



MALTA

QORTI TAL-APPELL
(Sede Inferjuri)

ONOR. IMĦALLEF
LAWRENCE MINTOFF

Seduta tad-19 ta' Jannar, 2022

Appell Inferjuri Numru 45/2020 LM

John Thomas Rogers (Passaport nru. 707597499)
(‘l-appellat’)

vs.

Momentum Pensions Malta Limited (C 52627)
(‘l-appellanta’)

Il-Qorti,

Preliminari

1. Dan huwa appell magħmul mis-soċjetà intimata **Momentum Pensions Malta Limited (C 52627)** [minn issa ‘l quddiem ‘is-soċjetà appellanta’] mid-deċiżjoni tal-Arbitru għas-Servizzi Finanzjarji [minn issa ‘l quddiem ‘l-Arbitru’] mogħtija fit-28 ta’ Lulju, 2020, [minn issa ‘l quddiem ‘id-deċiżjoni appellata’], li

permezz tagħha ddecieda li jilqa' l-ilment tar-rikorrent **John Thomas Rogers (Detentur tal-Passaport nru. 707597499)** [minn issa 'l quddiem 'l-appellat'] fil-konfront tal-imsemmija soċjetà appellanta, u dan safejn kompatibbli mad-deċiżjoni appellata, u wara li kkonsidra li l-istess soċjetà appellanta għandha tinzamm biss parzjalment responsabbli għad-danni sofferti, huwa ddikjara li a tenur tas-subinċiż (iv) tal-para. (ċ) tas-subartikolu 26(3) tal-Kap. 555 hija għandha tħallas lill-appellat l-kumpens bil-mod kif stabbilit, bl-imgħaxijiet legali mid-data ta' dik id-deċiżjoni appellata sad-data tal-effettiv pagament, filwaqt li kull parti kellha tħallas l-ispejjeż tagħha konnessi ma' dik il-proċedura.

Fatti

2. Il-fatti tal-każ odjern jirrigwardaw it-telf eventwali li allegatament jgħid li sofra l-appellat mill-investment tal-polza SEB Life International f'skema tal-irtirar [minn issa 'l quddiem 'l-Iskema'] jew QROPS ġestita mis-soċjetà appellanta. B'dana però li l-investment kien sar oriġinarjament ma' *trustee* ieħor wara li huwa kien ikkonsulta lil *Continental Wealth Management* [minn issa 'l quddiem 'CWM'] fis-sena 2011¹. u sussegwentement tali investment kien ġie trasferit lis-soċjetà intimata.²

Mertu

3. L-appellat ipprezenta lment quddiem l-Arbitru fit-18 ta' April, 2018 fil-konfront tas-soċjetà appellata fejn esprima l-fehma tiegħu li din kienet naqset

¹ Ara Note 1 a fol. 10.

² Ara Appendix 2 a fol. 61.

mill-obbligu tagħha ta' kura lejha bħala klijent b'diversi modi nkluz billi: (i) naqset milli tiegħu konjizzjoni tal-fatt li l-attitudni tiegħu lejn ir-riskju skont il-*fact find* originali kienet '*LOW to MEDIUM*' u saħansitra biddlitha għal '*MEDIUM*' mingħajr ma kellmitu; (ii) naqset milli twettaq '*due diligence*' fir-rigward tal-konsulent finanzjarju/professjonali; (iii) naqset milli tosserva, tirreagixxi jew tipprevjeni l-investment mill-gdid tal-qligħ f'noti strutturati li kienu jgħorru riskju għoli; u (iv) naqset milli tgħidlu b'dawk l-investimenti u anki bl-eventwali telf qawwi. Għalhekk huwa kien qed jippretendi kumpens tat-telf kollu li sofra fl-ammont ta' mhux inqas minn GBP118,827.41, u anki kumpens għad-dwejjaq, ansjetà u l-mard ikkawżati.

4. Is-soċjetà appellanta wiegbet fis-16 ta' Mejju, 2018 billi talbet lill-Arbitru sabiex jiċċad l-ilment tal-appellat. Hija eċċepiet fost affarijiet oħra li (i) l-azzjoni kienet preskritta *ai termini* tal-para. (ċ) tas-subartikolu 21(1) tal-Kap. 555; (ii) hija ma kellhiex liċenzja sabiex tagħti u hija fil-fatt ma kinitx tagħti pariri finanzjarji u lanqas qatt ma tat parir finanzjarju lill-appellat; (iii) il-klijenti ġew mgħoddija lilha minn CWM skont il-*Pension Rules for Service Providers* tal-MFSA; (iv) hija kienet iżżomm lill-appellat infurmat u fil-fatt bagħtet lill-appellat rendikonti annwali għas-snin 2014, 2015 u 2016; (v) l-appellat qatt ma lmentat sa Frar 2018 li f'dawn ir-rendikonti l-attitudni lejn ir-riskju tiegħu kien indikat bħala wieħed medju; (vi) hija kienet ħarset l-obbligi kollha lejha; (vii) l-investment sar skont il-profil ta' riskju tal-appellat u skont il-linji gwida applikabbli għal dak iż-żmien; (viii) ma kienx minnu li hija kienet qegħda titnikker bir-risposta tagħha għat-talba għal informazzjoni; (ix) bl-ebda mod ma kienet responsabbli għall-ammonti reklamati mill-appellat u r-rifużjoni tad-drittijiet

tagħha ma kinitx ammissjoni ta' xi responsabbiltà da parti tagħha; (x) hija ma wettqet l-ebda frodi u lanqas m'agixxiet b'mod negligenti u bi ksur tal-obbligi tagħha u t-telf soffert mill-appellat kien attribwibbli lill-konsulent finanzjarju tiegħu; u (xi) l-appellat kellu jressaq prova tan-ness kawżali bejn id-danni sofferti u l-allegat aġir tagħha.

Id-deċiżjoni appellata

5. L-Arbitru għamel is-segwent i konsiderazzjonijiet sabiex wasal għad-deċiżjoni appellata:

“Further Considers:

Preliminary Plea regarding the Competence of the Arbiter

The Service Provider raised the preliminary plea that the Arbiter does not have the competence to consider this case because it is time-barred under Article 21(1)(c) of Chapter 555, Article 21(1)(c) stipulates:

‘An Arbiter shall also have the competence to hear complaints in terms of his functions under article 19(1) in relation to the conduct of a financial service provider occurring after the coming into force of this Act, if a complaint is registered in writing with the financial services provider not later than two years from the day on which the complainant first had knowledge of the matters complained of.’

The Act came into force on 18 April 2016. As to the ‘conduct of a financial service provider’ the law does not refer to the date when a transaction takes place but refers to the date when the alleged misconduct took place.

In the case of a financial investment, the conduct of the service provider cannot be determined from the date when the transaction took place and, it is for this reason that the legislator departed from that date and laid the emphasis on the date when the conduct took place.

In this case, the conduct complained of involves the conduct of the Service Provider as trustee and retirement scheme administrator of the Scheme, which role MPM

occupied since 22 July 2014, upon the member's acceptance into the Scheme, and continued to occupy after the coming into force of the Act. It is noted that the complaint in question also involves the conduct of the Service Provider during the period in which CWM was permitted by MPM to act as the adviser of the complainant.

In terms of Article 21(1)(c), the complainant had two years to complain to the Service Provider 'from the day on which the complainant first had knowledge of the matters complained of'.

The fact that the Complainant was sent an Annual Member Statement, as stated by the Service Provider in its notes of submissions, could not be considered as enabling the Complainant to have knowledge about the matters complained of. This, taking into consideration a number of factors including that the said Annual Member Statement was a highly generic report which only listed the underlying life assurance policy. The Annual Member Statement issued to the Complainant by MPM included no details of the specific underlying investments held within the policy, which investments contributed to the losses and are being disputed by the Complainant. Hence, the Complainant was not in a position to know, from the Annual Member Statement he received, what investment transactions were actually being carried out within his portfolio of investments.

It is also noted that the Annual Member Statement sent to the Complainant by the Service Provider had even a disclaimer highlighting that certain underlying investments may show a value reflecting an early encashment value or potentially a zero value prior to maturity and that such value did not reflect the true performance of the underlying assets.

The disclaimer read as follows:

'Investment values are provided to Momentum Pensions Malta Limited by Investment Platforms, who are responsible for the accuracy of this information. Every effort has been made to ensure that this statement is correct but please accept this statement on this understanding.

Certain underlying assets with the Investment, may show a value that reflects an early encashment value or potentially a zero value prior to the maturity date. This will not reflect the true current performance of such underlying assets.'

Such a disclaimer did not reveal much to the Complainant about the actual state of the investments and the whole scenario could not have reasonably enabled the Complainant to have knowledge about the matters being complained of.

Moreover, the Arbiter, makes reference to Case Number 137/2018, whereby it results that the Service Provider itself declared in July 2015, in reply to a member's concern regarding losses, that:

'...whilst we, as Trustees, will review and assess any losses, these can only be on the maturity of the note (fn. 15 Emphasis of the Arbiter), as any valuations can and will be distorted ahead of the expiry'. (fn. 16 Case Number 137/2018 (a fol. 7 of the file) decided today)

The Service Provider did not prove the date of maturity of the structured notes comprising the portfolio of the Complainant. According to a statement presented by the Complainant, certain structured notes were still within his portfolio after the coming into force of the Act with certain notes also sold in May 2017. (fn. 17 A fol. 18)

The Arbiter has also discovered from Case Number 127/2018 that the Service Provider sent communication to all members of the Scheme with respect to the position with CWM. (fn. 18 Case Number 127/2018 (a fol. 53 of the file) decided today) In this regard, in September 2017, members were notified by MPM about the suspension of the terms of business that MPM had with CWM. Later, in October 2017, MPM also notified the members of the Scheme about the full withdrawal of such terms of business with CWM.

The Complainant made a formal complaint with the Service Provider on the 12 February 2018 (fn. 19 A fol. 29/30) and, therefore, within the two-year period established by Art. 21(1)(c) of Chapter 555.

Therefore, the Service Provider did not prove that the Complainant raised the complaint 'later than two years from the day on which the complainant first had knowledge of the matters complained of'.

It is also noted that in this case not even two years had passed from the coming into force of Chapter 555 of the Laws of Malta and the date when the formal complaint was made by the Complainant with the Service Provider.

For the above-stated reasons, this plea is also being rejected and the Arbiter declares that he has the competence to deal with the Complaint

The Merits of the Case

The Arbiter will decide the complaint by reference to what, in his opinion, is fair, equitable and reasonable in the particular circumstances and substantive merits of the case. (fn. 20 Cap. 555, Art. 19(3)(b))

The Arbiter is considering all pleas raised by the Service Provider relating to the merits of the case together to avoid repetition and to expedite the decision as he is obliged to do in terms of Chapter 555 (fn. 21 Art. 19(3)(d)) which stipulates that he should deal with the complain in 'an economical and expeditious manner'.

The Complainant

The Complainant is of British nationality and resided in Spain at the time of application as per the details contained in the Application for Membership of the Momentum Malta Retirement Trust ('the Application Form for Membership').

It was not proven during the case that the Complainant was a professional investor. Accordingly, the Complainant can be treated as a retail client.

The Complainant was accepted by MPM as member of the Retirement Scheme in the year 2014.

The Service Provider

The Retirement Scheme was established by Momentum Pensions Malta Limited ('MPM'). MPM is licensed by the MFSA as a Retirement Scheme Administrator (fn. 22 <https://www.mfsa.mt/financial-services-register/result/?id=3453>) and acts as the Retirement Scheme Administrator and Trustee of the Scheme. (fn. 23 Role of the Trustee, pg. 4 of MPM's Scheme Particulars (attached to Stewart Davies's affidavit).

The Legal Framework

The Retirement Scheme and MPM are subject to specific financial services legislation and regulations issued in Malta, including conditions or pension rules issued by the MFSA in terms of the regulatory framework applicable for personal retirement schemes.

The Special Funds (Regulation) Act, 2002 ('SFA') was the first legislative framework which applied to the Scheme and the Service Provider. The SFA was repealed and replaced by the Retirement Pensions Act (Chapter 514 of the Laws of Malta) ('RPA'). The RPA was published in August 2011 and came into force on the 1 January 2015. (fn. 24 Retirement Pensions Act, Cap. 514/Circular letter issued by the MFSA - <https://www.mfsa.com.mt/firms/regulation/pensions/pension-rules-applicable-as-from-1-january-2015/>)

There were transitional provisions in respect of those persons who, upon the coming into force of the RPA, were registered under the SFA. The Retirement Pensions (Transitional Provisions) Regulations, 2015 provided that retirement schemes or any

person registered under the SFA had one year from the coming into force of the RPA to apply for authorisation under the RPA.

In terms of Regulation 3 of the said Transitional Provisions Regulations, such schemes or persons continued to be governed by the provisions of the SFA until such time that these were granted authorisation by MFSA under the RPA.

As confirmed by the Service Provider, registration under the RPA was granted to the Retirement Scheme and the Service Provider on 1 January 2016 and hence the framework under the RPA became applicable as from such date. (fn. 25 As per pg. 1 of the affidavit of Stewart Davies and the Cover Page of MPM's Registration Certificate issued by MFSA dated 1 January 2016 attached to his affidavit)

Despite not being much mentioned by MPM in its submissions, the Trusts and Trustees Act (Chapter 331 of the Laws of Malta), ('TTA') is also much relevant and applicable to the Service Provider, as per Article 1(2) and Article 43(6)(c) of the TTA, in light of MPM's role as the Retirement Scheme Administrator and Trustee of the Retirement Scheme.

Indeed, Article 1(2) of the TTA provides that:

'The provisions of this Act, except as otherwise provided in this Act, shall apply to all trustees, whether such trustees are authorised, or are not required to obtain authorisation in terms of article 43 and article 43A', with Article 43(6)(c) in turn providing that: 'A person licensed in terms of the Retirement Pensions Act to act as a Retirement Scheme Administrator acting as a trustee to retirement schemes shall not require further authorisation in terms of this Act provided that such trustee services are limited to retirement schemes ...'.

Particularities of the Case

The Retirement Scheme in respect of which the Complaint is being made

The Momentum Malta Retirement Trust ('the Retirement Scheme' or 'the Scheme') is a trust domiciled in Malta. It was granted a registration by the MFSA (fn. 26 <https://www.mfsa.com.mt/financial-services-register/result/?id=3454>) as a Retirement Scheme under the Special Funds (Regulation) Act in April 2011 (fn. 27 Registration Certificate dated 28 April 2011 issued by MFSA to the Scheme (attached to Stewart Davies's affidavit) and under the Retirement Pensions Act in January 2016. (fn. 28 Registration Certificate dated 1 January 2016 issued by MFSA to the Scheme (attached to Stewart Davies's affidavit))

As detailed in the Scheme Particulars dated May 2018 presented by MPM during the proceedings of this case, the Scheme 'was established as a perpetual trust by trust deed under the terms of the Trusts and Trustees Act (Cap. 331) on the 23 March 2011' (fn. 29 Important Information setion, pg. 2 of MPM's Scheme Particulars (attached to Stewart Davies's affidavit). and is 'an approved Personal Retirement Scheme under the Retirement Pensions Act 2011' (fn. 30 Regulatory Status, Pg 4 of MPM's Scheme Particulars (attached to Stewart Davies's affidavit).

The Scheme Particulars specify that:

'The purpose of the Scheme is to provide retirement benefits in the form of a pension income or other benefits that are payable to persons who are resident both within and outside Malta. These benefits are payable after or upon retirement, permanent invalidity or death'. (fn. 31 Ibid.)

The case in question involves a member-directed personal retirement scheme where the Member was allowed to appoint an investment adviser to advise him on the choice of investments.

Prior to joining the Scheme, the Complainant was already invested into the 'Spanish Portfolio Bond', this being a policy issued by SEB Life International which policy commenced on the 7 February 2012 ('the SEB Policy'). (fn. 32 A fol. 61-62)

The said policy issued by SEB International was assigned to MPM as Trustee of the Retirement Scheme following the Complainant's membership of the Retirement Scheme on the 12 September 2014. (fn. 33 A fol. 62) At the time of assignment of the policy to MPM, there were already certain investments underlying the policy which were made prior to membership and which MPM accepted to retain within the Scheme following the assignment of the policy to MPM. The SEB Policy and the underlying assets within the SEB Policy, became assets of the Scheme since 12 September 2014.

The valuation for the SEB Policy as at 30 September 2014, indicated the policy to comprise one investment, the RBC Diversified Blue Chip Income Notes Series 1 ('RBC Investment'), valued at GBP70,391.38 which comprised 74.42% of the policy value at the time. (fn. 34 A fol. 63) The said valuation also indicated cash holdings of GBP24,198.42 with such cash holdings comprising 25.58% of the indicated policy at the time. Pending transactions into two Leonteq structured notes were also indicated in the valuation marked 30 September 2014. (fn. 35 A fol. 63/64)

After the transfer of the policy to MPM as trustees of the Retirement Scheme on 12 September 2014, additional investments to the RBC Investment were made within the

SEB Policy as summarised in the table of investments provided by the Service Provider. (fn. 36 A fol. 196)

The Service Provider indicated the valuation of the Retirement Scheme amounting to GBP58,643 as at 27 April 2018 with a loss (which excluded fees) of GBP8,836 as at that date. (fn. 37 Ibid.) The loss experienced by the Complainant is thus higher when taking into account the fees incurred and paid within the Scheme's structure.

The Service Provider does not explain whether the loss (excluding fees) it indicated in the 'current valuation' for the Complainant relates to realised or paper losses or both.

Investment Advisor

Continental Wealth Management ('CWM') was the investment advisor appointed by the Complainant. (fn. 38 As per pg. 1/2 of MPM's reply to the OAFS in respect of the Complainant) The role of CWM was to advise the Complainant regarding the assets held within his Retirement Scheme.

It is noted that in the notice issued to members of the Scheme in September and October 2017 as referred to above in the 'Preliminary Plea' section, MPM described CWM as 'an authorised representative/agent of Trafalgar International GmbH', where CWM's was Trafalgar's 'authorised representative in Spain and France'.

In its reply to this complaint, MPM explained inter alia that CWM: 'is a company registered in Spain. Before it ceased to trade, CWM acted as adviser and provided financial advice to investors. CWM was authorised to trade in Spain and in France by Trafalgar International GmbH'. (fn. 39 Pg. 1 of MPM's reply to the OAFS)

In its submissions, it was further explained by MPM that:

'CWM was appointed agent of Trafalgar International GmbH ('Trafalgar') and was operating under Trafalgar International GmbH licences', (fn. 40 Para. 39, Section E titled 'CWM and Trafalgar International GmbH' of the affidavit of Stewart Davies) and that Trafalgar 'is authorised and regulated in Germany by the Deutsche Industrie Handelskammer (IHK) Insurance Mediation licence 34D Broker licence number: D-FE9C-BELBQ-24 and Financial Asset Mediator licence 34F: D-F-125-KXGB-53'. (fn. 41 Ibid.)

