one Member State².

Figure 7.1 The European Commission's proposal

Tier 1 CCPs	Tier 2 CCPs	Too systemic CCPs
 Non-systemically important Basically subject to the same implementation of EMIR as currently used No additional requirements 	 Systemically important Enhanced supervisory requirements, depending on the degree of systemic risk (gradual sliding scale) Ongoing compliance with EU prudential requirements, allow ESMA to conduct on-site inspections, requirement that relevant central banks deem necessary, etc. 	 Risk posed to EU's (or Member State's) financial stability so important that even full compliance with enhanced framework is not be sufficient ESMA would recommend not to recognize the CCP Hence, relocation would be needed in this case

Source: BBVA Research

Given the importance of CCPs to the financial network, stronger supervision seems to be a reasonable approach. It is important to recognise as well, that if a location policy is enforced, and UK-based CCPs have to settle in a Member State, there might be a fragmentation of the liquidity pool, thus increasing the cost of using these CCPs. Nevertheless, EU's financial stability must prevail over other objectives. During periods of financial stress, rules in third countries might change in adapting to the new environment, but such rules might not be fully compatible with EU goals. Finally, it is worth mentioning that, whatever the outcome of this proposed reform (and the Brexit negotiations), a sufficiently long transition period is needed to allow firms to adapt their structures to the new environment. Given the complexity and the high interdependencies of CCPs, time is key to adapt positions to suit a different set of conditions; unravelling positions in a short period of time could lead to serious problems for the industry, as well as overall stability.

^{2:} In 2011 the ECB tried to impose a location policy on CCPs with a high exposure to euro-denominated products, which would have forced CCPs located in the UK to relocate to a Euro Member State. The UK opposed this measures, and took it to the General Court of the EU, which <u>ruled</u> in 2015 that the "ECB does not have the competence necessary to impose such a requirement on CCPs".

DISCLAIMER

This document has been prepared by BBVA Research Department, it is provided for information purposes only and expresses data, opinions or estimations regarding the date of issue of the report, prepared by BBVA or obtained from or based on sources we consider to be reliable, and have not been independently verified by BBVA. Therefore, BBVA offers no warranty, either express or implicit, regarding its accuracy, integrity or correctness.

Estimations this document may contain have been undertaken according to generally accepted methodologies and should be considered as forecasts or projections. Results obtained in the past, either positive or negative, are no guarantee of future performance.

This document and its contents are subject to changes without prior notice depending on variables such as the economic context or market fluctuations. BBVA is not responsible for updating these contents or for giving notice of such changes.

BBVA accepts no liability for any loss, direct or indirect, that may result from the use of this document or its contents.

This document and its contents do not constitute an offer, invitation or solicitation to purchase, divest or enter into any interest in financial assets or instruments. Neither shall this document nor its contents form the basis of any contract, commitment or decision of any kind.

In regard to investment in financial assets related to economic variables this document may cover, readers should be aware that under no circumstances should they base their investment decisions in the information contained in this document. Those persons or entities offering investment products to these potential investors are legally required to provide the information needed for them to take an appropriate investment decision.

The content of this document is protected by intellectual property laws. It is forbidden its reproduction, transformation, distribution, public communication, making available, extraction, reuse, forwarding or use of any nature by any means or process, except in cases where it is legally permitted or expressly authorized by BBVA.



This report has been produced by the Regulation Unit:

Chief Economist for Financial Systems & Regulation

Santiago Fernández de Lis sfernandezdelis@bbva.com

Maria Abascal Maria.abascal@bbva.com Arturo Fraile arturo.fraile@bbva.com

Victoria Santillana

Santiago Muñoz santiago.munoz.trujillo@bbva.com

With the contribution of:

Financial Systems Ana Rubio arubiog@bbva.com Digital Regulation team Lucia Pacheco Rodriguez lucia.pacheco@bbva.com

mvictoria.santillana@bbva.com

BBVA Research

Economista Jefe Grupo BBVA Jorge Sicilia Serrano

Macroeconomic Analysis Rafael Doménech r.domenech@bbva.com

Global Economic Situations Miguel Jiménez mjimenezg@bbva.com

Global Financial Markets Sonsoles Castillo s.castillo@bbva.com

Long term Global Modelling and Analysis J. Julián Cubero iuan.cubero@bbva.com

Innovation and Processes Oscar de las Peñas

oscar.delaspenas@bbva.com

Financial Systems And Regulation Santiago Fernández de Lis sfernandezdelis@bbva.com

International Coordination Olga Cerqueira olga.gouveia@bbva.com

Digital Regulation Álvaro Martín alvaro.martin@bbva.com

Regulation María Abascal maria.abascal@bbva.com Financial Systems

Ana Rubio arubiog@bbva.com Financial Inclusion David Tuesta david.tuesta@bbva.com Spain and Portugal Miguel Cardoso miguel.cardoso@bbva.com

Matías Daniel Cabrera

Pilar Soler

matiasdaniel.cabrera@bbva.com

pilar.soler.vaquer@bbva.com

United States Nathaniel Karp Nathaniel.Karp@bbva.com

Mexico Carlos Serrano carlos.serranoh@bbva.com

Middle East, Asia and Geopolitical

Álvaro Ortiz Alvaro.ortiz@bbva.com

Turkey Álvaro Ortiz alvaro.ortiz@bbva.com

Asia Le Xia le.xia@bbva.com South America

Javier García Tolonen

Álvaro Romero Mateu

javierpablo.garcia@bbva.com

alvaro.romero.mateu@bbva.com

juan.ruiz@bbva.com Argentina Gloria Sorensen

gsorensen@bbva.com

Jorge Selaive jselaive@bbva.com

Colombia Juana Téllez juana.tellez@bbva.com

Peru Hugo Perea hperea@bbva.com

Venezuela Julio Pineda juliocesar.pineda@bbva.com

CONTACT DETAILS: BBVA Research: Azul Street. 4. La Vela Building – 4th and 5th floor. 28050 Madrid (Spain). Tel.:+34 91 374 60 00 and +34 91 537 70 00 / Fax:+34 91 374 30 25 - bbvaresearch@bbva.com www.bbvaresearch.com