

BREXIT: ESMA SIGNALS TOUGHER STANCE ON UK ASSET MANAGER RELOCATION TO THE EU

On 13 July 2017, ESMA published [three opinions](#) setting out sector-specific principles aimed at supporting supervisory convergence in the context of requests from UK financial institutions seeking to relocate to the EU27. The opinions relate to investment management, investment firms and secondary markets and follow on from the general, [cross-sectoral opinion](#) published by ESMA in May 2017, on which we [briefed](#) earlier.

The opinion on Investment Management covers UCITS and AIFMD structures, and asset management structures involving delegation to MiFID investment firms. The opinion addresses provisions of the UCITS Directive and the AIFMD, although there are wider implications also, as regulators will need to consider other asset management regulation, such as the Regulations on European Venture Capital Funds (EuVECA), European Social Entrepreneurship Funds (EuSEF), European Long-Term Investment Funds (ELTIF) and Money Market Funds (MMF).

REGULATORY AND SUPERVISORY RISK

ESMA's opinion is directed at potential risks in relation to: authorisation; governance and internal control; delegation; and effective supervision. Most of the content is not surprising and what we already know about regulators' considerations when an asset manager is establishing in their jurisdiction – but the points listed below indicate a change of tone in respect of Brexit relocations – particularly in relation to substance requirements on delegation (Paragraphs 61 and 62 in particular).

Key points include:

- Paragraph 23: regulators are asked to scrutinise circumstances in which firms make up their local substance with "directors for hire" with multiple directorships;
- Paragraph 28: regulators should be able to contact and meet the local senior managers of the firm during normal business hours, and to be able to carry out on site visits and meet the senior managers without prior notice. We already knew that the senior managers needed to be locally resident but this new point looks a little less tolerant of arrangements

whereby some of the senior managers spend only part of their time locally (e.g. a London/Luxembourg split working arrangement);

- Paragraph 31/32/33: this points to the need for a separate standalone compliance officer locally;
- Paragraph 36: extra regulatory scrutiny for relocation proposals that envisage use of a third party UCITS/AIFM platform;
- Paragraph 40: extra regulatory scrutiny for relocation proposals that envisage a UK advisor to an EU manager, to ensure that the EU manager is not simply rubber stamping the advice from the UK advisor;
- Paragraph 42: ESMA proposes that the delegation rules under AIFMD should be applied in respect of UCITS delegation structures;
- Paragraph 45: regulators are required to assess properly whether there are objective reasons for delegation. The firm must provide evidence that the financial benefits of the delegation outweigh the estimated costs of performing the delegated function in the EU firm (i.e. this needs to be proved by the numbers – at present, the "objective reasons" for delegation are not generally subject to much probing by regulators);
- Paragraph 49: this points to the EU firm having to conduct and document a due diligence process prior to delegation of a function, including a detailed consideration of the alternatives. Any EU application you might make for a firm would need to set out the efficiencies to be achieved in terms of cost and expertise by the EU firm delegating certain functions to London;
- Paragraph 56: no ability to have full delegation of portfolio management, i.e. the EU firm must perform some investment management functions. This is not new, but to date there has not been much regulatory pressure on this point in AIFMD structures (i.e. we do see full delegation of portfolio management and not much focus on the EU firm's ability to scrutinise their conduct);
- Paragraph 60: ESMA pointing to a firm needing to have at least three full time employees for the performance of portfolio management and risk management and supervising any delegates;
- Paragraph 61: ESMA indicates that relocation plans should not result in a situation in which an asset manager "could continue to perform substantially more portfolio management and/or risk management functions for the relevant funds in their original Member State" on a delegation basis "and therefore also maintain substantially more relevant human and technical resources there despite a relocation";
- Paragraph 62: pressure on EU regulators to question a model under which an EU firm delegates to a UK firm in respect of a fund with assets which are securities issued by EU issuers or EU real estate assets;
- Paragraph 67: ESMA states that the risk management function should not be limited to ex-post controls, "but is to be involved in the investment process before transactions are concluded". This could be problematic for structures where the EU entity has delegated portfolio management, and has retained risk management but performs this only on an ex-post basis (i.e. it conducts checks after the event).

CONCLUSION

EU regulators are likely to conclude that they already comply with applicable legal and regulatory requirements governing their review of licence applications and delegation arrangements. The ESMA opinion does not (and cannot) change those legal and regulatory requirements. The ESMA opinion may, therefore, be simply that – an opinion of ESMA - a "steer" towards tougher appraisal of licence applications. EU regulators may note the change of tone, but continue to review relocation applications in accordance with their current approach. Of much more concern would be any proposal to revise the legal framework of AIFMD (e.g. in AIFMD 2), UCITS and MiFID in line with the tougher approach set out in the ESMA opinion, as that would require EU regulators to modify their approach.

Finally, while the ESMA opinion was prepared in the context of UK firms relocating to the EU, the approach it outlines would be equally applicable to all non-EU asset managers and their EU fund structures, e.g. U.S. managers with EU management companies delegating portfolio management back to the U.S.

CONTACTS

Simon Crown
Partner, London

T +44 20 7006 2944
E simon.crown@cliffordchance.com

Owen Lysak
Partner, London

T +44 207006 2904
E owen.lysak@cliffordchance.com

Joelle Hauser
Partner, Luxembourg

T +352 485050 203
E joelle.hauser@cliffordchance.com

Paul Van Den Abeele
Partner, Luxembourg

T +352 485050 478
E paul.vandenabeele@cliffordchance.com

Nigel Hatfield
Partner, London

T +44 20 7006 1834
E nigel.hatfield@cliffordchance.com

Gerard Saviola
Partner, London

T +44 20 7006 4958
E gerard.saviola@cliffordchance.com

Alexandra Davidson
Partner, London

T +44 20 7006 2581
E alexandra.davidson@cliffordchance.com

Jacqueline Jones
Senior PSL, London

T +44 20 7006 2457
E jacqueline.jones@cliffordchance.com

Fionnuala Oomen
PSL, London

T +44 20 7006 8392
E fionnuala.oomen@cliffordchance.com

This publication does not necessarily deal with every important topic or cover every aspect of the topics with which it deals. It is not designed to provide legal or other advice.

www.cliffordchance.com

Clifford Chance, 10 Upper Bank Street,
London, E14 5JJ

© Clifford Chance 2017

Clifford Chance LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC323571

Registered office: 10 Upper Bank Street,
London, E14 5JJ

We use the word 'partner' to refer to a member of Clifford Chance LLP, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications

If you do not wish to receive further information from Clifford Chance about events or legal developments which we believe may be of interest to you, please either send an email to nomorecontact@cliffordchance.com or by post at Clifford Chance LLP, 10 Upper Bank Street, Canary Wharf, London E14 5JJ

Abu Dhabi • Amsterdam • Bangkok •
Barcelona • Beijing • Brussels • Bucharest •
Casablanca • Dubai • Düsseldorf • Frankfurt •
Hong Kong • Istanbul • Jakarta* • London •
Luxembourg • Madrid • Milan • Moscow •
Munich • New York • Paris • Perth • Prague •
Rome • São Paulo • Seoul • Shanghai •
Singapore • Sydney • Tokyo • Warsaw •
Washington, D.C.

*Linda Widyati & Partners in association with Clifford Chance.

Clifford Chance has a co-operation agreement with Abuhimed Alsheikh Alhagbani Law Firm in Riyadh.

Clifford Chance has a best friends relationship with Redcliffe Partners in Ukraine.