Underlying Investments

The investments undertaken within the life assurance policy of the Complainant were summarised in the table of investment transactions included as part of the 'Investor Profile' provided by the Service Provider in respect of the Complainant. (fn. 42

Attachment to the 'Additional submissions' made by MPM in respect of the Complainant)

The extent of investments in structured notes, indicated as 'SN' in the column titled 'Asset Type' in the said table of investment transactions, was substantial as can be seen in the said table.

The said table indicates that the portfolio of investments for the Complainant involved substantial investments in structured notes with the portfolio comprising at times solely, or predominantly, of structured notes during the tenure of CWM as investment adviser.

The underlying policy, the Spanish Portfolio Bond issued by SEB Life International ('the SEB Policy') commenced on 7 February 2012 but was assigned to MPM as Trustee of the Retirement Scheme on 12 September 2014. (fn. 43 A fol. 62) As confirmed by both the Complainant and the Service Provider, upon the assignment of the said policy to MPM, the policy included an investment into the RBC Diversified Blue Chip Income Notes Series 1 GBP (XS0741467756), ('the RBC Investment'). (fn. 44 A fol. 15, 33 & 63) The Service Provider indicated that the RBC Investment was originally purchased for the amount of GBP140,000 on 24 February 2012 and that this investment matured for the amount of GBP55,989 in 2017. (fn. 45 A fol. 196)

The investments that were undertaken within the SEB Policy after this was assigned to MPM as trustee of the Scheme were also summarised in the table of investment transactions provided by the Service Provider. (fn. 46 Ibid.) The said table indicates that from September 2014 till 10 December 2015 a purchase of 6 structured notes and 1 fund were made as per the column titled 'Asset Type' indicated in the table. (fn. 47 Ibid.)

The table indicates that apart from the original investment into the RBC Diversified Blue Chip Income Notes, which was a structured note itself indicated in the same table, the bulk of the investments were done into Leonteq/EFG structured notes. The investments into structured notes undertaken following the assignment of the SEB Policy to MPM as trustee of the Scheme comprised 3 investments into structured notes undertaken in 2014 for a total of GBP26,153, (fn. 48 GBP10,725 + GBP10,428 + GBP5,000 (A fol. 196)) two investments in structured notes for a total of EUR17,000 undertaken in 2015, (fn. 49 Eur9,000 + Eur8,000 (A fol. 27) and an investment of GBP3,000 into another structured note undertaken in 2015. (fn. 50 A fol. 196) An investment of GBP5,000 was also undertaken into a fund in December 2015.

Further Considerations

Responsibilities of the Service Provider

MPM is subject to the duties, functions and responsibilities applicable as a Retirement Scheme Administrator and Trustee of the Scheme.

Obligations under the SFA, RPA and directives/rules issued thereunder

As indicated in the MFSA's Registration Certificate dated 28 April 2011, issued to MPM under the SFA, MPM was required, in the capacity of Retirement Scheme Administrator, 'to perform all duties as stipulated by articles 17 and 19 of the Special Funds (Regulation) Act, 2002 ... in connection with the ordinary or day-to-day operations of a Retirement Scheme registered under the [SFA]'.

The obligations of MPM as a Retirement Scheme Administrator under the SFA are outlined in the Act itself and the various conditions stipulated in the original Registration Certificate which inter alia also referred to various Standard Operational Conditions (such as those set out in Sections B.2, B.5, B.7 of Part B and Part C) of the 'Directives for Occupational Retirement Schemes, Retirement Funds and Related Parties under the Special Funds (Regulation) Act, 2002' ('the Directives').

In terms of the said Registration Certificate issued under the SFA, MPM was also required to assume and carry out, on behalf of the Scheme, any functions and obligations applicable to the Scheme under the SFA, the regulations and the Directives issued thereunder.

Following the repeal of the SFA and issue of the Registration Certificate dated 1 January 2016 under the RPA, MPM was subject to the provisions relating to the services of a retirement scheme administrator in connection with the ordinary or day-to-day operations of a Retirement Scheme registered under the RPA. As a Retirement Scheme Administrator, MPM was subject to the conditions outlined in the 'Pension Rules for Service Providers issued under the Retirement Pensions Act' ('the Pension Rules for Service Providers') and the 'Pension Rules for Personal Retirement Schemes issued under the Retirement Pensions Act' ('the Pension Rules for Personal Retirement Schemes').

In terms of the said Registration Certificate issued under the RPA, MPM was also required to assume and carry out, on behalf of the Scheme, any functions and obligations applicable to the Scheme under the RPA, the regulations and the Pension Rules issued thereunder.

One key duty of the Retirement Scheme Administrator emerging from the primary legislation itself is the duty to ‘act in the best interests of the scheme’ as outlined in Article 19(2) of the SFA and Article 13(1) of the RPA.

From the various general conduct of business rules/standard licence conditions applicable to MPM in its role as Retirement Scheme Administrator under the SFA/RPA regime respectively, it is pertinent to note the following general principles: (fn. 51 Emphasis added by the Arbitrator).

- a) *Rule 2.6.2 of Part B.2.6 titled ‘General Conduct of Business Rules applicable to the Scheme Administrator’ of the Directives issued under the SFA, which applied to MPM as a Scheme Administrator under the SFA, provided that:*

‘The Scheme Administrator shall act with due skill, care and diligence – in the best interests of the Beneficiaries ...’.

The same principle continued to apply under the rules issued under the RPA. Rule 4.1.4, Part B.4.1 titled ‘Conduct of Business Rules’ of the Pension Rules for Service Providers dated 1 January 2015, issued in terms of the RPA, and which applied to MPM as a Scheme Administrator under the RPA, provided that: ‘The Service Provider shall act with due skill, care and diligence ...’.

- b) *Rule 2.7.1 of Part B.2.7 titled ‘Conduct of Business Rules related to the Scheme’s Assets’, of the Directives issued under the SFA, which applied to MPM as a Scheme Administrator under the SFA, provided that:*

‘The Scheme Administrator shall arrange for the Scheme assets to be invested in a prudent manner and in the best interest of Beneficiaries ...’.

The same principle continued to apply under the rules issued under the RPA. Standard Condition 3.1.2, of Part B.3 titled ‘Conditions relating to the investments of the Scheme’ of the Pension Rules for Personal Retirement Schemes dated 1 January 2015 issued in terms of the RPA, provided that:

‘The Scheme’s assets shall be invested in a prudent manner and in the best interest of Members and Beneficiaries and also in accordance with the investment rules laid out in its Scheme Particulars and otherwise in the Constitutional Document and Scheme Document’;

- c) *Rule 2.6.4 of Part B.2.6 titled ‘General Conduct of Business Rules applicable to the Scheme Administrator’ of the Directives issued under the SFA, which applied to MPM as a Scheme Administrator under the SFA provided that:*

‘The Scheme Administrator shall organise and control its affairs in a responsible manner and **shall have adequate operational, administrative** and financial procedures **and controls in respect of its own business and the Scheme** to ensure compliance with regulatory conditions and to enable it to be effectively prepared to manage, reduce and mitigate the risks to which it is exposed ...’.

The same principle continued to apply under the rules issued under the RPA.

Standard Condition 4.1.7, Part B.4.1 titled ‘Conduct of Business Rules’ of the Pension Rules for Service Providers dated 1 January 2015, issued in terms of the RPA, provided that:

‘The Service Provider shall organise and control its affairs in a responsible manner and **shall have adequate operational, administrative** and financial procedures **and controls in respect of its own business and the Scheme** or Retirement Fund, as applicable, to ensure compliance with regulatory conditions and to enable it to be effectively prepared to manage, reduce and mitigate the risks to which it is exposed.’

Standard Condition 1.2.2, Part B.1.2 titled ‘Operation of the Scheme, of the Pension Rules for Personal Retirement Schemes dated 1 January 2015’, issued in terms of the RPA, also required that:

‘The Scheme shall organise and control its affairs in a responsible manner and shall have adequate operational, administrative and financial procedures and controls to ensure compliance with all regulatory requirements’.

Trustee and Fiduciary obligations

As highlighted in the section of this decision titled ‘The Legal Framework’ above, the Trusts and Trustees Act (‘TTA’), Chapter 331 of the Laws of Malta is also relevant for MPM considering its capacity as Trustee of the Scheme. This is an important aspect on which not much emphasis on, and reference to, has been made by the Service Provider in its submissions.

*Article 21(1) of the TTA which deals with the ‘Duties of trustees’, stipulates a crucial aspect, that of the *bonus paterfamilias*, which applies to MPM.*

The said article provides that:

‘(1) Trustees shall in the execution of their duties and the exercise of their powers and discretions act with the prudence, diligence and attention of a bonus paterfamilias, act in utmost good faith and avoid any conflict of interest’.

It is also to be noted that Article 21(2)(a) of the TTA, further specifies that:

'Subject to the provisions of this Act, trustees shall carry out and administer the trust according to its terms; and, subject as aforesaid, the trustees shall ensure that the trust property is vested in them or is under their control and shall, so far as reasonable and subject to the terms of the trust, safeguard the trust property from loss or damage ...'.

In its role as Trustee, MPM was accordingly duty bound to administer the Scheme and its assets to high standards of diligence and accountability.

The trustee, having acquired the property of the Scheme in ownership under trust, had to deal with such property 'as a fiduciary acting exclusively in the interest of the beneficiaries, with honesty, diligence and impartiality'. (fn. 52 Pg. 174, 'An Introduction to Maltese Financial Services Law', Editor Dr Max Ganado, Allied Publications 2009.)

As has been authoritatively stated:

'Trustees have many duties relating to the property vested in them. These can be summarized as follows: to act diligently, to act honestly and in good faith and with impartiality towards beneficiaries, to account to the beneficiaries and to provide them with information, to safeguard and keep control of the trust property and to apply the trust property in accordance with the terms of the trust'. (fn. 53 Pg.178, 'An Introduction to Maltese Financial Services Law', Editor Dr Max Ganado, Allied Publications 2009.)

The fiduciary and trustee obligations were also highlighted by MFSA in a recent publication where it was stated that:

'In carrying out his functions, a RSA [retirement scheme administrator] of a Personal Retirement Scheme has a fiduciary duty to protect the interests of members and beneficiaries. It is to be noted that by virtue of Article 1124A of the Civil Code (Chapter 16 of the Laws of Malta), the RSA has certain fiduciary obligations to members or beneficiaries, which arise in virtue of law, contract, quasi-contract or trusts. In particular, the RSA shall act honestly, carry out his obligations with utmost good faith, as well as exercise the diligence of a bonus paterfamilias in the performance of his obligations'. (fn. 54 Page 9 - Consultation Document on Amendments to the Pension Rules issued under the Retirement Pensions Act [MFSA Ref: 09-2017], (6 December 2017))

Although this Consultation Document was published in 2017, MFSA was basically outlining principles established both in the TTA and the Civil Code which had already been in force prior to 2017.

The above are considered to be crucial aspects which should have guided MPM in its actions and which shall accordingly be considered in this decision.

Other relevant aspects

*One other important duty relevant to the case in question relates to the **oversight and monitoring function of the Service Provider in respect of the Scheme including with respect to investments**. As acknowledged by the Service Provider, whilst MPM's duties did not involve the provision of investment advice, however, MPM did '**... retain the power to ultimately decide whether to proceed with an investment or otherwise**'. (fn. 55 Para. 17, page 5 of the affidavit of Stewart Davies)*

Once an investment decision is taken by the member and his/her investment adviser, and such decision is communicated to the retirement scheme administrator, MPM explained that as part of its duties:

'The RSA will then ensure that the proposed trade on the dealing instruction, when considered in the context of the entire portfolio, ensures a suitable level of diversification, is in line with the member's attitude to risk and in line with the investment guidelines (applicable at the time the trade is placed) ...' (fn. 56 Para. 31, page 8 of the affidavit of Stewart Davies)

MPM had accordingly the final say prior to the placement of a dealing instruction, in that, if MPM was satisfied that the level of diversification is suitable and in order, and the member's portfolio as a whole is in line with his attitude to risk and investment guidelines, 'the dealing instruction will be placed with the insurance company and the trade will be executed. If the RSA is not so satisfied, then the trade will not be proceeded with'. (fn. 57 Para. 33, Page 9 of the affidavit of Stewart Davies. Para. 17 of Page 5 of the said affidavit also refers)

This, in essence, reflected the rationale behind the statement reading:

'I accept that I or my chosen professional adviser may suggest investment preferences to be considered, however, the Retirement Scheme administrator will retain full power and discretion for all decisions relating to the purchase, retention and sale of the investments within my Momentum Retirement Fund', which featured in the 'Declarations' section of the Application Form for Membership signed by the Complainant.'

The MFSA regarded the oversight function of the Retirement Scheme Administrator as an important obligation where it emphasised, in recent years, the said role.

The MFSA explained that it:

'... is of the view that as specified in SLC 1.3.1 of Part B.1 (Pension Rules for Retirement Scheme Administrators) of the Pension Rules for Service Providers, the RSA, in carrying out his functions, shall act in the best interests of the Scheme members and beneficiaries. The MFSA expects the RSA to be diligent and to take into account his fiduciary role towards the members and beneficiaries, at all times, irrespective of the form in which the Scheme is established. The RSA is expected to approve transactions and to ensure that these are in line with the investment restrictions and the risk profile of the member in relation to his individual member account within the Scheme'. (fn. 58 Pg. 7 of the MFSA's Consultation Document dated 16 November 2018 titled 'Consultation on Amendments to the Pension Rules for Personal Retirement Schemes issued under the Retirement Pensions Act' (MFSA Ref. 15/2018) - <https://www.mfsa.com.mt/publications/policy-and-guidelines/consultation-documents-archive/>)

The MFSA has also highlighted the need for the retirement scheme administrator to query and probe the actions of a regulated investment adviser stating that: 'the MFSA also remains of the view that the RSA is to be considered responsible to verify and monitor that investments in the individual member account are diversified, and the RSA is not to merely accept the proposed investments, but it should acquire information and assess such investments'. (fn. 59 Pg. 9 of MFSA's Consultation Document dated 16 November 2018 titled 'Consultation on Amendments to the Pension Rules for Personal Retirement Schemes issued under the Retirement Pensions Act' (MFSA Ref. 15/2018))

Despite that the above quoted MFSA statements were made in 2018, an oversight function applied during the period relating to the case in question as explained earlier on.

As far back as 2013, MPM's Investment Guidelines indeed also provided that:

'The Trustee needs to ensure that the member's funds are invested in a prudent manner and in the best interests of the beneficiaries. The key principle is to ensure that there is a suitable level of diversification ...', (fn. 50 Investment Guidelines titled January 2013, attached to the affidavit of Stewart Davies. The same statement is also included in page 9 of the scheme Particulars of May 2018 (also attached to the same

affidavit) whilst para. 3.1 of the section titled 'Terms and Conditions' of the Application Form for Membership into the Scheme' also provided inter alia that:

'... in its role as Retirement Scheme Administrator [MPM] will exercise judgement as to the merits or suitability of any transaction ...'.

Other Observations and Conclusions

Reference to Old Mutual International

In its reply, MPM pointed out that 'Momentum is aware that Old Mutual International Ireland Limited ('OMI'), the bond provider, has initiated legal action against one of the structured note providers (Leonteq Securities AG ('Leonteq')) for losses incurred by the ultimate holders of the bonds, such as the Complainant'. (fn. 61 A fol. 44)

It is pertinent to note that Old Mutual International is however not the bond provider for the Complainant. In the Complainant's case, the underlying bond is actually the Spanish Portfolio Bond, which is issued by a different provider, this being SEB Life International. (fn. 62 A fol. 62 & 196)

Key considerations relating to the principal alleged failures

The Arbiter will now consider the principal alleged failures. The principal alleged failures of the Service Provider that were made in this regard include that (i) MPM failed to exercise due diligence and monitor or question: the original investment at the time MPM took over as Trustee; as well as the actions of CWM with respect to the portfolio CWM created until it ceased business (ii) MPM failed to comply with its own published conditions/ regulations (iii) MPM allowed investments into high risk structured products (iv) there was a lack of communication by MPM throughout including on the high risks, losses and dealing transactions.

General observations

On a general note, it is clear that MPM did not provide investment advice in relation to the underlying investments of the member-directed scheme. The role of the investment adviser was the duty of other parties, such as CWM.

This would reflect on the extent of responsibility that the financial adviser and the RSA and Trustee had in this case as will be later seen in this decision.

However, despite that the Retirement Scheme Administrator was not the entity which provided the investment advice to invest in the contested financial instruments, MPM had nevertheless certain obligations to undertake in its role of Trustee and Scheme Administrator. The obligations of the trustee and retirement scheme administrator

in relation to a retirement plan are important ones and could have a substantial bearing on the operations and activities of the scheme and affect direct, or indirectly, its performance.

Consideration thus needs to be made as to whether MPM failed in any relevant obligations and duties, and if so, to what extent any such failures are considered to have had a bearing or otherwise on the financial performance of the Scheme and the resulting losses for the Complainant.

A. The appointment of the Investment Adviser

It is noted that the Complainant chose the appointment of CWM to provide him with investment advice in relation to the selection of the underlying investments and composition of the portfolio within the member-directed Scheme. However, from its part, MPM allowed and/or accepted CWM to provide investment advice to the Complainant within the Scheme's structure. MPM even had itself an introducer agreement with CWM.

There are a number of aspects which give rise to concerns on the diligence exercised by MPM when it came to the acceptance of, and dealings with, the investment adviser as further detailed below.

Inappropriate and inadequate material issues involving the Investment Adviser

- i. *Inaccurate, incorrect and unclear information relating to the adviser in MPM's Application Form for Membership*

It is considered that MPM accepted and allowed inaccurate and incomplete material information relating to the Adviser to prevail in its own Application Form for Membership. MPM should have been in a position to identify, raise and not accept the material deficiencies arising in the Application Form.

If inaccurate and incomplete material information arose in the Application Form for Membership in respect of such a key party it was only appropriate and in the best interests of the Complainant, and reflective of the role as Trustee as a bonus paterfamilias, for MPM to raise and flag such matters to the Complainant and not accept such inadequacies in its form. MPM had ultimately the prerogative whether to accept the application, the selected investment adviser and also decide with whom to enter into terms of business.

The section titled 'Professional Adviser's Details' in the Application Form for Membership in respect of the Complainant indicated 'CWM' as the company's name of the professional advisor.

In the same section of the Application Form, CWM was indicated as having a registered address in Spain and that it was regulated with 'Inter Alliance World Net' ('Inter-Alliance') being identified as the regulator of the professional adviser.

The Arbitrator considers the reference to Inter-Alliance as regulator to be inadequate and misleading.

