

Citadel Europe LLP

MiFID II RTS 28 Best Execution Disclosure

Other Instruments - Transmitted

April 2019

Quality of Execution Obtained on Execution Venues¹

Firm	Citadel Europe LLP	
Disclosure Period	1 January 2018 to 31 December 2018	
Publication Date	April 2019	
Class of instrument	Other Instruments ² - Transmitted	
	Summary of Analysis	Conclusion
Execution factors	<p>The relative importance of the execution factors was determined by the following execution criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the characteristics of the Citadel Fund • the characteristics of the order • the characteristics of the financial instrument to which the order related; and • the characteristics of the broker or trading venue/systematic internaliser/market maker/liquidity provider/ third country entity performing a similar function to which the order could be directed. 	<p>Given the breadth of instruments included within this report, this section focuses on those that were most frequently traded during the period under review. Given the liquidity of, and transparency for, index futures the Firm considered price to be the most important execution factor when assessing quality of execution. Therefore in monitoring quality of execution for these instruments, the Firm has used slippage as a tool to consider whether best execution has been provided by the execution venues.</p>
Close links, conflicts of interest and common ownership with respect to execution venues³	<p>Close links During the period under review certain orders were transmitted to the affiliate firms Citadel Advisors LLC and Citadel Advisors II LLC to facilitate execution. These orders related to non-EMEA instruments.</p>	<p>Close links These close links did not influence the Firm's selection of the execution venues as the Firm followed its Best Execution Policy and Conflicts of Interest Policy when selecting execution venues.</p>
	<p>Conflicts of interest The Firm has no conflicts of interest to report.</p>	<p>Conflicts of interest Not applicable</p>
	<p>Common ownerships During the period under review certain orders were transmitted to the affiliate firms Citadel Advisors LLC and Citadel Advisors II LLC to facilitate execution. These orders related to non-EMEA instruments.</p>	<p>Common ownerships These common ownerships did not influence the Firm's selection of the execution venues as the Firm followed its Best Execution Policy and Conflicts of Interest Policy when selecting execution venues.</p>
Specific arrangements with execution venues² regarding payments made or received, discounts,	<p>During the period under review payments were made to execution venues in respect of research, data and corporate access received. In addition, business gifts and entertainments were received. No payments, discounts or rebates were received from execution venues.</p>	<p>The Firm followed its internal policies in line with its regulatory obligations in relation to these arrangements. No issues were noted in respect of these payments made or non-monetary benefits received. In addition these arrangements did not influence the Firm's selection of execution venues, as</p>

¹ This report has been produced in line with the requirements of the recast Markets in Financial Instruments Directive and Regulation (together, "MiFID II") and Regulatory Technical Standard ("RTS") 28, as implemented in the UK.

² For the purposes of this report, 'other instruments' includes equities not assigned to a liquidity band, bond futures, index futures, options on bond futures and certain variance swaps.

³ For the purposes of this report, execution venue means broker, trading venue, systematic internaliser, market maker, liquidity provider and/or third country entity performing a similar function.

rebates or non-monetary benefits received		the Firm followed its Best Execution Policy and Conflicts of Interest Policy when selecting execution venues.
Factors leading to a change in the list of execution venues² listed in the order execution policy	There were no changes to the list of execution venues referred to in the Firm's Best Execution Policy. However as a result of the ongoing monitoring of the quality of execution, the allocation of orders to the various execution venues changed throughout the period under review.	The factors leading to such changes were objective factors which were considered and applied by the Firm on an objective basis.
Differentiation across client categories	All of the Firm's clients are professional clients.	Not applicable
Use of data / tools relating to quality of execution	The Firm has used a variety of data and tools relating to quality of execution during the period under review in order to inform both its real-time and periodic assessments.	These objective factors were considered and applied by the Firm on an objective basis.
Use of consolidated tape provider output	There were no consolidated tape providers during the period under review.	Not applicable
Use of Direct Electronic Access (DEA)	<p>The list of Top 5 execution venues for this class of instrument includes brokers who provide the Firm with direct electronic access to trading venues.</p> <p>These brokers are: Barclays and Citigroup.</p> <p>The trading venues accessed by the Firm using DEA for this instrument class were: EUREX, ICE Futures Europe, the Montreal Exchange and the Australian Securities Exchange.</p>	

ALL TRADEMARKS, SERVICE MARKS AND LOGOS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT ARE TRADEMARKS OR SERVICE MARKS OR REGISTERED TRADEMARKS OR REGISTERED SERVICE MARKS OF CITADEL

NEITHER THIS DOCUMENT NOR ANY OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN IT SHALL CONSTITUTE AN OFFER, SOLICITATION, INVITATION OR INDUCEMENT TO PURCHASE, ACQUIRE, SUBSCRIBE TO, PROVIDE OR SELL ANY PARTICULAR INVESTMENT, NOR DOES IT CONSTITUTE INVESTMENT ADVICE OR ANY OTHER RECOMMENDATION REGARDING ANY PARTICULAR INVESTMENT, NOR SHALL IT OR ANY PART OF IT FORM THE BASIS OF OR BE RELIED UPON AS A PROMISE OR REPRESENTATION IN CONNECTION WITH ANY CONTRACT OR INVESTMENT DECISION.