

Implementation of the Markets in Financial Instruments Derivative (MiFID II)

<i>Lead Officer:</i>	Kevin Nacey: Director of Finance and Performance
<i>Author:</i>	Anton Sweet: Funds and Investments Manager
<i>Contact Details:</i>	(01823) 359584 asweet@somerset.gov.uk
<i>Cabinet Member:</i>	Not applicable
<i>Division and Local Member:</i>	Not applicable

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report outlines the impact of the implementation of the Markets in Financial Instrument Directive 2014/65 (“MiFID II”) and in particular the risk to the administering authority of becoming a retail client on 3rd January 2018 and recommends that the committee agree that elections for professional client status should be made on behalf of the authority immediately.
- 1.2 By opting up to professional client status the authority will waive the right to certain protections. However, in choosing to opt up we are in effect choosing not to gain these protections as we are currently classified as a professional client under the outgoing rules.

2. Issues for consideration

- 2.1 Committee notes the potential impact on investment strategy of becoming a retail client with effect from 3rd January 2018.
- 2.2 Committee agrees to the immediate commencement of applications for elected professional client status with all relevant institutions in order to ensure it can continue to implement an effective investment strategy.
- 2.3 In electing for professional client status, the committee acknowledges and agrees to forgo the protections available to retail clients attached as Appendix A.
- 2.4 Committee agrees to approve delegated responsibility to the Funds and Investments Manager for the purposes of completing the applications and determining the basis of the application as either full or single service.

3. Background

- 3.1 Under the current UK regime, local authorities are automatically categorised as 'per se professional' clients in respect of non-MiFID scope business and are categorised as 'per se professional' clients for MiFID scope business if they satisfy the MiFID Large Undertakings test. Local authorities that do not satisfy the Large Undertakings test may opt up to elective professional client status if they fulfil certain 'opt-up criteria'.
- 3.2 Following the introduction of the Markets in Financial Instrument Directive 2014/65 ("MiFID II") from 3 January 2018, firms will no longer be able to categorise a local public authority or a municipality that (in either case) does not manage public debt ("local authority") as a 'per se professional client' or elective eligible counterparty (ECP) for both MiFID and non-MiFID scope business. Instead, all local authorities must be classified as "retail clients" unless they are opted up by firms to an 'elective professional client' status.
- 3.3 Furthermore, the FCA has exercised its discretion to adopt gold-plated opt-up criteria for the purposes of the quantitative opt-up criteria, which local authority clients must satisfy in order for firms to reclassify them as an elective professional client.
- 3.4 A move to retail client status would mean that all financial services firms like banks, brokers, advisers and fund managers will have to treat local authorities the same way they do non-professional individuals and small businesses. That includes a raft of protections ensuring that investment products are suitable for the customer's needs, and that all the risks and features have been fully explained. This provides a higher standard of protection for the client but it also involves lots more work and potential cost for both the firm and the client, for the purpose of proving to the regulator that all such requirements have been met.
- 3.5 Such protections would come at the price of local authorities not being able to access the wide range of assets needed to implement an effective, diversified investment strategy. Retail status would significantly restrict the range of financial institutions and instruments available to authorities. Many institutions currently servicing the LGPS are not authorised to deal with retail clients and may not wish to undergo the required changes to resources and permissions in order to do so.
- 3.6 Even if the institution secures the ability to deal with retail clients, the range of instruments it can make available to the client will be limited to those defined under Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) rules as 'non-complex' which would exclude many of the asset classes currently included in LGPS fund portfolios. In many cases managers will no longer be able to even discuss ('promote') certain asset classes and vehicles with the authority as a retail client.

- 3.7 MiFID II allows for retail clients which meet certain conditions to elect to be treated as professional clients (to 'opt up'). There are two tests which must be met by the client when being assessed by the financial institution: the quantitative and the qualitative test.
- 3.8 The Local Government Pension Scheme Advisory Board (SAB) and the Local Government Association (LGA) along with the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and the Investment Association (IA) have successfully lobbied the FCA to make the test better fitted to the unique situation of local authorities. The new tests recognise the status of LGPS administering authorities as providing a 'pass' for the quantitative test while the qualitative test can now be performed on the authority as a collective rather than an individual.
- 3.9 The election to professional status must be completed with all financial institutions prior to the change of status on 3rd January 2018. Failure to do so by local authorities would result in the financial institution having to take 'appropriate action' which could include a termination of the relationship at a significant financial risk to the authority. The SAB and the LGA have worked with industry representative bodies including the IA, the British Venture Capital Association (BVCA) and others to develop a standard opt-up process with letter and information templates. This process should enable a consistent approach to assessment and prevent authorities from having to submit a variety of information in different formats.
- 4.0 Applications can be made in respect of either all of the services offered by the institution (even if not already being accessed) or a particular service only. A local authority may wish to do the latter where the institution offers a wide range of complex instruments which the authority does not currently use and there is no intention to use the institution again once the current relationship has come to an end, for example, if the next procurement is achieved via the LGPS pool. It is recommended that officers determine the most appropriate basis of the application, either via full or single service.
- 4.1 Authorities are not required to renew elections on a regular basis but will be required to review the information provided in the opt-up process and notify all institutions of any changes in circumstances which could affect their status, for example, if the membership of the committee changed significantly resulting in a loss of experience, changes in the named officers in the opt up documentation or if the relationship with the authority's investment advisor was terminated.

4. Consultations undertaken

None

5. Financial Implications

- 5.1 Should the Fund not be able to access a full range of financial services it could significantly impair the operation of the investments of the Fund and financial returns on investments.

6. Background Papers

None

Note For sight of individual background papers please contact the report author.