*The reference to 'Inter-Alliance' was not defined or explained in the Application Form. Neither was such reference ever explained or referred to during the comprehensive submissions made by the Service Provider during the proceedings of the case. It has not emerged either that InterAlliance is, or was, a regulatory authority for investment advisers in Spain or in any other jurisdiction. It appears that 'Inter Alliance WorldNet Insurance Agents & Advisers Ltd' was a service provider itself in Cyprus, but clearly it was not a regulatory authority. (fn. 63 <https://international-adviser.com/iaw-fined-cypriot-regulator/>) **No evidence was submitted by MPM of CWM being truly regulated.***

The reference to Inter-Alliance could not have reasonably provided any comfort to MPM that this was a regulator of CWM and neither that there was some form of regulation and adequate controls and/or supervision on CWM equivalent to that applicable for regulated investment services providers.

ii. Lack of clarity/convoluted information

It is noted that with respect to the policy issued by SEB Life International ('SEB'), the 'Endorsement Following Notice of Assignment' letter sent by SEB to MPM makes reference to 'Inter-Alliance – Continental Wealth Management' as 'Intermediary Name'. There is lack of clarity of the rationale for references to both entities in the intermediary name.

The capacity in which CWM was acting, such as, as an agent of another firm, did not emerge either from the Application Form for Membership or other documentation indicated to have been received or provided to the Complainant

iii. No proper distinctions between CWM, Inter-Alliance and Trafalgar

It has not emerged that the Complainant was provided with clear and adequate information regarding the respective roles and responsibilities between CWM, Inter-Alliance and/or Trafalgar.

If CWM was acting as an appointed agent of another party, such capacity, as an agent of another firm, should have been clearly reflected in the application forms and other documentation relating to the Scheme. Relevant explanations and implications of such agency relationship and respective responsibilities should have also been duly indicated without any ambiguity.

During the proceedings of this case MPM has not provided evidence of any agency agreement between CWM and Inter-Alliance and/or between CWM and Trafalgar.

iv. No regulatory approval in respect of CWM

During the proceedings of this case, no evidence has emerged about the regulatory status of CWM. As indicated earlier, MPM provided no details about Inter-Alliance, and in its submissions only referred to the alleged links between CWM and Trafalgar. MPM only provided a copy of the authorisations issued to Trafalgar International GmbH in Germany which just indicated that Trafalgar (and not CWM) held an authorization as at 05.02.2016 as 'Investment intermediary' and 'Insurance intermediary and insurance consultant' from IHK Frankfurt am Main, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Frankfurt, with the 'Insurance Mediation licence 34D Broker licence number: D-FE9C-BELBQ-24 and Financial Asset Mediator licence 34F: D-F-125-KXGB-53'. (fn. 64 Copy of authorisations issued to Trafalgar were attached to the reply of MPM submitted before the Arbiter for Financial Services and/or specifically referred to in para. 39, Section E, titled 'CWM and Trafalgar International GmbH' in the affidavit of Stewart Davies.)

With respect to authorisations issued by IHK, the Arbiter makes reference to Case 068/2018 and Case 172/2018 against MPM in which correspondence was produced involving replies issued by IHK in 2018 to queries made in respect of CWM. In this regard, it is noted that in an email from IHK dated 19 April 2018, IHK indicated inter alia that it was not aware of an official affiliation between CWM and Trafalgar and that Trafalgar held the financial investment intermediation licence (34f para. 1 GewO) from June 2013 until March 2016 where the licence was 'not extendable' and 'even

back then it did not cover the activities of another legal personality'. (fn. 65 Email from IHK dated 19 April 2018 – A fol. 166/167 of Case 068/2018 decided today)

Similarly, in a letter dated 20 April 2018, issued by IHK, it was *inter alia* noted by IHK that 'Trafalgar International GmbH is a German limited company headquartered in Frankfurt am Main. The company currently holds a licence under 34d para. 1 German Trade Law (German: Gewerbeordnung, GewO) (insurance intermediation). The German licence as an insurance intermediary cannot be extended to another legal personality and it does not authorize the licence holder to regulate other insurance or financial investment intermediaries.' (fn. 66 Letter from IHK dated 20 April 2018 – A fol. 12/13 of Case 172/2018 decided today)

MPM's statement that CWM 'was operating under Trafalgar International GmbH licenses', (fn. 67 Para. 39, Section E, titled 'CWM and Trafalgar International GmbH' of the affidavit of Stewart Davies) has not been backed up by any evidence during the proceedings of this case and has actually been contradicted by communications issued by IHK as indicated above. It is accordingly clear that no comfort can be taken from the authorisation/s held by Trafalgar.

Indeed, no evidence of any authorisation held by CWM in its own name or as an agent of a licensed institution, authorising it to provide advice on investment instruments and/or advice on investments underlying an insurance policy has, ultimately been produced by the service provider to substantiate its defence on this matter, or emerged during the proceedings of this case.

In the absence of such, the mere explanations provided by MPM regarding the regulatory status of CWM, including that CWM 'was authorised to trade in Spain and in France by Trafalgar International GmbH' (fn. 68 Pg.1, Section A, titled 'Introduction', of the Reply of MPM submitted before the Arbiter for Financial Services), are rather vague, inappropriate and do not provide sufficient comfort of an adequate regulatory status for CWM to undertake the investment advisory activities provided to the Complainant.

This also taking into consideration that:

- (i) *Trafalgar is itself no regulatory authority but a licensed entity itself. Similarly, Inter-Alliance was no regulatory authority;*
- (ii) *the lack of clarity as to the regulatory status of the investment advisor in the Application Form for Membership;*
- (iii) *legislation covering the provision of investment advisory services in relation to investment instruments, namely, the Markets in Financial Instruments*

Directive (2004/39/EC) already applied across the European Union since November 2007.

No evidence was provided that CWM, an entity indicated as being based in Spain, held any authorisation to provide investment advisory services, in its own name or in the capacity of an agent of an investment service provider under MiFID.

Article 23(3) of the MiFID I Directive, which applied at the time, indeed provided specific requirements on the registration of tied agents. (fn. 69 <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32004L0039&from=EN>)

No evidence of CWM featuring in the tied agents register in any EU jurisdiction was either produced or emerged.

Neither was any evidence produced of any exemption from licence under MiFID, or that CWM held an authorisation or exemption under any other applicable European legislation for the provision of the contested investment advice.

The Service Provider noted inter alia that ‘CWM was appointed agent of Trafalgar International GmbH’. (fn. 70 Para. 39, Section E, titled ‘CWM and Trafalgar International GmbH’ of the affidavit of Stewart Davies)

The nature of the agency agreement that CWM was claimed to have was not explained nor defined, and it was not indicated either in terms of which European financial services legislation such agency agreement was in force and permitted the provision of the disputed investment advice. Nor evidence of any agency agreement existing between CWM and any other party was produced during the proceedings of this case as indicated above.

Other observations & synopsis

As explained above, albeit being selected by the Complainant, the investment adviser was however accepted, at MPM’s sole discretion, to act as the Complainant’s investment adviser within the Scheme’s structure.

The responsibility of MPM in accepting and allowing CWM to act in the role of investment adviser takes even more significance when one takes into consideration the scenario in which CWM was accepted by MPM. As indicated above, MPM accepted CWM when, as verified in the Complainant’s Application Form for Membership, it was being stated in MPM’s own application form that CWM was a regulated entity but no evidence has transpired that this was so, as amply explained above.

MPM allowed and left uncontested incorrect, misleading and unclear key information to feature in its own Application Form for Membership of the Retirement Scheme with respect to the regulatory status of the investment advisor. In so doing, it abetted a fundamentally wrong impression and perception that the investment adviser being selected was regulated when, in reality, no evidence has emerged that CWM was indeed a regulated entity.

The Service Provider argued inter alia in its submissions that it was not required, in terms of the rules, to require the appointment of an adviser which was regulated during the years 2013-2015 under the SFA regime and until the implementation of Part B.9 titled 'Supplementary Conditions in the case of entirely Member Directed Schemes' of the Pension Rules for Personal Retirement Schemes issued in terms of the RPA updated in December 2018, where the latter clearly introduced the requirement for the investment adviser to be regulated.

However, the Arbiter believes that MPM as Trustee had in any case the obligation to act with the required diligence of a bonus paterfamilias throughout, and was duty bound to raise with the Complainant, and not itself accept, material aspects relating to the investment adviser, which it should have reasonably been in a position to know that were incorrect, misleading and inappropriate. Instead it chose to allow and accept such material, incorrect, misleading and inappropriate information relating to the adviser to even prevail in its own application form.

The appointment of an entity such as CWM as investment adviser meant, in practice, that there was a layer of safeguard in less for the Complainant as compared to a structure where an adequately regulated adviser is appointed. An adequately regulated financial adviser is subject to, for example, fitness and properness assessments, conduct of business requirements as well as ongoing supervision by a financial services regulatory authority. MPM, being a regulated entity itself, should have been duly and fully cognisant of this. It is was only in the best interests of the Complainant for MPM to ensure that the Complainant had correct and adequate key information about the investment adviser.

Besides the issue of the regulatory status of the adviser, MPM also allowed and left uncontested important information, which was convoluted, misleading, unclear and lacking as explained above, with respect to the investment adviser, namely in relation to:

- ***CWM's alleged role as agent of another party, and the respective responsibilities of CWM and its alleged principal/s;***

- ***the entity actually taking responsibility for the investment advice given to the Complainant given the references to different parties;***
- ***the distinctions between CWM, Inter-Alliance and Trafalgar.***

It is also to be noted that apart from the above, MPM had itself a business relationship with CWM, having accepted it to act as its introducer of business. Such relationship gave rise to potential conflicts of interest, where an entity whose actions were subject to certain oversight by MPM on one hand was, on the other hand channelling business to MPM.

Even in case where, under the previous applicable regulatory framework, an unregulated adviser could have been allowed by the trustee and scheme administrator to provide investment advice to the member of a member-directed scheme, one would, at the very least, reasonably expect the retirement scheme administrator and trustee of such a scheme to exercise even more caution and prudence in its dealings with such a party.

This is even more so when the activity in question, that is, one involving the recommendations on the choice and allocation of underlying investments, has such a material bearing on the financial performance of the Scheme and the objective to provide for retirement benefits.

In the case in question, it would have accordingly been only reasonable, to expect MPM, as part of its essential and basic obligations and duties as a retirement scheme administrator and trustee of the Scheme, to have an even higher level of disposition in the probing and querying of the actions of an unregulated investment adviser in order to also ensure that the interests of the member of the scheme are duly safeguarded and risks mitigated in such circumstances.

The Arbiter does not have comfort that such level of diligence and prudence has been actually exercised by MPM for the reasons already stated in this section of the decision.

B. The permitted portfolio composition

Investment into Structured Notes

Preliminary observations

The sale of, and investment into, structured notes is an area which has attracted various debates internationally including reviews by regulatory authorities over the

years. Such debates and reviews have been occurring even way back since the time when the Retirement Scheme was granted registration in 2011.

The Arbiter considers that caution was reasonably expected to be exercised with respect to investments in, and extent of exposure to, such products since the time of the Scheme's registration. Even more so when taking into consideration the nature of the Retirement Scheme and its specific objective.

Nevertheless, the exposure to structured notes allowed within the Complainant's portfolio was extensive, with the insurance policy underlying the Scheme being at times fully or predominantly invested into such products.

A typical definition of a structured note provides that:

'A structured note is a debt security issued by financial institutions; its return is based on equity indexes, a single equity, a basket of equities, interest rates, commodities or foreign currencies. The return on a structured note is linked to the performance of an underlying asset, group of assets or index'. (fn. 71 <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/structurednote.asp>)

A structured note is further described as:

'a debt obligation – basically like an IOU from the issuing investment bank – with an embedded derivative component; in other words, it invests in assets via derivative instruments'. (fn. 72 <https://www.investopedia.com/articles/bonds/10/structured-notes.asp>)

The Arbiter notes that the fact sheets presented by the Complainant in respect of structured notes that featured in his portfolio as well as the fact sheet of the original RBC Investment highlighted a number of risks in respect of the capital invested into these products.

Apart from inter alia the credit risk of the issuer and the liquidity risk, the fact sheets of the said structured products also highlighted risk warnings about the notes not being capital protected, warning that the investor could possibly receive less than the original amount invested, or potentially even losing all of the investment.

A particular feature emerging of the type of structured notes invested into, involved the application of capital buffers and barriers. In this regard, the fact sheets of such products described and included warnings that the invested capital was at risk in case of a particular event occurring. Such event typically comprised a fall, observed on a specific date of more than a specified percentage in the respective fact sheet, in the value of any underlying asset to which the structured note was linked. The fall in value

would typically be observed on maturity/final valuation of the note. The specified percentage in the fall in value mentioned in the relevant fact sheets presented was of 50% of the initial value as indicated by the Service Provider itself in its submissions. The underlying asset to which the structured notes were linked comprised listed companies.

The said fact sheets further included a warning, on the lines of, 'If any stock has fallen by more than 50% (a barrier breach) then investors receive the performance of the Worst Performing Stock at Maturity'. (fn. 73 Example – Fact Sheet of the RBC Diversified Blue Chip Income Notes – Series 1 - <https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/read/38731551/rbc-diversified-blue-chip-income-notes-series-1fund-platform>) Such features and warnings featured, in essence, in the fact sheets of similar structured notes.

It is accordingly clear that there were certain specific risks in the structured products invested into and there were material consequences if just one asset, out of a basket of assets to which the note respectively was linked, fell foul of the indicated barrier. The implication of such a feature should have not been overlooked nor discounted. Given the said particular features neither should have comfort been derived regarding the adequacy of such products just from the fact that the structured notes were linked to a basket of quoted shares.

The Arbitrator would also like to make reference to a particular communication presented in another separate case made against MPM which is relevant to the case in question. In this regard, it is particularly revealing to note the statements made by Trafalgar itself, in its email communication dated 17 September 2017 to CWM, **wherein MPM was in copy**, and which communication was presented in Case Number 185/2018 against MPM, decided today. In the said case, MPM did not contest that such communication was untrue or did not exist, but only challenged the way in which the said email was obtained by the complainant.

The email sent by Trafalgar's official *inter alia* stated the following:

'Structured Notes – It is my opinion we need to get as far away from these vehicles as possible. They have no place in an uneducated investor's portfolio and when they breach their barriers untold amounts of damage is done'. (fn. 74 Emphasis added by the Arbitrator)

Such a statement indeed summarily highlighted the pertinent issues with respect to investments in structured notes which are relevant to the case in question.

Excessive exposure to structured products and to single issuers in respect of the Complainant's portfolio

As indicated above, the portfolio of investments in respect of the Complainant comprised at times solely or predominantly of structured products. Such excessive exposure to structured products occurred over a long period of time. This clearly emerges from the Table of Investments forming part of the 'Investor Profile' provided by the Service Provider.

In addition, the said table indicates investments resulting in high exposures to the same single issuer/s, both through a singular purchase and/or through cumulative purchases in products issued by the same issuer.

Even in case where the issuer of the structured product was a large institution, the Arbiter does not consider this to justify or make the high exposure to single issuers acceptable even more so in the Scheme's context. The maximum limits relating to exposures to single issuers outlined in the MFSA rules and MPM's own Investment Guidelines did not make any distinctions according to the standing of the issuer. Hence, the maximum exposure limits to single counterparties should have been applied and ensured that they are adhered to across the board. The credit risk of the respective issuer was indeed still one of the applicable risks highlighted in various fact sheets, as presented to and sourced by the OAFS, of structured products invested into.

In Specie Transfer and subsequent investments

The Arbiter has considered the overall portfolio allowed by MPM within the Scheme's structure, that is, the in specie investment accepted by MPM upon the Complainant becoming a member of the Scheme and also the subsequent investments made following the assignment of the SEB Policy to MPM.

It is noted that upon the assignment of the SEB Policy to MPM as trustee of the Retirement Scheme, the SEB Policy already had a substantial exposure to a single investment, the RBC Investment, which was over 70% of the policy value at the time.

Despite such substantial investment, the portfolio still continued to be constructed predominantly with structured products.

As to the investment undertaken prior to membership and transferred in specie to the Scheme, it is noted that MPM, as Trustee and Retirement Scheme Administrator, accepted the said investment within the Scheme's structure and also allowed it to be retained within the Retirement Scheme.

MPM was ultimately in a position not to accept such investment at the time when it considered whether to accept or not the Complainant as member of the Scheme. Accordingly, it is considered that MPM cannot completely wash its hands from such investment with the excuse that this was undertaken prior to membership.

Furthermore, it has not been indicated, nor any evidence has emerged that MPM, as Trustee and Retirement Scheme Administrator of the Scheme, expressed, at any time, any reservations or warnings to the Complainant about the said substantial RBC Investment. It has neither been indicated that the sale of such product prior to its maturity was not possible and/or that the early redemption of such investment was not in the Complainant's best interests. During the proceedings of this case it was neither indicated nor proven that the Complainant risked sustaining a greater loss on such investment had such product been redeemed prior to maturity.

In the particular circumstances of this case, it is accordingly considered that whilst MPM cannot be held responsible for the loss in value of the investment prior to the transfer and assignment of the policy to the Service Provider, MPM should, however, be responsible for the position starting from the date since it took over as Trustee and Retirement Scheme Administrator. Accordingly, in the particular circumstances, it is considered that responsibility should be attributed to MPM from the date when the investment was accepted by it within the Scheme's structure and until the said RBC Investment remained under MPM's control in its capacity as Trustee and Scheme Administrator.

With respect to the RBC Investment, the Service Provider argued that 'any capital loss suffered by the Complainant (which was substantial) for this investment cannot be attributed to Momentum'. (fn. 75 A fol. 193)

The Service Provider further argued inter alia that 'Whilst the product did provide coupons ... the capital loss ... was nevertheless £84,011' on this product and that this was 'why the portfolio has overall suffered a loss'. (fn. 76 Ibid.)

The Service Provider seems to attribute the overall loss on the portfolio to the RBC Investment. Whilst a loss has been indicated on such investment, the documents produced during this case indicate that this was not the only loss experienced by the Complainant, as material losses were also experienced on various other investments within the portfolio. In the Table of Investments, the Service Provider indicated one sale of a structured product, the Leonteq 1.5yrs Multi Barrier Express Cert on 3 Companies 9% Coupon, which sale is indicated as yielding a capital gain of GBP352. (fn. 77 A fol. 196 – Sale value of GBP10,780 less Purchase value of GBP 10,428) The statement presented by the Complainant of the SEB Policy as at March 2018,

however, also indicated the sale of various structured products on which substantial capital losses were experienced such as: (fn. 78 A fol. 18019 & 27)

- *the Leonteq (EFG) Express Cert on 4 Companies Multi Barrier AC Quanto EUR which was purchased for EUR9,000 and sold at a value of EUR333.96;*
- *the Leonteq (EFG) 8.4%pa Multi Barrier Reverse Conv on 4 Companies AC Quanto EUR which was purchased for EUR8,000 and sold at a value of EUR1,060.63;*
- *the Leonteq 2yr Multi Barrier Express Cert on 3 Companies 10% pa which was purchased for GBP5,000 and sold at nil value;*
- *the Leonteq 1.5yrs 50% Multi Barrier Express Cert 9% pa which was purchased for GBP10,725 and sold at a value of GBP5,941.63.*

Portfolio not reflective of the MFSA rules

The high exposure to structured products as well as high exposure to single issuers, which was allowed to occur by the Service Provider in the Complainant's portfolio, jarred with the regulatory requirements that applied to the Retirement Scheme at the time, particularly Standard Operational Condition ('SOC') 2.7.1 and 2.7.2 of the 'Directives for Occupational Retirement Schemes, Retirement Funds and Related Parties under the Special Funds (Regulation) Act, 2002', ('the Directives') which applied from the Scheme's inception in 2011 until the registration of the Scheme under the RPA on 1 January 2016. The applicability and relevance of these conditions to the case in question was highlighted by MPM itself. (fn. 79 Para. 21 & 23 of the Note of Submissions filed by MPM in 2019)

SOC 2.7.1 of Part B.2.7 of the Directives required inter alia that the assets were to 'be invested in a prudent manner and in the best interest of beneficiaries ...'.

