Insider dealing and market manipulation (market abuse): implementing powers conferred on the Commission

2006/0301(COD) - 15/02/2007

The European Central Bank adopted an Opinion at the request of the Council of the European Union on eight proposals amending Directives 2006/49/EC, 2006/48/EC, 2005/60/EC, 2004/109/EC, 2004/39/EC, 2003/71/EC, 2003/6/EC and 2002/87/EC, as regards the implementing powers conferred on the Commission.

The ECB welcomes the new agreement on comitology reached between the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission, which is of great importance for the continued functioning of the Lamfalussy process.

The ECB has no specific comments on the proposals which are in line with the joint statement of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on the introduction of the new ‘regulatory procedure with scrutiny’ into the comitology framework).

Having regard to the importance of the role played by implementing measures in EU legislation in the financial services field, the ECB takes this opportunity to underline the importance of its advisory role under Article 105(4) of the Treaty, which requires the ECB to be consulted ‘on any proposed Community act in its fields of competence’.

As recently noted, the ECB considers that proposed Level 2 acts constitute “proposed Community acts” within the meaning of Article 105(4) of the Treaty’. Therefore the Treaty provision which requires the ECB to be consulted on any proposed Community act in its field of competence includes an obligation for it to be consulted on these implementing acts.

It should be noted that the lack of consultation between Community institutions has been the subject of several judgments by the Court of Justice. As far as Article 105(4) of the Treaty is concerned, in Case C-11 /00 Commission v European Central Bank [2003] ECR I-7147, Advocate General Jacobs emphasised that: ‘Consultation of the ECB on proposed measures in its field of competence is a procedural step, required by a provision of the Treaty, which is clearly capable of affecting the content of the measures adopted. Failure to comply with such requirement must, in my view, be capable of leading to the annulment of the measures adopted’,