SOC 2.7.2 in turn required the Scheme to ensure inter alia that, the assets of a scheme are 'invested in order to ensure the security, quality, liquidity and profitability of the portfolio as a whole', (fn. 80 SOC 2.7.2 (a)) and that such assets are 'properly diversified in such a way as to avoid accumulations of risk in the portfolio as a whole'. (fn. 81 SOC 2.7.2.(b))

SOC 2.7.2 of the Directives also provided other benchmarks including for the portfolio to be 'predominantly invested in regulated markets'; (fn. 82 SOC 2.7.2 (c)) to be 'properly diversified in such a way as to avoid excessive exposure to any particular asset, issuer or group of undertakings', (fn. 83 SOC 2.7.2 (e)) where the exposure to single issuer was: in the case of investments in securities issued by the same body limited to no more than 10% of assets; in the case of deposits with any one licensed

credit institution limited to 10%, which limit could be increased to 30% of the assets in case of EU/EEA regulated banks; and where in case of investments in properly diversified collective investment schemes, which themselves had to be predominantly invested in regulated markets, limited to 20% of the scheme's assets for any one collective investment scheme. (fn. 84 SOC 2.7.2 (h)(iii) & (v))

Despite the standards of SOC 2.7.2, MPM allowed the portfolio of the Complainant to, at times, comprise solely and predominantly of structured products. Individual exposures to single issuers were at times higher than 20% and in certain instances, such as the investment into the RBC Diversified Blue Chip Income Notes – Series 1 ('the RBC investment'), even higher than 30%, the latter being the maximum limit applied in the Rules to relatively safer investments such as deposits as outlined above.

The structured products invested into were also not indicated, during the proceedings of this case, as themselves being traded in or dealt on a regulated market. The portfolio also included, on a cumulative basis, material positions into high risk investments. The high risk in the high rate of returns of 8.4%, 9% and 10% p.a. which featured in the name of various structured products invested into.

Portfolio not reflective of MPM's **own** Investment Guidelines

In its submissions MPM produced a copy of the Investment Guidelines marked 'January 2013' and 'Mid-2014', which guidelines featured in the Application Form for Membership, and also Investment Guidelines marked '2015', '2016', 'Mid-2017', 'Dec-2017' and '2018' where, it is understood the latter respectively also formed part of the Scheme's documentation such as the Scheme Particulars issued by MPM.

*Despite that the Service Provider claimed that the investments made in respect of the Complainant were in line with the Investment Guidelines, **MPM has however not adequately proven such a claim.***

As indicated, the investment portfolio in the case reviewed in this decision was at times either solely and/or predominantly invested in structured notes for a long period of time. It is unclear how such a portfolio composition truly satisfied certain conditions specified in MPM's own Investment Guidelines such as:

(i) The requirement that the member's assets had to be 'predominantly invested in regulated markets'.

This was a condition which prevailed in all of the presented MPM's Investment Guidelines since January 2013 till that of 2018. (fn. 85 Investment Guidelines attached to the affidavit of Stewart Davies)

The said requirement of being ‘predominantly invested in regulated markets’ meant, and should have been construed to mean, that investments had to be predominantly invested in listed instruments, that is, financial instruments that were admitted to trading. With reference to industry practice, the terminology of ‘regulated markets’ is referring to a regulated exchange venue (such as a stock exchange or other regulated exchange). The term ‘regulated markets’ is in fact commonly referred to, defined and applied in various EU Directives relating to financial services, including diversification rules applicable on other regulated financial products. (fn. 86 Such as UCITS schemes - the Undertakings for Collective Investments in Transferable Securities (UCITS) Directive (Directive 2009/65/EC as updated). The Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID) (Directive 2004/39/EC as repealed by Directive 2014/65/EU) also includes a definition as to what constitutes a ‘regulated market’) Hence, the interpretation of ‘regulated markets’ has to be seen in such context.

The reference to ‘predominantly invested in regulated markets’ cannot be interpreted as referring to the status of the issuers of the products and it is typically the product itself which has to be traded on the regulated market and not the issuer of the product.

Moreover, a look through approach, could not either be sensibly applied to the structured notes for the purposes of such condition taking into consideration the nature and particular features of the structured notes invested into.

No evidence was submitted that, predominantly, the portfolio, which at times comprised solely or predominantly of structured notes, constituted listed structured notes. The fact sheets sourced and presented by the Complainant of structured notes forming part of the portfolio, actually indicated that the products in question were not listed on an exchange.

On its part the Service Provider did not prove that the portfolio of the Complainant was ‘predominantly invested in regulated markets’ on an ongoing basis.

Furthermore, when investment in unlisted securities was itself limited to 10% of the Scheme assets, as stipulated throughout MPM’s own Investment Guidelines for 2013 to 2018, it is unclear how the Trustee and Scheme Administrator chose to allow higher exposures (as indicated will be indicated further below) to structured notes, a debt security, which were themselves unlisted.

(ii) The requirement relating to the liquidity of the portfolio.

The Investment Guidelines of MPM, marked January 2013, required no more than a ‘maximum of 40% of the fund (fn. 87 The reference to ‘fund’ is construed to refer to

the member's portfolio) in assets with liquidity of greater than 6 months'. This requirement remained, in essence, also reflected in the Investment Guidelines marked 'Mid-2014' which read 'Has a maximum of 40% of the fund in assets with expected liquidity of greater than 6 months' as well as in the subsequent Investment Guidelines marked 2015 till 2018 which were updated by MPM and tightened further to read a 'maximum of 40% of the fund in assets with expected liquidity of greater than 3 months but not greater than 6 months'.

It is evident that the scope of such requirement was to ensure the liquidity of the portfolio as a whole by having the portfolio predominantly (that is, at least 60%) exposed to liquid assets which could be easily redeemed within a short period of time, that is, 3-6 months (as reflected in the respective conditions) whilst limiting exposure to those assets which take longer to liquidate to no more than 40% of the portfolio.

With reference to the Complainant's portfolio, it is noted that the structured notes invested into typically had a maturity or investment term of 1-2 years and, at times, even higher up to 5 years as evidenced in the product fact sheets. The bulk of the assets within the policy was, at times, invested into just one or very few structured notes. It is unclear how the 40% maximum limit referred to above could have been satisfied in such circumstances where the portfolio was predominantly invested into structured notes which themselves had long investment terms.

It is further noted that the fact sheets of the said unlisted structured products included reference to the possibility of a secondary market existing for structured notes. In this regard, a buyer had to be found in the secondary market in case one wanted to redeem a holding into such structured note prior to its maturity.

The secondary market could, however, not have provided an adequate level of comfort with respect to liquidity.

There are indeed various risks highlighted in relation to the secondary market as amply reflected in the risk warnings emerging in the said fact sheets.

The said risk warnings highlighted the risks related to the availability of such market (as the secondary market had to be in the first place offered by the issuer), as well as the limitations of the said market. They also highlighted the lower price that could be sought on this market.

In this regard, there was the risk that the price of the structured note on the secondary market could be well below the initial capital invested.

For example, the note issued by RBC included the risk disclaimer that: ‘Any secondary market provided by Royal Bank of Canada is subject to change and may be stopped without notice and investors may therefore be unable to sell or redeem the Notes until their maturity. If the Notes are redeemed early, they may be redeemed at a level less than the amount originally invested’.

Similar warnings feature in other fact sheets.

MPM should have been well aware about the risks associated with the secondary market. It has indeed itself seen the material lower value that could be sought on such market in respect of the structured notes invested into. The lower values of the structured notes on the secondary market was indeed affecting the value of the Scheme as can be deduced from the respective Annual Member Statements that MPM itself produced.

Hence, no sufficient comfort about liquidity could have possibly been derived with respect to the secondary market in case of unlisted structured notes.

The Arbiter is not accordingly convinced that the conditions relating to liquidity were being adequately adhered to either, nor that the required prudence was being exercised with respect to the liquidity of the portfolio, when considering the above mentioned aspects and when keeping into context that the portfolio of investments that was allowed to develop within the Retirement Scheme was, at times, solely/ predominantly invested into the said structured notes.

Even if one had to look at the composition of the portfolio purely from other aspects, there is still undisputable evidence of non-compliance with other requirements detailed in MPM’s own Investment Guidelines. This is particularly so with respect to the requirements applicable regarding the proper diversification, avoidance of excessive exposure and permitted maximum exposure to single issuers.

In addition to the exposure of 76.20% of the policy value to the RBC Investment that was accepted and allowed by MPM in the Scheme’s portfolio, Table A below shows another examples of excessive single exposures allowed within the portfolio at the time of purchase. The excessive exposure to single counterparties clearly emerges from the ‘Table of Investments’ forming part of the ‘Investor Profile’ produced by MPM as part of its submissions.

Table A – Examples of Excessive Exposure to a Single Issuer of Structured Notes (‘SNs’)

<i>Exposure to single issuer in % terms of the policy value at time of purchase</i>	<i>Issuer</i>	<i>Description</i>
20.08%	EFG	2 SNs issued by EFG both purchased in September 2014 respectively comprised 10.18%, and 9.90% of the policy value at the time of purchase thus resulting in an overall exposure to the same issuer of 20.08% of the policy value at the time of purchase.

*Irrespective of whether or not the particular investment indicated had actually yielded a profit, **the fact that such high exposure to a single counterparty was allowed in the first place indicates, in itself, the lack of prudence and excessive exposure and risks to single counterparties that were allowed to be taken on a general level.***

The fact that such high exposures to a single counterparty was allowed in the first place indicates, in itself, the lack of prudence and excessive exposure and risks to single counterparties that were allowed to be taken.

The Arbiter notes that the Service Provider has along the years revised various times the investment restrictions specified in its own 'Investment Guidelines' with respect to structured products, both in regard to maximum exposures to structured products and maximum exposure to single issuers of such products. The exposure to structured notes and their issuers was indeed progressively and substantially reduced over the years in the said Investment Guidelines.

The specified maximum limit of 66% of the portfolio value in structured notes having underlying guarantees which featured in the 'Investment Guidelines' marked 2015 (fn. 88 MPM's Investment Guidelines '2015' as attached to the affidavit of Stewart Davies) was reduced to 40% of the portfolio's value in the 'Investment Guidelines' marked December 2017, (fn. 89 MPM's Investment Guidelines 'Dec-2017' as attached to the

affidavit of Stewart Davies) and, subsequently, reduced further to 25% in the 'Investment Guidelines' for 2018. (fn. 90 MPM's Investment Guidelines '2018' as attached to the affidavit of Stewart Davies)

Similarly, the maximum exposure to single issuers for 'products with underlying guarantees', that is, structured products as referred to by MPM itself, in the 'Investment Guidelines' marked Mid-2014 and 2015 specifically limited maximum exposure to the same issuer default risk to no more than (33.33%), one third of the portfolio. The maximum limit to such products was subsequently reduced to 25%, one quarter of the portfolio, in the 'Investment Guidelines' marked 2016 (fn. 91 MPM's Investment Guidelines '2016' as attached to the affidavit of Stewart Davies) and mid-2017 (fn. 92 MPM's Investment Guidelines 'Mid-2017' as attached to the affidavit of Stewart Davies), reduced further to 20% in the 'Investment Guidelines' marked December 2017 and, subsequently, to 12.5% in the 'Investment Guidelines' for 2018. Even before the Investment Guidelines of Mid-2014, MPM's Investment Guidelines of January 2013 still limited exposure to individual investments (aside from collective investment schemes) to 20%.

The Arbitrator considers that the high exposure to structured products as well as to single issuers in the Complainant's portfolio jarred and did not reflect to varying degrees, with one or more of MPM's own investment guidelines applicable at the time when the investments were made, most particularly with respect to the following guidelines: (fn. 93 Emphasis in the mentioned guidelines added by the Arbitrator.)

Investment Guidelines marked 'Mid-2014':

- *Where products with underlying guarantees are chosen, **no more than one third of the overall portfolio to be subject to the same issuer default risk.***

*In addition, **further consideration needs to be given to** the following factors:*

- ...
- **Credit risk of underlying investment**
- ...

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>In addition to the above, the portfolio must be constructed in such a way as to avoid excessive exposure:</i>• ...• To any single credit risk
<p><u>Investment Guidelines marked '2015':</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Where products with underlying guarantees are chosen, i.e. Structured Notes, these will be permitted up to a maximum of 66% of the portfolio's values,</i>
<p><i>with no more than one third of the portfolio to be subject to the same issuer default risk.</i></p>
<p><i>In addition, further consideration needs to be given to the following factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ...• Credit risk of underlying investment• ...• ...
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>In addition to the above, the portfolio must be constructed in such a way as to avoid exposure:</i>• ...• To any single credit risk.
<p><u>Investment Guidelines marked '2016' & 'Mid-2017':</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Where products with underlying Capital guarantees are chosen, i.e. Structured</i>

<p>Notes, these will be permitted up to a maximum of 66% of the portfolio's values,</p>
<p>with no more than one quarter of the portfolio to be subject to the same issuer/ guarantor default risk.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Where no such Capital guarantee exists, investment will be permitted up to a maximum of 50% of the portfolio's value. <p>...</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In addition, further consideration needs to be given to the following factors:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ...• Credit risk of underlying investment; <p>...</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In addition to the above, the portfolio must be constructed in such a way as to avoid exposure:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ...• To any single credit risk.

Besides the mentioned excessive exposure to single issuers it is noted that additional investments into structured notes were observed (fn. 94 'Table of Investments' in the 'Investor Profile' provided by MPM refers) to have been allowed to occur within the Complainant's portfolio, in excess of the limits allowed on the overall maximum exposure to such products. MPM's Investment Guidelines of 2015, 2016 and mid-2017 specifically mentioned a maximum limit of 66% of the portfolio value to structured notes. In the case reviewed the Service Provider still continued to allow further investments into structured products at one or more instances when the said limits should have applied.

The additional investments also occurred despite the portfolio being already exposed to structured notes more than the said percentage at the time when the additional purchase was being made.

For the reasons amply explained, the Arbiter has no comfort that in its role as a Scheme Administrator and Trustee, MPM has truly ensured that the Scheme's investments were generally, and at all times, managed in accordance with relevant legislation and regulatory requirements and in accordance with relevant legislation and regulatory requirements, as well as in accordance with the rules and terms and conditions of the Trust.

The Service Provider did not help its case by not providing detailed information on the underlying investments as already stated in this decision. Although the Service Provider filed a Table of Investments, it did not provide adequate information to explain the portfolio composition and justify its claim that the portfolio was diversified. It did not provide fact sheets in respect of the investments comprising the portfolio of the Complainant and it did not demonstrate the features and the risks attached to the investments.

The Service Provider's mere indication that it made in its submissions, that the portfolio was diversified through a number of structured notes with a range of issuers and with diversified listed underlyings, cannot reasonably provide in itself sufficient and adequate comfort on the level of diversification/adequacy of such investments. Various other aspects cannot be ignored by the Service Provider.

Such aspects include, but are not limited to:

- the nature of the structured products being invested into and the effects any events or barriers that may form part of the key features of such products, would have on the investment if and when such events occur as already detailed above;*
- the potential rate of returns as indicative of the level of risk being taken;*
- the level of risks ultimately exposed to in the respective product and in the overall portfolio composition; and*
- not the least, the issuer/counterparty risk being taken.*

The extent of losses experienced on the capital of the Complainant's portfolio, as indicated by MPM itself, (fn. 95 'Investor Profile' attached with the Additional Submissions made by MPM in 2019) is in itself indicative of the failure in adherence with the applicable conditions on diversification and avoidance of excessive exposures. Otherwise, material losses, which are reasonably not expected to occur in a pension product whose scope is to provide for retirement benefits, would have not occurred.

Apart from the fact that no sensible rationale has emerged for limiting the composition of the pension portfolio solely and/or predominantly to structured products, no adequate and sufficient comfort has either emerged that such composition reflected the prudence expected in the structuring and composition of a pension portfolio. Neither that the allocations were in the best interests of the Complainant despite his selected risk profile.

In the circumstance where the portfolio of the Complainant was at times, solely or predominantly invested in structured products with a high level of exposure to single issuer/s, and for the reasons amply explained above, the Arbiter does not consider that there was proper diversification nor that the portfolio was at all times 'invested in order to ensure the security, quality, liquidity and profitability of the portfolio as a whole' (fn. 96 SOC2.7.2(a) of Part B.2.7 of the Directives) and 'properly diversified in such a way as to avoid accumulations of risk in the portfolio as a whole'. (fn. 97 SOC2.7.2(b) of Part B.2.7 of the Directives)

Apart from the fact that the Arbiter does not have comfort that the portfolio was reflective of the conditions and investment limits outlined in the MFSA's Rules and MPM's own Investment Guidelines, it is also being pointed out that over and above the duty to observe specific maximum limits relating to diversification as may have been specified by rules, directives or guidelines applicable at the time, the behaviour and judgement of the Retirement Scheme Administrator and Trustee of the Scheme is expected to, and should have gone beyond compliance with maximum percentages and was to, in practice, reflect the spirit and principles behind the regulatory framework and in practice promote the scope for which the Scheme was established.

The excessive exposure to structured products and their issuers nevertheless clearly departed from such principles and cannot ultimately be reasonably considered to satisfy and reflect in any way a suitable level of diversification nor a prudent approach.

This is even more so when considering the crucial aim of a retirement scheme being that to provide for retirement benefits – an aspect which forms the whole basis for the pension legislation and regulatory framework to which the Retirement Scheme and MPM were subject to. The provision of retirement benefits was indeed the Scheme's sole purpose as reflected in the Scheme Particulars.

C. The Provision of information

With respect to reporting to the member of the Scheme, MPM mentioned and referred only to the Annual Member Statement in its submissions. The said annual statements issued by the Service Provider to the Complainant are, however, highly generic reports which only listed the underlying life assurance policy and included no details of the underlying investments, that is, the structured notes comprising the portfolio of investments.

Hence, the extent and type of information sent to the Complainant by MPM as a member of the Scheme in respect of his underlying investments is considered to have been lacking and insufficient.

SOC 9.3(e) of Part B.9 of the Pension Rules for Personal Retirement Schemes of 1 January 2015 already provided that, in respect of member directed schemes, ‘a record of all transactions (purchases and sales) occurring in the member’s account during the relevant reporting period should be provided by the Retirement Scheme Administrator to the Member at least once a year and upon request ...’. (fn. 98 the said condition was further revised and updated as per condition 9.5(3) of Part B.9 of the Pension Rules for Personal Retirement Schemes indicated as ‘Issued’ 7 January 2015/ Last updated: 28 December 2018’)

It is noted that the Pension Rules for Personal Retirement Schemes under the RPA became applicable to MPM on 1 January 2016 and that, as per the MFSA’s communications presented by MPM, (fn. 99 MFSA’s letter dated 11 Decemebr 2017, attached to the Note of Submissions filed by MPM in 2019) Part B.9 of the said rules did not become effective until the revised rules issued in 2018.

Nevertheless, it is considered that even where such condition could have not strictly applied to the Service Provider from a regulatory point of view, the Service Provider as a Trustee, obliged by the TTA to act as a bonus paterfamilias and in the best interests of the members of the Scheme, should have felt it its duty to provide members with detailed statements and information on the underlying investment transactions.

Moreover, prior to being subject to the regulatory regime under the RPA, the Service Provider was indeed already subject to regulatory requirements relating to the provision of adequate information to members such as the following provisions under the SFA framework:

- *Standard Operating Conditions 2.6.2 and 2.6.3 of Section B.2 of the Directives for Occupational Retirement Schemes, Retirement Funds and Related Parties under the Special Funds (Regulation) Act, 2002 (fn. 100 Condition 2.2 of the*

Certificate of Registratrtration issued by the MFSA to MPM dated 28 April 2011 included reference to Section B.2 of the said Directives) respectively already provided that:

'2.6.2 The Scheme Administrator shall act with due skill, care and diligence in the best interests of the Beneficiaries. Such action shall include:

...

b) ensuring that contributors and prospective contributors are provided with adequate information on the Scheme to enable them to take an informed decision ...';

'2.6.3 The Scheme Administrator shall ensure the adequate disclosure of relevant material information to prospective and actual contributors in a way which is fair, clear and nor misleading. This shall include:

...

b) reporting fully, accurately and promptly to contributors the details of transactions entered into by the Scheme ...'.

There is no apparent and justified reason why the Service Provider did not report itself on key information such as the composition of the underlying investment portfolio, which it had in its hands as the trustee of the underlying life assurance policy held in respect of the Complainant.

The general principles of acting in the best interests of the member and those relating to the duties of trustee as already outlined in this decision (fn. 101 The section titled 'Responsibilities of the Service Provider') and to which MPM was subject to, should have prevailed and should have guided the Service Provider in its actions to ensure that the Member was provided with an adequate account of the underlying investments within his portfolio.

In view of the Complainant's remarks that he was never asked to sign one of the dealing instructions, the provision of details on the underlying investments could have ultimately enabled the member of the Scheme to highlight any transactions on which there was an issue. (fn. 102 A fol. 6)

Causal link and Synopsis of main aspects

*The actual cause of the losses experienced by the Complainant on his account within the Retirement Scheme **cannot** just be attributed to the under-performance of the investments as a result of general market and investment risks and/or the issues alleged against one of the structured note providers, as MPM has inter alia suggested in these proceedings.*

There is sufficient and convincing evidence of deficiencies on the part of MPM in the undertaking of its obligations and duties as Trustee and Retirement Scheme Administrator of the Scheme, as amply highlighted above, which, at the very least, impinge on the diligence it was required and reasonably expected to be exercised in such roles.

It is also evidently clear that such deficiencies prevented the losses from being minimised and in a way contributed in part to the losses experienced. The actions and inactions that occurred, as explained in this decision, enabled such losses to result within the Scheme, leading to the Scheme's failure to achieve its key objective.

Had MPM undertaken its role adequately and as duly expected from it, in terms of the obligations resulting from the law, regulations and rules stipulated thereunder and the conditions to which it was subject to in terms of its own Retirement Scheme documentation as explained above, such losses would have been avoided or mitigated accordingly.

The actual cause of the losses is indeed linked to and cannot be separated from the actions and/or inactions of key parties involved with the Scheme, with MPM being one of such parties.

In the particular circumstances of the cases reviewed, the losses experienced on the Retirement Scheme are ultimately tied, connected and attributed to events that have been allowed to occur within the Retirement Scheme which MPM was duty bound and reasonably in a position to prevent, stop and adequately raise as appropriate with the Complainant.

Final remarks

As indicated earlier in this decision, the role of a retirement scheme administrator and trustee does not end, nor is just strictly and solely limited, to the compliance of the specified rules. The wider aspects of its key role and responsibilities as a trustee and scheme administrator must also be kept into context.

Whilst the Retirement Scheme Administrator was not responsible to provide investment advice to the Complainant, the Retirement Scheme Administrator had however clear duties to check and ensure that the portfolio composition recommended by the investment adviser provided a suitable level of diversification and was inter alia in line with the applicable requirements in order to ensure that the portfolio composition was one enabling the aim of the Retirement Scheme to be achieved with the necessary prudence required in respect of a pension scheme. The oversight function is an essential aspect in the context of personal retirement schemes as part of the safeguards supporting the objective of retirement schemes.

It is considered that, had there been a careful consideration of the contested structured products and extent of exposure to such products and their issuers, the Service Provider would and should have intervened, queried, challenged and raised concerns on the portfolio composition recommended and not allow the overall risky position to be taken in structured products as this ran counter to the objectives of the retirement scheme and was not in the Complainant's best interests amongst others.

The Complainant ultimately relied on MPM as the Trustee and Retirement Scheme Administrator of the Scheme, as well as other parties within the Scheme's structure, to achieve the scope for which the pension arrangement was undertaken, that is, to provide for retirement benefits and also reasonably expect a return to safeguard his pension.

Whilst losses may indeed occur on investments within a portfolio, a properly diversified and balanced and prudent approach, as expected in a pension portfolio, should have mitigated any individual losses and, at the least, maintain rather than substantially reduce the original capital invested.

For the reasons amply explained, it is accordingly considered that there was, at the very least, a clear lack of diligence by the Service Provider in the general administration of the Scheme in respect of the Complainant and in carrying out its duties as Trustee, particularly when it came to the dealings and aspects involving the appointed investment adviser; the oversight functions with respect to the Scheme and portfolio structure; as well as the reporting to the Complainant on the underlying portfolio.

It is also considered that there are various instances which indicate non-compliance by the Service Provider with applicable requirements and obligations as amply explained above in this decision. The Service Provider failed to act with the prudence, diligence and attention of a bonus paterfamilias. (fn. 103 Cap. 331 of the Laws of Malta, Art. 21(1))

The Arbiter also considers that the Service Provider did not meet the 'reasonable and legitimate expectations' (fn. 104 Cap. 555, Article 19(3)(c)) of the Complainant who had placed his trust in the Service Provider and others, believing in their professionalism and their duty of care and diligence.

Conclusion

For the above-stated reasons, the Arbiter considers the complaint to be fair, equitable and reasonable in the particular circumstances and substantive merits of the case (fn. 105 Cap. 555, Article 19(3)(b)) and is accepting it in so far as it is compatible with this decision.

Cognisance needs to be taken of the responsibilities of other parties involved with the Scheme and its underlying investments, particularly, the role and responsibilities of the investment adviser to the Member of the Scheme.

Hence, having carefully considered the case in question, the Arbiter considers that the Service Provider is to be partially held responsible for the losses incurred.

Compensation

Being mindful of the key role of Momentum Pensions Malta Limited as Trustee and Retirement Scheme Administrator of the Momentum Malta Retirement Trust and in view of the deficiencies identified in the obligations emanating from such roles as amply explained above, which deficiencies are considered to have prevented the losses from being minimised and in a way contributed in part to the losses experienced on the Retirement Scheme, the Arbiter concludes that the Complainant should be compensated by Momentum Pensions Malta Limited for part of the realised losses on his pension portfolio.

In the particular circumstances of this case, considering that the Service Provider had the last word on the investments and acted in its dual role of Trustee and Retirement Scheme Administrator, the Arbiter considers it fair, equitable and reasonable for Momentum Pensions Malta Limited, to be held responsible for seventy per cent of the net realised losses sustained by the Complainant on his investment portfolio.

The Arbiter notes that the latest valuation and list of transactions provided by the Service Provider in respect of the Complainant is not current. Besides, no detailed breakdown was provided regarding the status and performance of the respective investments within the disputed portfolio of the Complainant.

The Arbiter shall accordingly formulate how compensation is to be calculated by the Service Provider for the purpose of this decision.

Given that the Complaint made by the Complainant principally relates to the losses suffered on the Scheme at the time of Continental Wealth Management acting as adviser, compensation shall be provided solely on the investment portfolio existing and constituted under Continental Wealth Management in relation to the Scheme.

The Service Provider is accordingly being directed to pay the Complainant compensation equivalent to 70% of the sum of the Net Realised Loss incurred within the whole portfolio of underlying investments constituted under Continental Wealth Management and allowed within the Retirement Scheme by the Service Provider.

The Net Realised Loss calculated on such portfolio shall be determined as at the date of this decision and calculated as follows:

- (i) For every such investment within the said portfolio which, at the date of this decision, no longer forms part of the Member's current investment portfolio (given that such investment has matured, been terminated or redeemed and duly settled), it shall be calculated any realised loss or profit resulting from the difference in the purchase value and the sale/maturity value (amount realised) inclusive of any realised currency gains or losses.***

Any realised loss so calculated on such investment shall be reduced by the amount of any total interest or other total income received from the respective investment throughout the holding period to determine the actual amount of realised loss, if any;

With respect to the RBC Diversified Blue Chip Income Notes-Series 1 only, which was made prior to membership and which was accepted and retained by MPM within the Scheme's portfolio following membership, reference should not be made to the purchase value but the value applicable for this investment as at 12 September 2014, this being the date of assignment of the SEB Policy to MPM. Accordingly, for this investment it shall be calculated any realised loss or profit resulting from the difference in the value of the RBC Diversified Blue Chip Income Notes-Series 1 as at 12 September 2014 and its sale value (amount realised).

Similarly, any realised loss on such investment calculated over the aforesaid period shall be reduced by the amount of any total interest or other total income received from such investment throughout the holding period.

The holding period shall comprise the date from when such investment constituted part of the Retirement Scheme's portfolio until the sale of this investment.

- (ii) *In case where an investment in (i) above is calculated to have rendered a profit after taking into consideration the amount realised (inclusive of any total interest or other total income received from the respective investment and any realised currency gains or losses) such realised profit shall be accumulated from all such investments and netted off against the total of all the realised losses from the respective investments calculated as per (i) above to reach the figure of the Net Realised Loss within the indicated portfolio.***

The computation of the Net Realised Loss shall accordingly take into consideration any realised gains or realised losses arising within the portfolio, as at the date of this decision.

In case where any currency conversion/s is/are required for the purpose of (a) finally netting any realised profits/losses within the portfolio which remain denominated in different currencies and/or (b) crystallising any remaining currency positions initiated at the time of Continental Wealth Management, such conversion shall, if and where applicable, be made at the spot exchange rate sourced from the European Central Bank and prevailing on the date of this decision. Such a direction on the currency conversion is only being given in the very particular circumstances of such cases for the purposes of providing clarity and enabling the calculation of the compensation formulated in this decision and avoid future unnecessary controversy.

- (iii) *Investments which were constituted under Continental Wealth Management in relation to the Scheme and are still held within the current portfolio of underlying investments as at, or after, the date of this decision are not the subject of the compensation stipulated above. This is without prejudice to any legal remedies the Complainant might have in future with respect to such investments.***

In accordance with Article 26 (3)(c)(iv) of Chapter 555 of the Laws of Malta, the Arbiter orders Momentum Pensions Malta Limited to pay the indicated amount of compensation to the Complainant.

A full and transparent breakdown of the calculations made by the Service Provider in respect of the compensation as decided in this decision, should be provided to the Complainant.

With legal interest from the date of this decision till the date of payment.

Because of the novelty of this case each party is to bear its own legal costs of these proceedings”.

L-Appell

6. Is-soċjetà appellanta ħasset ruħha aggravata bid-deċiżjoni appellata tal-Arbitru, u fis-17 ta’ Awwissu, 2020 intavolat appell fejn qed titlob lil din il-Qorti sabiex tirrevoka u tħassar id-deċiżjoni appellata billi tilqa’ l-aggravji tagħha. Tgħid li l-aggravji tagħha huma s-segwent: (i) l-Arbitru applika u interpreta ħażin il-liġi meta ddeċieda li s-soċjetà appellanta naqset mid-dmirijiet tagħha fil-kwalità tagħha ta’ *trustee* jew mod ieħor, iżda partikolmarment meta ddeċieda fost affarijiet oħra li (a) hija kienet naqset għaliex ippermettiet lil CWM tagħxi bħala *investment adviser* tal-appellat; u (b) il-kompożizzjoni tal-portafoll tal-appellat ma kienx skont il-liġijiet, regoli u linji gwida applikabbli; (ii) ma kienx jeżisti l-ebda ness kawżali u għalhekk l-Arbitru sejjes in-ness kawżali fuq konsiderazzjonijiet infondati; u (iii) l-Arbitru għamel apprezzament ħażin tal-fatti u tal-liġi dwar il-mizati, u dak li kien mistenni mingħand is-soċjetà appellanta.

7. L-appellat wieġeb fl-24 ta’ Novembru, 2020 fejn issottometta li d-deċiżjoni appellata hija ġusta, u għaldaqstant timmerita li tiġi kkonfermata għal dawk ir-raġunijiet li huwa jispjega fit-twegiba tiegħu.

Konsiderazzjonijiet ta' din il-Qorti

8. Din il-Qorti ser tgħaddi sabiex tikkunsidra l-aggravji tas-soċjetà appellanta, u dan fid-dawl tar-risposta ntavolata mill-appellat u anki tal-konsiderazzjonijiet magħmulin mill-Arbitru fid-deċiżjoni appellata.

L-ewwel aggravju

9. Meta tfisser l-ewwel aggravju tagħha, is-soċjetà appellanta tikkontendi li l-Arbitru ddecieda ħażin li hija kienet responsabbli għaliex naqset mill-obbligi tagħha meta ħalliet lil CWM taġixxi bħala *investment advisor* hekk kif din kienet giet maħtura mill-appellat stess. Tirrileva li l-Arbitru kien osserva li CWM giet magħzula mill-appellat stess u li s-soċjetà appellanta ma kellha l-ebda obbligu li tivverifika jekk din kinitx entità regolata jew jekk kinitx awtorizzata taħt sistema regolatorja sabiex tipprovdi pariri dwar investimenti. Tgħid li l-obbligu tagħha sabiex tivverifika jekk CWM kellhiex awtorizzazzjoni regolatorja sabiex tagħti pariri ta' investment jew jekk kinitx entità, regolatorja, daħal fis-seħħ fis-sena 2019 meta nbidlu r-regoli mill-MFSA, u għalhekk dawn l-obbligi mhumiex applikabbli għall-każ odjern. Madankollu l-Arbitru xorta waħda sostna li hija kienet naqset fl-obbligi tagħha. Tirrileva li l-Arbitru semma erba' aspetti fejn naqset is-soċjetà appellanta, iżda hija tinsisti li ma kien hemm l-ebda obbligu, u għaldaqstant ma seta' jkun hemm l-ebda nuqqas. Iżda l-Arbitru fittex minflok nuqqasijiet oħra sabiex jiġġustifika l-konkluzjoni tiegħu li hija kienet naqset fl-obbligi tagħha. Issostni li l-punt ċentrali kien jekk hija kellhiex obbligu tivverifika jekk CWM kinitx liċenzjata u mhux jekk fil-fatt din kinitx liċenzjata, iżda l-Arbitru

ddecieda li hija min-naħa tagħha ma kinitx ressqet l-ebda prova sabiex turi li CWM kienet liċenzjata tagħti pariri ta' investiment u tispjega kif din il-konkluzjoni hija waħda difettuża f'żewġ aspetti. Hija tagħmel riferiment għal dak li xehed Stewart Davies fl-affidavit tiegħu, fejn dan stqarr li ma kien hemm l-ebda liġi jew regola dak iż-żmien li kienet titlob li s-soċjetà appellanta tagħmel eżerċizzju ta' *due diligence* jew li tassigura li CWM kienet liċenzjata, u dan fejn wara kollox kien proprju l-appellat li volontarjament ħatar lil CWM bħala l-konsulent finanzjarju tiegħu. Izda fid-deċiżjoni appellata tiegħu, is-soċjetà appellanta tgħid li l-Arbitru mar lil hinn mill-punt kruċjali u straħ fuq obbligu ġenerali ta' *trustee* li jaġixxi fl-aħjar interess tal-benefiċjarji, sabiex wasal għall-konkluzjoni tiegħu. Tirrileva li l-Arbitru saħansitra għamel interpretazzjoni tassew wiesgħa ta' dak li kienet tipprovdi l-formola tal-Applikazzjoni għal Sħubija. Filwaqt li tiddikjara li hija ma kinitx qegħda tikkontesta l-obbligu ġenerali ta' *trustee* li jaġixxi f'kull każ fl-aħjar interess tal-benefiċjarji u bl-attenzjoni ta' *bonus paterfamilias*, is-soċjetà appellanta tikkontendi li dan l-obbligu ta' *trustee* ma kienx iħaddan ukoll l-obbligu speċifiku li ssir verifika dwar jekk il-konsulent finanzjarju kienx liċenzjat jew le, u dan meta l-imsemmi konsulent finanzjarju kien magħżul mill-appellat innifsu. Tikkontendi li kieku l-obbligu kien digà jeżisti qabel ma l-MFSA bidlet ir-regolamenti applikabbli fl-2019, ma kienx ikun hemm proprju l-ħtieġa li ssir din il-bidla. Dwar it-tieni parti ta' dan l-ewwel aggravju tas-soċjetà appellanta, tissottometti li d-deċiżjoni appellata hija msejsa fuq il-konkluzjoni li kien hemm "*excessive exposure to structured products and to single issuers*" sabiex b'hekk il-portafoll ma kienx jirrifletti r-regoli tal-MFSA u l-*investment guidelines* tagħha, u ma kienx hemm diversifikazzjoni xierqa jew '*prudent approach*'. Għalhekk l-Arbitru ddecieda li

hija kienet naqset mill-obbligu tagħha li timxi bl-attenzjoni ta' *bonus paterfamilias* bħal ma kienet tenuta tagħmel fil-kwalità tagħha ta' *trustee*. Tgħid li madankollu d-deċiżjoni appellata hija żbaljata u l-Arbitru hawn kien ukoll naqas milli jieħu in konsiderazzjoni l-profil ta' riskju tal-appellat u jevalwa r-riskju individwali skont il-kompożizzjoni tal-portafoll sħiħ. Filwaqt li tirrileva li hija ssottomettiet l-informazzjoni kollha dwar il-portafoll tal-appellat, anki l-profil ta' riskju tiegħu u l-istruzzjonijiet li kienu ngħataw lilha, tgħid li hija aġixxiet fil-parametri tal-linji gwida applikabbli. Tgħid li jidher li l-Arbitru kellu l-impressjoni li l-prodotti strutturati kellhom riskju ogħla minn dak li fil-fatt intrinsikament kellhom. Is-soċjetà appellanta tirrileva hawn li l-MFSA dejjem kienet tippermetti investiment f'dawn il-prodotti, kif kienu wkoll il-linji gwida tagħha, u l-investment għalhekk qatt ma kien ipprojbit, iżda kellu jsir fil-parametri permissibbli. Tirrileva mbagħad li kull investiment fih element ta' riskju inerenti, u dan filwaqt li taċċetta li hija kienet obligata li tassigura li l-portafoll kien f'kull mument fil-parametri tal-profil ta' riskju tal-membri u anki tal-linji gwidi u tar-regoli applikabbli. Filwaqt li tiċċita dak li jirrileva l-Arbitru fir-rigward ta' prodotti strutturati, tgħid li kuntrarjament għal dak li jgħid, il-profil kien juri li l-linji gwida applikabbli kienu ġew osservati meta sar in-negozju, inkluż l-espożizzjoni għall-imsemmija prodotti strutturati u għal emittenti singolari. Tikkontendi b'riferiment għal Table A f'pagna 47 tad-deċiżjoni appellata, li l-Arbitru jagħmel biss riferiment għall-profil li hija kienet ipprezentat fir-rigward tal-allegata espożizzjoni żejda għal prodotti strutturati. Tispjega b'riferiment għal dak li qal l-Arbitru fejn osserva li matul is-snin hija kienet naqset il-limitu permissibbli ta' investiment f'noti strutturati, li dawn dejjem baqgħu permissibbli fil-limiti identifikati u li l-limiti, bħal fil-każ ta' kull

prodott ieħor, dejjem kienu dinamiċi. Tgħid li anki fir-rigward tal-allegat *excessive exposure to single issuers*, l-Arbitru għalhekk kien ukoll żbaljat fattwalment. Minn hawn is-soċjetà appellanta tgħaddi sabiex tissottometti kif l-Arbitru applika ħażin ir-regoli tal-MFSA. Tikkontendi li mhux ċar x'ried ifisser biha l-kelma "jarred" u lanqas kif wasal għall-konklużjoni li "*...the high exposure to structured products (as well as high exposure to single issuers in respect of the Complainant), which was allowed to occur by the Service Provider in the Complainant's portfolio jarred with the regulatory requirements that applied to the Retirement Scheme at the time...*". Tgħid li l-Arbitru applika ħażin l-*Standard Operational Conditions 2.7.1 u 2.7.2* għaliex dawn kienu applikabbli fir-rigward ta' skema fit-totalità tagħha u mhux fir-rigward ta' portafoll. Tirrileva li sussegwentement ir-regola kienet tbiddlet u sar applikabbli l-kunċett ta' diversifikazzjoni fil-livell ta' membru u mhux tal-iskema biss, iżda l-bidla saret biss wara 2017. Għalhekk peress li l-obbligu ma kienx jeżisti, l-Arbitru ma setax jgħid li hija kellha xi obbligu li tapplika l-prinċipji fil-livell ta' membru. Minn hawn is-soċjetà appellanta tgħaddi sabiex tagħmel is-sottomissjonijiet tagħha fejn hija kienet qegħda ssostni li l-Arbitru ddeċieda ħażin fir-rigward tal-linji gwida dwar l-investment tagħha stess. Filwaqt li tagħmel riferiment għall-affidavit ta' Stewart Davies fuq imsemmi, tikkontendi li dawn huma intiżi sabiex iservu ta' gwida, iżda fl-istess ħin iżommu livell ta' flessibilità li jirrikjedi kull każ partikolari, u għalhekk m'għandhomx jiġu applikati b'mod tassattiv. Tinsisti li m'hemmx '*one size fits all*' fl-applikazzjoni ta' dawn il-linji gwida. Min-naħa tagħha hija kienet ipprezentat il-profil tal-appellat, iżda xorta waħda l-Arbitru ddeċieda li hija ma kinitx ressqet evidenza sabiex turi b'mod sodisfaċenti li l-investimenti saru skont il-linji gwida in kwistjoni. Tirrileva li r-regola ġenerali hija

li min jallega għandu l-oneru tal-prova, u għalhekk hawn l-appellat kellu l-obbligu li jsostni l-ilment tiegħu, u dan filwaqt li tikkontendi li hija fil-fatt kienet gābet prova sodisfaċenti sabiex turi li l-linji gwida kienu gēw osservati. Is-soċjetà appellanta tgħid li l-Arbitru mbagħad żbalja wkoll meta skarta l-prova tagħha allavolja din ma kinitx giet ikkontestata mill-appellat. Tgħid li l-Arbitru għażel żewg eżempji sabiex jispjega kif hija ma kinitx applikat il-linji gwida tagħha stess. Dwar l-ewwel wieħed li l-investment kellu jsir l-aktar f' swieq regolati, hija tgħid li ma ngħatatx l-opportunità sabiex tispjega kif hija kienet applikat din il-linja gwida u għalhekk illum hija rinfaċċjata b' deċiżjoni li qatt ma kellha l-opportunità li tikkontestaha. Barra minn hekk hija ma kinitx taf minn fejn l-Arbitru kien sab l-informazzjoni jew liema kienu l-*fact sheets* li huwa kkonsulta, u dan kien ipogġiha f'pożizzjoni fejn ma setgħetx tikkontesta l-pożizzjoni meħuda minnu. Issostni li anki din il-Qorti issa kienet ser issib li ma setgħetx tieħu pożizzjoni, għaliex ma kienx ċar jekk din l-informazzjoni li straħ fuqha l-Arbitru kinitx tagħmel parti mill-proċess. Dwar dak li kien iddikjara l-Arbitru, is-soċjetà appellanta tgħid li l-investimenti kollha, anki n-noti strutturati, kienu fil-fatt '*listed*' jew fuq l-elenku, u għalhekk setgħu jiġu negozjati fi swieq li jiffaċilitaw u li jiġġestixxu n-negozju fi strumenti finanzjarji. Għalhekk, tkompli tgħid, il-konklużjoni tal-Arbitru li l-linja gwida ma kinitx giet osservata fil-kompożizzjoni tal-portafoll, kienet tassew żbaljata. It-tieni eżempju meħud mil-linji gwida kien jirrigwarda l-konklużjoni tal-Arbitru li huwa ma kienx konvint li l-kondizzjonijiet ta' likwidità kienu qed jiġu osservati adegwatament. Tikkontendi li hija ma kellhiex tinstab responsabbli fuq sempliċi nuqqas ta' konvinzjoni, u mingħajr ma tingħata raġuni għal tali konvinzjoni. Fil-mertu, tgħid li l-Arbitru huwa żbaljat għaliex il-prodott kien '*realisable*' fl-intier tiegħu f'kull stadju, u s-suq għall-

prodott kien pprovdut minn min kien ħareġ in-nota, għaliex dan kien jixtri lura dik in-nota. Ir-raba' punt li tqajjem is-soċjetà appellanta huwa li l-Arbitru naqas milli jikkonsidra l-profil ta' riskju tal-investitur. Tgħid li skont l-appellat, l-investimenti ma kienux skont il-profil ta' riskju tiegħu u hija kienet ikkontestat din l-allegazzjoni. Filwaqt li għal darb'ohra tagħmel riferiment għall-affidavit ta' Stewart Davies, issostni li l-profil ta' riskju kien għaliha jagħmel parti ntegrali mill-konsiderazzjonijiet tagħha bħala Amministratur u li kieku dan ma kienx il-każ, ma kinitx tistaqsi għalih fil-formola tal-applikazzjoni tagħha stess. Dan filwaqt li tirrileva li x-xhieda ta' Stewart Davies ma kinitx giet ikkontestata u għalhekk l-Arbitru kellu jistrieħ fuqha. Is-soċjetà appellata hawn tirrileva punt ieħor li dwaru tħossha aggravata. Tgħid li l-Arbitru ma kkonsidrax b'mod xieraq il-fatt li kien hemm investimenti li saru taħt *trustee* preċedenti, u dan filwaqt li tiċċita silta mid-deċiżjoni appellata dwar l-osservazzjoni li għamel l-Arbitru. Għal dak li kien jirrigwarda d-deċiżjoni appellata fejn l-Arbitru ddikjara li ma kien hemm l-ebda raġuni ġustifikata għaliex is-soċjetà appellanta kienet naqset milli tagħti informazzjoni dwar l-investimenti sottoskritti, tgħid li hawn l-Arbitru jirrepeti l-iżball tiegħu meta filwaqt li jirrikonoxxi li hija ma kellha l-ebda obbligu speċifiku, huwa ddikjara li bħala *trustee* bl-obbligu li timxi bħala *bonus paterfamilias*, hija kienet tenuta tipprovdi rendikont iktar dettaljat. B'hekk huwa kien saħansitra nferixxa obbligi fir-rigward tal-kwalità u l-estent ta' dik l-informazzjoni, u ħoloq incertezza dwar x'kienu l-obbligi tagħha taħt il-liġi billi silet obbligi mill-obbligi generali li jirregolaw *trustees*. Issostni li SOC 2.6.2 u 2.6.3 jirreferu għall-iskema fit-totalità tagħha meta l-appellat ma kienx qed jilmenta li huwa ma ngħatax informazzjoni dwar l-iskema fejn ukoll ma kienx il-punt li kien qed jiġi deċiż.

It-tieni aqgravju

Is-soċjetà appellanta tgħid li hija tħossha aggravata wkoll għaliex l-Arbitru ddikjara li hija kienet parzjalment responsabbli għal 70% tat-telf soffert mill-appellat. Tgħid li fl-ewwel lok l-Arbitru sejjes in-ness kawżali fuq konsiderazzjonijiet li hija kienet diġà fissret li kienu infondati, iżda jekk imbagħad wieħed kellu jaċċetta li l-Arbitru kellu raġun, tgħid li huwa naqas milli jispjega kif attribwixxa lilha r-responsabbiltà ta' 70% tat-telf. Dan filwaqt li tgħid li sabiex jiddikjara responsabbiltà, huwa kellu qabel xejn isib li hemm ness kawżali bejn in-nuqqasijiet tagħha u t-telf soffert mill-appellat. Tgħid li l-Arbitru ma qal xejn ukoll dwar il-fatt li l-appellat ammetta li huwa kien iffirma *in blank* u b'hekk ikkontribwixxa għat-telf tiegħu stess. Hawn is-soċjetà appellanta tikkontendi li ċertament ir-responsabbiltà tagħha qatt ma setgħet tkun akbar minn ta' min ta l-parir, jiġifieri CWM jew tal-appellat li ħa d-deċiżjoni. Tagħmel ukoll riferiment għar-riskji naturali tas-suq, u tişhaqq li meħud dan kollu in konsiderazzjoni, ir-responsabbiltà tagħha kellha tkun inqas minn 70%.

10. L-appellat jilqa' billi jikkontendi li għaladarba huwa kien jikkwalifika bħala '*retail client*', jiġifieri huwa ma kienx investitur professjonali, kien mistenni aktar diliġenza min-naħa tas-soċjetà appellanta. Jgħid li kif sewwa osserva l-Arbitru fid-deċiżjoni appellata, għalkemm is-soċjetà appellanta ma ndaħlitx fl-għażla tal-appellat tal-konsulent finanzjarju tiegħu, hija kellha ftehim ma' CWM fejn kienet aċċettat li tintroduci lil din tal-aħħar mal-membri bħala konsulent finanzjarju, u dan kien saħansitra imniżżel fl-applikazzjoni tas-soċjetà appellanta. B'hekk il-klijent seta' kien influwenzat biex jagħżel lil CWM bħala konsulent finanzjarju tiegħu, u jgħid li f'każ ta' *retail client* aktar kien hemm iċ-

ċans li dan jistrieħ fuq ir-rakkomandazzjonijiet mogħtija mis-soċjetà appellanta. Iżda bħala *Trustee* u Amministratur tal-Iskema tal-Irtirar, l-appellat jgħid li l-obbligi bażiċi tas-soċjetà appellanta kienu jirrikjedu wkoll diligenza u prudenza fil-ftehim li għamlet ma' CWM. Iżda mill-applikazzjoni stess kien jirriżulta li s-soċjetà appellanta kienet aċċettat u anki ħalliet informazzjoni ineżatta dwar il-konsulent finanzjarju. Jgħid l-Arbitru kien irrileva wkoll dwar dan l-punt. Jirriveva li hemm dubbji dwar x'kienu r-riċerki li saru dwar CWM u Trafalgar għaliex, għalkemm fl-applikazzjoni kien hemm miktub li CWM kienet entità regolata, hija ma ressqet l-ebda prova dwar dan. L-Arbitru dan kollu ikkonstatah fid-deċiżjoni appellata, kif ukoll sab illi fl-applikazzjoni ma kienx ċar dwar min fil-fatt kellu r-rwol ta' konsulent finanzjarju, u ma kien hemm l-ebda indikazzjoni jew spjegazzjoni dwar id-differenza bejn it-termini '*professional adviser*' u '*investment adviser*'. Hawn l-appellat jiċċita is-subartikolu 1(2) tal-Att dwar *Trusts* u *Trustees* (Kap. 331), u anki l-para. (ċ) tas-subartikolu 43(6) u l-artikolu 21 tal-istess liġi. Huwa jagħmel ukoll riferiment għal pubblikazzjoni tal-MFSA u jiċċita silta minnha, liema dokument jgħid li kien ġie ppubblikat fl-2017, iżda kien jittratta prinċipji ġenerali tat-Kap. 331 u tal-Kodiċi Ċivili li kienu diġà fis-seħħ qabel dik is-sena. Għalhekk jiċċita wkoll l-*Investment Guidelines* ta' Jannar 2013. Imbagħad jagħmel riferiment għall-para. 3.1 tas-sezzjoni ntestata '*Terms and Conditions*' fil-formola tal-Applikazzjoni għas-Shubija tal-Iskema, u jsostni li minkejja li s-soċjetà appellanta kellha d-dettalji tat-transazzjonijiet kollha u anki tal-portafoll sħiħ, hija naqset fl-obbligu ta' rappurtagġ u saħansitra ma ressqet l-ebda prova dwar dan. Għal dak li jirrigwarda d-deċiżjoni tal-Arbitru dwar il-kompożizzjoni tal-portafoll tiegħu, l-appellat jikkontendi li kien irriżulta tassew ċar li kien hemm numru ta' riskji assoċjati mal-kapital investit f'dan it-tip ta'

prodotti, u kien hemm saħansitra noti li tali prodotti kienu rizervati għal investituri professjonali biss, u li seta' jintilef il-kapital. Jagħmel ukoll riferiment għal *email* ta' Trafalgar lil CWM mibgħuta fis-17 ta' Settembru, 2017, li giet ikkuppjata lis-soċjetà appellata, fejn l-istess Trafalgar uriet it-tħassib tagħha dwar l-investiment *f'structured notes*. Għal dak li jirrigwarda l-argument tas-soċjetà appellanta dwar l-*Standard Operational Conditions 2.7.1* u *2.7.2*, huwa jibda billi jiċċita l-istess u anki dak li qal l-Arbitru fir-rigward, filwaqt li jissottometti li s-soċjetà appellanta ma kinitx ħielsa milli tosserva l-obbligi tagħha fuq livell individwali, għaliex l-iskema kienet tirrifletti l-investimenti u l-portafolli individwali. Dwar l-argument tas-soċjetà appellanta li l-Arbitru kien applika u ddecieda ħażin fir-rigward tal-linji gwida magħmulin minnha stess, jirrileva li huwa diffiċli għas-soċjetà appellanta li targumenta li dawn ma kellhomx japplikaw b'mod rigoruż u li hija setgħet tagħżel li ma ssegwihomx. Filwaqt li jagħmel riferiment għal dak li kienu jipprovdu dwar il-massimu ta' assi li setgħu jinżammu b'likwidità ta' iktar minn 6 xhur jew inqas, jirrileva li mill-proċeduri quddiem l-Arbitru kien irriżulta li l-investimenti f'noti strutturati kellhom tipikament maturità jew terminu ta' investiment ta' madwar sena jew sentejn, jew saħansitra ta' ħames snin. Jirrileva li kif gie osservat mill-Arbitru, kien hemm ukoll f'ċerti każijiet l-possibilità ta' suq sekondarju għal dawn in-noti strutturati, iżda dan ma setax jipprovdi livell ta' kumdità adegwata dwar il-likwidità. Ikompli fuq il-kwistjoni li l-prodotti strutturati kienu mmirati lejn investituri professjonali, u jiċċita dak li qal l-Arbitru dwar l-investigazzjoni li saret għall-verifika ta' dan il-punt u l-konkluzjoni tiegħu. Jissottometti dwar l-ilment tas-soċjetà appellanta fir-rigward tal-investigazzjoni li kien wettaq l-Arbitru, li dan kellu kull dritt li jagħmel riċerka li qies bżonnjuża, u hawn huwa jagħmel

riferiment għall-artikolu 25 tal-Kap. 555. Għal dak li jirrigwarda d-deċiżjoni tal-Arbitru li s-soċjetà appellanta ma kinitx toffri informazzjoni adegwata lill-membri tal-Iskema, jgħid li l-Arbitru tajjeb osserva li ma kien hemm l-ebda raġuni għaliex is-soċjetà appellanta naqset li tagħmel dan. Jgħid li l-argument tas-soċjetà appellanta li hija ma kellha l-ebda obbligu speċifiku għaliex id-Direttivi jtkellmu dwar l-Iskema, ma jregix għaliex hija ma setgħetx tinjora l-obbligi tagħha fir-rigward tal-Iskema b'mod ġenerali, u l-obbligi ta' *bonus paterfamilias* kienu jservu sabiex jirregolaw sitwazzjonijiet fejn forsi ma kienux regolati permezz ta' provvedimenti partikolari tal-liġi.

11. Il-Qorti mill-ewwel tgħid li d-deċiżjoni tal-Arbitru hija waħda tajba. Huwa jibda bis-solita dikjarazzjoni li m'hemm l-ebda dubju jew kontestazzjoni dwarha, jgħid li huwa kien ser jiddeċiedi l-ilment skont dak li fil-fehma tiegħu kien ġust, ekwu u raġonevoli fic-cirkostanzi partikolari, u meħudin in konsiderazzjoni l-merti sostantivi tal-każ. Imbagħad, wara li huwa għamel diversi konstatazzjonijiet fir-rigward tal-informazzjoni limitata li huwa seta' jieħu dwar l-appellat minn diversi dokumenti eseblti fl-atti³, innota li ma kienx ġie ndikat jew ippruvat li l-appellat huwa investitur professjonali, u mbagħad għadda sabiex għamel l-osservazzjonijiet tiegħu fir-rigward tas-soċjetà appellanta. Il-Qorti ssib li dawn huma kollha korretti u anki f'lokhom, u tinnota li m'hemm l-ebda kontestazzjoni dwarhom.

12. Wara li spjega l-qafas legali li kien jirregola l-Iskema u anki lis-soċjetà appellanta, l-Arbitru rrileva li tali Skema kienet tikkonsisti f'*trust* b'domicilju

³ Ara a fol. 46 et seq..

hawn Malta u kif awtorizzata mill-MFSA bħala *Retirement Scheme* f'April 2011 taħt I-Att li Jirregola Fondi Speċjali (Kap. 450 tal-Liġijiet ta' Malta kif imħassar) u f'Jannar 2016 taħt I-Att dwar Pensjonijiet għall-Irtirar (Kap. 514 tal-Liġijiet ta' Malta). Osserva li l-appellat qabel ma sar membru tal-Iskema kien diġà investa fl-*Spanish Portfolio Bond* maħruġ minn SEB Life International u li kien ġie assenjata lis-soċjetà appellata bħala *trustee* tal-Iskema hekk kif l-appellat sar membru tagħha fit-12 ta' Settembru, 2014.⁴ Qal li fil-mument tal-assenjazzjoni tal-polza kien hemm ċerti investimenti sottoskritti li kienu saru qabel ma l-appellat kien sar membru tal-Iskema u li s-soċjetà appellanta għażlet li żzomm. Spjega li l-polza in kwistjoni fit-30 ta' Settembru, 2014 kellha investment wieħed li kien il-RBC Diversified Blue Chip Income Notes Series 1 [minn issa 'l quddiem 'RBC Investment'] li kellu valur ta' GBP70,391.38, jew 74.42% tal-valur tal-polza msemmija. L-istima kienet tindika wkoll investment fi flus kontanti ta' GBP 24,198.42 jew 25.58% tal-polza, u transazzjonijiet pendenti f'żewġ noti strutturati Leonteq.⁵ Sussegwenti għall-assenjazzjoni tal-polza lis-soċjetà appellanta fit-12 ta' Settembru, 2014, kienu saru investimenti oħra fil-RBC Investment, li kif l-Arbitru spjega, ġew elenkati fl-elenku pprovdut mis-soċjetà appellanta stess.⁶ Spjega li filwaqt li s-soċjetà appellanta kienet indikat li l-valur tal-Iskema kien ta' GBP8,836 fis-27 ta' April, 2018 b'telf soffert ta' GBP8,836, mingħajr ma jittieħdu in konsiderazzjoni d-drittijiet imħallsa, ġustament iddikjara li għalhekk it-telf fil-fatt kien akbar, meħudin in konsiderazzjoni d-drittijiet imħallsa. Osserva wkoll li s-soċjetà appellanta ma spjegatx jekk it-telf kienx dak attwalment soffert.

⁴ Ara fol. 62.

⁵ Ara fol. 63-64.

⁶ A fol. 196.

13. L-Arbitru kkonsidra li CWM kienet il-konsulent finanzjarju kif maħtura mill-appellat sabiex tagħtih parir dwar l-assi miżmuma fl-Iskema. Irrileva li s-soċjetà appellanta fl-avviż li bagħtet lill-appellat f'Ottubru 2017, kienet iddeskriviet lil CWM bħala *'an authorised representative/agent of Trafalgar International GMBH'*⁷, u dan filwaqt li għamel ukoll riferiment għar-risposta tal-imsemmija soċjetà appellanta u għas-sottomissjonijiet tagħha fejn terġa' tirrileva dan il-fatt. Irrileva wkoll li s-soċjetà appellanta kienet issottomettiet li CWM kienet aġent ta' Trafalgar u kienet qegħda topera taħt il-liċenzji ta' din tal-aħħar, li kienet liċenzjata u regolata permezz ta' Deutsche Industrie Handelskammer (IHK) ġewwa l-Ġermanja.

14. Filwaqt li l-Arbitru osserva li l-investimenti magħmulin taħt il-polza ta' assikurazzjoni tal-ħajja tal-appellat kienu indikati fl-elenku tat-transazzjonijiet esebit mis-soċjetà appellanta stess, qal li mill-istess elenku kien jirrizulta li l-investimenti f'noti strutturati kienu sostanzjali u saħansitra kien hemm żmien fejn il-portafoll kien magħmul biss jew l-aktar mill-imsemmija noti strutturati matul iż-żmien li CWM kienet il-konsulent finanzjarju. Għalhekk skont l-istess elenku kien jirrizulta wkoll li minn Settembru 2014 sa Diċembru 2015 kienu nixtra 6 noti strutturati u fond wieħed kif indikat taħt il-kap 'Asset Type' u ta wkoll aktar dettalji dwarhom. Osserva li l-investimenti saru l-aktar fin-noti strutturati Leonteq/EFG.

15. L-Arbitru mbaġħad għadda sabiex ikkonsidra li s-soċjetà appellanta bħala Amministratriċi u *Trustee* tal-Iskema kienet soġġetta għall-obbligi, funzjonijiet u responsabbiltajiet applikabbli, kemm dawk legali u anki dawk li kienu stipulati

⁷ A fol. 130.

fiċ-Ċertifikat ta' Registrazzjoni tagħha kif maħruġ mill-MFSA fit-28 ta' April, 2011, li jagħmel riferiment għall-*Standard Operational Conditions* [minn issa 'l quddiem "SOC"] tad-*Directives for Occupational Retirement Schemes, Retirement Funds and Related Parties under the Special Funds (Regulation) Act, 2002* [minn issa 'l quddiem 'id-Direttivi']. Huwa hawn għamel riferiment għall-Att li Jirregola Fondi Speċjali li ġie sostitwit permezz tal-Att dwar Pensjonijiet għall-Irtirar u għar-regoli magħmula taħthom, li għalihom ġiet soġġetta s-soċjetà appellanta mal-ħruġ taċ-Ċertifikat ta' Registrazzjoni tal-1 ta' Jannar, 2016 taħt il-Kap. 514. Sostna li wieħed mill-obbligi ewlenija tas-soċjetà appellanta bħala Amministratur tal-Iskema skont il-Kap. 450 u l-Kap. 514, kien proprju li taġixxi fl-aħjar interessi tal-Iskema.

16. Il-Qorti hawn iżżid tgħid li m'hemmx dubju li s-soċjetà appellanta kellha obbligi daqstant ċari hawn li timxi fl-aħjar interess tal-Iskema, kemm fiż-żmien fejn saret l-assenjazzjoni tal-polza lis-soċjetà appellanta fis-sena 2014 meta kienu applikabbli d-dispożizzjonijiet tal-Kap. 450, u anki sussegwentement meta ġie fis-seħħ l-Att dwar Pensjonijiet għall-Irtirar fis-sena 2015 u l-appellat kien għadu membru tal-Iskema u garrab it-telf allegat.

17. Minn hawn l-Arbitru għadda sabiex elenka diversi prinċipji li kienu applikabbli fil-konfront tas-soċjetà appellanta skont il-*General Conduct of Business Rules/Standard Licence Conditions* applikabbli taħt ir-regim tal-Kap. 450 kif imħassar, u tal-Kap. 514 li ssostitwih. Għal darb'oħra l-Qorti tirrileva li jirriżulta li s-soċjetà appellanta bħala Amministratur tal-Iskema kienet tenuta li timxi b'kull ħila dovuta, kura u diliġenza fl-aħjar interessi tal-benefiċċjarji tal-Iskema. L-obbligi legali tagħha jirriżultaw ċari u inekwivoċi, tant li l-Qorti tirrileva

li anki minn dak li ngħad, jirrizulta li d-difiza tagħha li hija qatt ma setgħet tinzamm responsabbli peress li ma kellha l-ebda obbligu fil-konfront tal-appellat, ma tistax tirnexxi.

18. Iżda l-Arbitru ma waqafx hawn għaliex ikkonsidra wkoll il-kariga tagħha bħala *Trustee*, u rrileva li hawn kienu applikabbli l-provvedimenti tal-Att dwar *Trusts* u *Trustees* (Kap. 331), li l-Qorti tirrileva li kien gie fis-seħħ fit-30 ta' Ġunju, 1989 kif sussegwentement emendat, u l-Arbitru għamel riferiment partikolari għas-subartikolu 21(1), u l-para. (a) tas-subartikolu 21(2). Hawn il-Qorti tgħid li għal darb'oħra d-difiza tas-soċjetà appellanta ma ssib l-ebda sostenn. L-Arbitru rrileva li fil-kariga tagħha ta' *Trustee*, is-soċjetà appellanta kienet tenuta tamministra l-Iskema u l-assi tagħha skont diligenza u responsabbiltà għolja. In sostenn ta' dan kollu, huwa ċċita l-pubblikazzjoni An Introduction to Maltese Financial Services Law⁸, u anki silta mill-pubblikazzjoni riċenti tal-MFSA tas-sena 2017 fejn din ittrattat prinċipji diġà stabbiliti qabel dik id-data permezz tal-Att dwar *Trusts* u *Trustees* u anki permezz tal-Kodiċi Ċivili.

19. L-Arbitru mbagħad aċċenna fuq obbligu ieħor tas-soċjetà appellanta li huwa qies importanti u rilevanti għall-każ in kwistjoni, dak ta' sorveljanza u monitoraġġ tal-Iskema, inkluż l-investimenti magħmula. Huwa għamel riferiment għall-affidavit ta' Stewart Davies⁹, fejn dan aċċetta li s-soċjetà appellanta fl-aħħar mill-aħħar kellha s-setgħa li tiddeċiedi jekk l-investment għandux isir, u li meta kkonsidrat il-portafoll sħiħ, tali nvestment kien jassigura livell adegwat ta' diversifikazzjoni u kien jirrifletti l-attitudni ta' riskju tal-

⁸ Ed. Max Ganado.

⁹ A fol. 118 para. 17, fol. 121 para. 31 u fol. 122 para. 33.

membru u l-linji gwidi ta' dak iż-żmien. Dan kollu kif imfisser, tgħid il-Qorti, jagħmel ċar li s-socjetà appellanta kienet taf sew x'inhuma l-obbligi tagħha lejn il-membri tal-Iskema u li dawn kienu saħansitra obbligi pożittivi fejn hija kienet tenuta tħares il-portafoll tal-membru individwali tal-Iskema u taġixxi skont il-każ. L-Arbitru osserva li x-xhieda ta' Stewart Davies kienet saħansitra riflessa fil-Formola tal-Applikazzjoni għal Sħubija ffirmata mill-appellat.¹⁰ Qal li anki l-MFSA kienet tqis il-funzjoni ta' sorveljanza bħala obbligu importanti tal-Amministratur tal-Iskema, u huwa ċcita siltiet mill-*Consultation Document* tagħha maħruġ fis-16 ta' Novembru, 2018, filwaqt li nsista li l-istqarrijiet hemm magħmula kienu applikabbli wkoll għaž-żmien li fih sar l-investment in kwistjoni. Għamel ukoll riferiment għall-*Investment Guidelines* magħmulin mis-socjetà appellanta fis-sena 2013, u għal darb'oħra għal dak li kien jipprovdi l-para. 3.1 tas-sezzjoni ntestata '*Terms and Conditions*' fil-Formola tal-Applikazzjoni għal Sħubija.

20. L-Arbitru mbagħad għadda sabiex ikkonsidra proprju ż-żewġ punti li fuqhom huwa msejjes l-ewwel aggravju tas-socjetà appellanta. Huwa aċċetta li kien inekwivoku li s-socjetà appellanta ma kinitx ipprovdiet parir dwar l-investimenti sottoskritti, u li dan kien l-obbligu ta' terzi bħal CWM. L-Arbitru ddikjara li kien tal-fehma, kif inhi din il-Qorti, li s-socjetà appellanta bħala Amministratur ta' Skema għall-Irtirar u t-*Trustee*, kellha ċerti obbligi importanti li setgħu jkollhom rilevanza sostanzjali fuq l-operat u l-attivitajiet tal-Iskema, u li jaffettwaw direttament jew indirettament l-andament tagħha. Kien għalhekk li kellu jiġi nvestigat jekk is-socjetà appellanta naqsitx mill-obbligi relattivi

¹⁰ A fol. 54.

tagħha, u jekk fl-affermattiv allura safejn dan kellu effett fuq l-andament tal-Iskema u r-rizultanti telf tal-appellat.

21. L-Arbitru osserva li l-appellat kien huwa stess għażel li jaħtar lil CWM sabiex din tipprovdih b'pariri dwar l-investimenti formanti parti mill-portafoll tiegħu fl-Iskema, u min-naħa tagħha s-socjetà appellanta aċċettat u/jew ħalliet il-konsulent joffri l-parir tiegħu lill-appellat. Osserva li s-socjetà appellanta kellha saħansitra *introducer agreement* ma' CWM. L-ewwel punt li rrileva hawn huwa li s-socjetà appellanta ppermettiet li l-Formola ta' Applikazzjoni għal Sħubija tkun tinkludi informazzjoni mhux sħiħa u preċiża fir-rigward tal-konsulent finanzjarju, u spjega dawn x'kienu. Jirrileva li fir-rwol tagħha ta' *trustee* u *bonus paterfamilias*, hija kienet tenuta tiġbed l-attenzjoni tal-appellat għal dawn in-nuqqasijiet, u qal li fl-aħħar mill-aħħar hija kellha l-prerogattiva li taċċetta jew le l-applikazzjoni, lill-konsulent finanzjarju u anki l-persuna ma' min kienet ser tinnegozja. Osserva li l-ebda prova ma tressqet li kienet turi li CWM kienet fil-fatt regolata. It-tieni punt li qajjem l-Arbitru jirrigwarda n-nuqqas ta' kjarizza fil-Formola ta' Sħubija fir-rigward tal-kwalità li biha kienet qegħda taġixxi CWM. Imbagħad it-tielet punt tiegħu jirrigwarda l-kwistjoni li ma kienx hemm distinzjoni ċara bejn CWM, Inter-Alliance u Trafalgar, u ma kienx jirrizulta b'mod inekwivoku jekk CWM kinitx qegħda taġixxi bħala agent in rappreżentanza ta' ditta oħra, meta dan kellu jkun rifless b'mod ċar fid-dokumentazzjoni kollha. Fir-raba' punt tiegħu, l-Arbitru stqarr li ma rrizultat l-ebda evidenza li kienet turi jekk CWM kienet entità regolata. Hawn huwa għamel riferiment għal żewġ deċiżjonijiet oħra tiegħu, fejn huwa kien ikkonstata korrispondenza li kienet turi li kienu saru ċertu mistoqsijiet dwar CWM minn

IHK, fejn saħansitra kien jirrizulta li CWM ma kinitx qegħda topera taħt il-liċenzji maħruġa lil Trafalgar. Izda qal li min-naħa tagħha s-soċjetà appellanta ma pproduċiet l-ebda evidenza dwar dak allegat minnha fir-rigward tal-awtorizzazzjoni ta' CWM.

22. Fir-rigward tal-argument miġjub mis-soċjetà appellanta li bejn 2013 u 2015 taħt il-qafas regolatorju tal-Kap. 450 u sakemm ġew implimentati l-*Pension Rules for Personal Retirement Schemes* taħt il-Kap. 514, hija ma kellha l-ebda obbligu li teżiġi l-ħatra ta' konsulent regolat, l-Arbitru sostna li xorta waħda kien mistenni li l-Amministratur u t-*Trustee* jeżegwixxu l-obbligu tagħhom ta' kura u diligenza professjonali bħal *bonus paterfamilias*. L-Arbitru hawn sostna li l-ħatra ta' entità li ma kinitx regolata sabiex isservi ta' konsulent, kienet tfisser li l-appellata kienet tgawdi minn inqas protezzjoni u s-soċjetà appellanta kienet tenuta tkun mgħarfa b'dan il-fatt u li tassigura li l-appellat ikollu l-informazzjoni korretta u adegwata dwar il-konsulent. Qal li mhux biss is-soċjetà appellanta naqset milli tindirizza l-kwistjoni li l-konsulent ma kienx regolat, iżda wkoll hija bl-ebda mod ma qajmet dubju dwar informazzjoni importanti fir-rigward ta' diversi aspetti oħra konċernanti CWM. L-Arbitru rrileva li l-ftehim eżistenti bejn is-soċjetà appellanta u CWM, li diġà sar riferiment għalih aktar 'il fuq f'din is-sentenza, qajjem kunflitt ta' interess potenzjali, fejn l-entità li kienet soġġetta għal sorveljanza partikolari mis-soċjetà appellanta, fl-istess ħin kienet qegħda tgħaddilha n-negozju. Il-Qorti ma tistax ma tikkondividiex din il-fehma, u tikkonsidra minn dak kollu li s'issa ġie rilevat u kkonsidrat, li ċertament il-kariga tas-soċjetà appellanta ma setgħetx tkun dik ta'

amministrazzjoni sempliċi u bażika meħud kont li hija saħansitra kienet ukoll *trustee* tal-Iskema.

23. L-Arbitru għalhekk sewwa qal li s-soċjetà appellanta kellha turi iktar kawtela u prudenza, aktar u aktar meta l-għażla u l-allokazzjoni tal-investimenti sottoskritti, kien ser ikollhom effett fuq l-andament tal-Iskema nnifisha u l-objettiv tagħha li tipprovdi għal benefiċċji għall-irtirar. Il-Qorti hawn tikkondividi wkoll il-ħsieb tal-Arbitru, li l-amministratur tal-iskema u t-*trustee* tagħha kien mistenni li jfittex iktar u jinvestiga dwar l-azzjonijiet ta' dik l-entità mhux regolata sabiex b'hekk jitharsu l-interessi tal-membri l-oħra tal-iskema u r-riskji jitnaqqsu.

24. Dwar it-tieni punt sollevat mis-soċjetà appellanta fl-ewwel aggravju tagħha, l-Arbitru osserva li l-investimenti li kienu sottoskritti bil-polza ta' assikurazzjoni taħt l-Iskema, kienu magħmula l-aktar jew biss f'noti strutturati. Irrileva li fil-*fact sheets* ipprezentati mill-appellat fir-rigward tan-noti strutturati in kwistjoni, kien hemm indikati diversi riskji fir-rigward tal-kapital investit f'dawn il-prodotti.

25. L-Arbitru mbagħad għadda sabiex irrileva x'kienu dawk ir-riskji li sar aċċenn għalihom fil-*fact sheets*, fost oħrajn ir-riskju tal-kreditu ta' min kien qed joħroġhom u anki r-riskju tal-likwidità, u twissijiet li n-noti ma kellhomx il-kapital protett. Dan kollu, tgħid il-Qorti, kien ferm indikattiv tal-fatt li l-investment fin-noti strutturati ma kienx wieħed kompatibbli mal-informazzjoni dwar l-appellat. L-Arbitru qal li kien hemm aspett partikolari li ħareġ minn dawn in-noti, fejn kien hemm twissija f'kull waħda mill-*fact sheets* dwar l-eventwalità ta' tnaqqis fil-

valur tal-kapital kif marbut ma' percentwali. Għalhekk, qal l-Arbitru, kien hemm konsegwenzi materjali jekk il-valur ta' wieħed biss mill-assi kollha tan-noti strutturati kien jinżel mill-minimu indikat. Hawn l-Arbitru jagħmel riferiment għal komunikazzjoni partikolari li kienet giet ipprezentata f'każ separat nru. 185/2018, li kien sar kontra s-soċjetà appellanta, u li kienet rilevanti għall-każ odjern. Irrileva li d-dikjarazzjonijiet magħmulin f'*email* tagħha tas-17 ta' Settembru, 2017 li Trafalgar kienet bagħtet lil CWM izda wkoll ikkuppjata lis-soċjetà appellanta, ma kienux ġew ikkontestati minn din tal-aħħar. Fosthom kien hemm miktub mill-istess Trafalgar li "*Structured Notes – It is my opinion we need to get as far away from these vehicles as possible. They have no place in an uneducated investor's portfolio and when they breach their barriers untold amounts of damage is done*". Il-Qorti tgħid li ċertament hija ma tistax twarrab legġerment prova daqstant ċara kontra l-investment f'noti strutturati.

26. Imbagħad l-Arbitru osserva wkoll li l-portafoll tal-appellant kien ġie espost b'mod eċċessiv għal prodotti strutturati, u dan għal żmien twil u kif kien jirrizulta mit-*Table of Investments* li kienet tagħmel parti mill-*Investor Profile* li esebiet is-soċjetà appellanta. Osserva wkoll li kien hemm espożizzjoni għolja għar-riskju għaliex kienu nxitraw prodotti permezz ta' transazzjoni waħedha jew permezz ta' diversi transazzjonijiet mingħand emittent wieħed, meta fil-fehma tiegħu kellhom jiġu applikati l-limiti massimi kif imfissra fir-regoli tal-MFSA u tal-*Investment Guidelines* tas-soċjetà appellanta stess.

27. Hawn l-Arbitru kuntrarjament għal dak li qegħda tallega s-soċjetà appellata, ikkonsidra l-fatt li kien hemm investimenti li saru taħt *trustee* preċedenti. Għaraf sewwa li meta kienet saret l-assenjazzjoni tal-polza lis-

soċjetà appellanta bħala *trustee* tal-Iskema, l-imsemmija polza digà kienet esposta sostanzjalment għal investiment ewlieni li kien il-RBC Investment li kien jagħmel aktar minn 70% mill-valur ta' dik il-polza f'dak iż-żmien. Tajjeb osserva li min-naħa tagħha s-soċjetà appellanta kienet aċċettat u ppermettiet dan l-investment fl-istruttura tal-Iskema. Għalhekk, u l-Qorti tikkondividi pjenament il-ħsieb tiegħu, din ma setgħetx taħsel idejha bl-iskuża li tali investiment kien sar qabel l-appellant kien daħal membru fl-Iskema. B'hekk l-Arbitru sewwa ddecieda li hija kellha terfa' responsabbiltà tal-investment mid-data li fiha l-polza giet trasferita lilha. L-Arbitru osserva li ma kienx gie ndikat jew saħansitra ppruvat li s-soċjetà appellanta kienet espremiet xi rizerva jew ipprezentat xi twissija lill-appellat dwar il-RBC Investment. Lanqas qal ma kien gie ndikat li l-bejgħ bikri ta' dan l-investment ma kienx possibbli u/jew li l-fidi bikri tiegħu ma kienx fl-aħjar interess tal-appellat. Irrileva wkoll li kuntrarjament għal dak li donna kienet qegħda tgħid is-soċjetà appellanta, l-appellat ma kienx sofra telf fuq dan l-investment biss, iżda esperjenza wkoll telf fuq investimenti oħra fil-portafoll.

28. L-Arbitru mbagħad għadda sabiex indirizza l-insistenza tas-soċjetà appellanta li l-*Investment Guidelines* tagħha kienu ntizi bħala sempliċi gwida, u li ma kellhomx jiġu applikati b'mod strett u b'hekk l-għan tagħhom jintilef. Isostni li fl-ewwel lok kien kontradittorju li jingħad li kien fl-aħjar interessi tal-membri li l-linji gwidi ma jiġux segwiti, u dan filwaqt li fit-tieni lok is-soċjetà appellanta ma wrietx f'liema ċirkostanzi dan kellu jkun il-każ. Għalhekk l-*Investment Guidelines* qal li kienu jorbtuha u konsegwentement kellhom jiġu segwiti, iżda jekk wieħed kellu jaċċetta l-argument tas-soċjetà appellanta li

dawn kienu biss linji gwida u mhux regoli stretti, ma kienx mistenni li wieħed imur wisq lil hinn mil-limiti u l-massimi ta' espożizzjoni hemm imniżżla.

29. L-Arbitru minn hawn għadda sabiex iddikjara li l-espożizzjoni qawwiya għal prodotti strutturati u għal emittent singolari li tħalliet issir mis-soċjetà appellanta, ma kinitx tirrispetta r-rekwiżiti regolatorji applikabbli għall-Iskema dak iż-żmien, u huwa jagħmel riferiment partikolari għal SOC 2.7.1 u 2.7.2, li kienu applikabbli sa mill-bidunett meta nħolqot l-Iskema fis-sena 2011 sad-data li din giet registrata fl-1 ta' Jannar, 2016 taħt il-Kap. 514. Qal li s-soċjetà appellanta stess kienet għamlet aċċenn dwar l-applikabbiltà u r-rilevanza ta' dawn il-kundizzjonijiet għall-każ odjern. L-Arbitru ċċita partijiet minn dawn id-Direttivi u rrileva li minkejja li SOC 2.7.2 kien jeżiġi ċertu livell, is-soċjetà appellanta kienet ippermettiet li l-portafoll tal-appellat xi kultant ikun magħmul biss jew fil-parti l-kbira tiegħu minn prodotti strutturati. Anki l-espożizzjoni għal emittent waħdieni kien f'xi drabi viċin il-massimu ta' 30% stabbilit mir-regoli għal investimenti aktar siguri bħal depożiti. Osserva li matul il-proċeduri ma kienx gie ndikat jekk il-prodotti strutturati kienux ġew negozjati f'suq regolat, u anki r-rati għolja ta' imgħax kienu indikazzjoni tar-riskju għoli tal-prodotti. Is-soċjetà appellanta tittenta targumenta quddiem din il-Qorti li r-regoli suriferiti jolqtu biss l-Iskema, iżda mhux il-portafoll tal-membru individwali, imma l-Qorti mhijiex tal-istess fehma u għaldaqstant mhijiex qegħda tilqa' dan l-argument. Tgħid li huwa daqstant ċar mid-dicitura ta' dawn ir-regoli li l-intendiment huwa li jiġu regolati l-investimenti kollha li jaqgħu fl-iskema, u dan mingħajr distinzjoni bejn l-iskema nnifisha u l-portafoll ta' kull membru. Il-Qorti żżid tgħid li l-argument tas-soċjetà appellanta lanqas jista' jitqies li huwa wieħed loġiku,

meħud in konsiderazzjoni l-fatt li jekk ifalli portafoll ta' membru, dan jista' ċertament ikollu effett fuq il-kumplament tal-iskema.

30. L-Arbitru mbagħad jaqbad, imma din id-darba b'mod aktar fil-fond, il-kwistjoni li l-portafoll saħansitra ma kienx jirrifletti l-*Investment Guidelines* tas-soċjetà appellanta. Filwaqt li ħa konjizzjoni tal-imsemmija linji gwida għas-snin 2013 sa 2018, li s-soċjetà appellanta annettiet mas-sottomissjonijiet tagħha, irrileva li hija ma kienx irnexxielha turi b'mod adegwat li dawn kienu ġew applikati fir-rigward tal-investimenti in kwistjoni. Qal li l-portafoll tal-appellat kien f'xi waqtiet kompost l-aktar jew saħansitra biss min-noti strutturati għal perijodu twil ta' żmien.

31. Wara dawn l-osservazzjonijiet, l-Arbitru għadda sabiex ittratta żewġ istanzi fejn il-kompożizzjoni tal-portafoll ma kienx irrispetta l-linji gwida. L-ewwel rekwizit li kkonsidra huwa li l-assi kellhom jiġu investiti l-aktar fi swieq regolati. Wara li ta t-tifsira tal-frazi '*predominantly invested in regulated markets*' kif din kienet tidher fil-linji gwida, sostna li ma giet sottomessa l-ebda evidenza li kienet turi li l-portafoll kien magħmul kollu kemm hu jew l-aktar min-noti strukturati elenkati. Is-soċjetà appellanta hawn issostni li l-Arbitru ikkonsidra li l-kliem '*regulated markets*' għandhom ikollhom l-istess tifsira bħall-kliem '*listed instruments*, iżda l-Qorti ma tikkonsidrax li dan huwa minnu u dak li qegħda tittenta tagħmel is-soċjetà appellanta huwa li tilgħab bil-kliem. Huwa daqstant ċar mid-deċiżjoni appellata li l-Arbitru qies li suq regolat f'dan il-każ kien '*regulated exchange venue*' fejn il-prodott jista' jiġi negozjat u mhux l-emittent tal-imsemmi prodott.

32. L-Arbitru stqarr korrettement li ma kienx ċar kif fid-dawl tal-massimu ta' 10% tal-assi tal-Iskema impost mil-linji gwida għas-snin bejn 2013 sa 2018 fir-rigward ta' investiment f'titoli mhux elenkati, it-*Trustee* u l-Amministratur tal-Iskema ippermetta investiment b'espożizzjoni aktar għolja f'noti strutturati li kienu garanzija ta' debitu u li s-soltu ma kienux elenkati. It-tieni rekwizit li jittratta l-Arbitru huwa l-likwidità tal-portafoll. Wara li osserva li l-linji gwida ta' Jannar 2013 u għal nofs is-sena 2014 kienu jirrikjedu li mhux aktar minn 40% tal-fond jew tal-portafoll tal-membri kellu jiġi nvestit f'assi li kellhom likwidità ta' aktar minn 6 xhur, osserva wkoll li aktar tard fis-snin 2015 sa 2018 it-terminu tnaqqas għal bejn tlieta u sitt xhur. Irrileva li kien jirriżulta li n-noti strutturati fejn sar l-investiment tal-portafoll kellhom terminu twil ta' maturità ta' bejn sena, u sentejn u xi drabi oħra sa ħames snin, kif muri fil-*fact sheets* relattivi. Osserva li l-possibilità ta' suq sekondarju fir-rigward ta' noti strutturati ma kienx jiggerantixxi assikurazzjoni adegwata ta' likwidità, u aċċenna fuq il-valuri aktar baxxi li dan is-suq kien joffri, tant li l-istess valuri kellhom effett fuq l-Iskema sħiħa kif irriżulta mir-rendikonti annwali maħruġa lill-membri mis-soċjetà appellanta. Huwa hawn ukoll għamel riferiment għat-twissija fir-rigward tal-RBC Investment, u qal li twissijiet simili setgħu jinstabu f'*fact sheets* oħra.

33. L-Arbitru qal li kien hemm diversi aspetti oħra fejn il-kompożizzjoni tal-portafoll ma kinitx jirrispetta r-rekwiziti l-oħra mfissra fil-linji gwida tas-soċjetà appellanta stess, u fosthom kien hemm id-diversifikazzjoni xierqa, it-twarrib ta' espożizzjoni eċċessiva u l-espożizzjoni massima permessa għal emittenti singolari, u għadda sabiex ta diversi eżempji ta' dan. Irrileva li matul is-snin, is-soċjetà appellanta kienet saħansitra emendat il-linji gwida tagħha sabiex

naqqset l-espożizzjoni għal noti strutturati u l-emittenti tagħhom, imma osserva li dawn ma g'ewx segwiti fil-każ tal-portafoll tal-appellat, u dan mingħajr raġuni li setgħet tiġġustifika espożizzjoni tant għolja għal emittenti singolari. L-Arbitru hawn silet ir-rekwiżiti partikolari fil-linji gwida li kienet f'arġent is-soċjetà appellanta matul is-snin, bil-għan li tiġi evitata l-espożizzjoni eċċessiva tal-investimenti. Innota wkoll li kien sar investiment mill-portafoll tal-appellat f'noti strutturati, li kien jeċċedi l-massimu tal-espożizzjoni għal dawn il-prodotti.

34. Il-Qorti hawn ser tikkonsidra dak li g'ie rilevati mis-soċjetà appellanta li l-Arbitru ddeċieda li jagħmel minn jeddu investigazzjoni dwar l-investimenti billi jissorsja l-*fact sheets* tagħhom. Min-naħa tiegħu l-Arbitru fid-deċiżjoni appellata għamel osservazzjoni aħħarija li s-soċjetà appellanta saħansitra dgħajfet id-difiza tagħha meta naqqset milli tipprezenta informazzjoni dettaljata dwar l-investimenti sottoskritti. Il-Qorti ikkonstatat ukoll dan kollu, u tgħid li ċertament dan il-fatt ma għenx id-difiza tas-soċjetà appellanta, fejn saħansitra jibqa' d-dubju jekk b'dan il-mod hija f'haliet mistura dettalji jew informazzjoni li ma kienux favur id-difiza tagħha. Tqis għalhekk li l-Arbitru m'għamel xejn li ma tippermettix l-kompetenza tiegħu jekk u meta ddeċieda li jfittex għal aktar informazzjoni, u dan skont kif ċirkoskritti mill-artikolu 25 tal-Kap. 555, u mingħajr dubju sabiex jassigura li huwa kien qed jiddeċiedi l-ilment fil-parametri tal-para. (b) tas-subartikolu 19(3) tal-istess liġi. Il-Qorti tirrileva li r-risultat tat-tfittxija tiegħu tista' biss turi kemm kien korrett li ma jjeqafx fl-investigazzjoni tiegħu minħabba l-informazzjoni limitata a dispożizzjoni diretta tiegħu, li l-Qorti tqis li ma kinitx ir-risultat ta' nuqqas ta' attenzjoni, u b'hekk allura jkun qed jgħin id-difiza tas-soċjetà appellanta. Ma tqisx li min-naħa l-oħra b'hekk huwa kien qed

jgħin il-każ imressaq mill-appellat, aktar milli jaċċerta li ssir ġustizzja. Is-soċjetà appellanta tilmenta wkoll li hija qatt ma kellha l-opportunità li tiegħu konjizzjoni tal-informazzjoni meħuda mill-*fact sheets*, iżda jirriżulta minn dak li qal l-Arbitru li l-informazzjoni ma kinitx waħda diffiċli li tinkiseb permezz ta' ricerka fuq l-*internet*, u għalhekk din kienet disponibbli wkoll għall-pubbliku, inkluż is-soċjetà appellanta. B'hekk ukoll is-soċjetà appellanta kellha kull opportunità, imma fil-fatt naqset milli tagħmel, li tikkontesta dik l-informazzjoni miksuba. Iżda l-Qorti tikkonsidra li jekk hija għandha temmen li s-soċjetà appellanta qatt ma kellha din l-informazzjoni a dispożizzjoni tagħha, tassew din kienet qegħda tonqos minn kull obbligu ta' *bonus paterfamilias*.

35. Imbagħad l-Arbitru osserva wkoll li fil-fehma tiegħu s-soċjetà appellanta m'għenitx id-difiza tagħha meta naqset milli tipprovi informazzjoni dettaljata dwar l-investimenti sottoskritti. Huwa aċċenna għal darb'oħra fuq dawk l-aspetti li kellhom jiġu kkonsidrati mis-soċjetà appellanta fir-rigward tal-kompożizzjoni tal-portafoll tal-appellat, u qal li t-telf tal-kapital soffert mill-appellat kien juri n-nuqqas min-naħa tas-soċjetà appellanta li tassigura d-diversifikazzjoni u li tiġi evitata espożizzjoni eċċessiva. Kieku dan in-nuqqas ma seħħx, l-Arbitru qal li ma kienx ikun hemm it-telf li raġonevolment mhux mistenni f'prodott li kellu l-iskop li jipprovi għal benefiċċji ta' irtirar.

36. L-Arbitru mbagħad ikkunsidra kwistjoni oħra li qajjem l-appellat, dik ta' nuqqas ta' rappurtagġ u notifika dwar it-transazzjonijiet. Filwaqt li ha konjizzjoni tal-fatt imressaq mis-soċjetà appellanta, li hija kienet tibgħat rendikonti annwali lill-membri tal-iskema, osserva li dawn kienu ġeneriċi fin-natura tagħhom, fejn kien hemm biss indikat il-polza tal-ħajja mingħajr dettalji fir-rigward tal-

investimenti sottoskritti li kienu jikkonsistu fin-noti strutturati. Għaldaqstant sewwa kkonsidra l-Arbitru li din l-informazzjoni mibgħuta lill-appellat bħala membru tal-Iskema ma kinitx biżżejjed u suffiċjenti. Huwa hawn jagħmel riferiment għal SOC 9.3(e) tal-Parti B.9 tal-*Pension Rules for Personal Retirement Schemes*, li kienu applikabbli fir-rigward tas-soċjetà appellanta mill-1 ta' Jannar, 2016, b'dana li rrileva li l-Parti B.9 saret biss applikabbli fis-sena 2018. Iżda l-Arbitru qal, u hawn għal darb'oħra l-Qorti tgħid li qegħda taqbel, li madankollu bħala *bonus paterfamilias*, li kellu jimxi fl-aħjar interessi tal-membri tal-Iskema, is-soċjetà appellanta kellha l-obbligu li tagħti rappurtaġġ sħiħ lill-membri dwar it-transazzjonijiet tal-investimenti sottoskritti. Is-soċjetà appellanta tikkontendi għal darb'oħra li hawn hija ma kellha l-ebda obbligu speċifiku, u l-Arbitru ddecieda ħażin meta silet l-obbligu mill-prinċipju ġenerali li hija kienet tenuta timxi skont id-doveri tagħha ta' *bonus paterfamilias*. Imma l-Qorti hawn ukoll mhijiex qegħda taċċetta l-argument tas-soċjetà appellanta, u dan mhux biss fid-dawl tal-obbligi tagħha ta' *bonus paterfamilias*, li kif diġa ngħad ma jistgħu qatt jitwarrbu fl-assenza ta' obbligi speċifiċi, iżda anki għal raġuni oħra li ta l-Arbitru. Huwa qal li s-soċjetà appellanta kienet diġà qabel ma ġie fis-seħħ il-Kap. 514 soġġetta għad-disposizzjonijiet tar-regolamenti li kienu saru taħt il-Kap. 450, u hawn huwa jiċċita SOC 2.6.2 u 2.6.3 tal-Parti B.2 tad-Direttivi. L-Arbitru ddikjara li ma kienet tirrizulta l-ebda raġuni għalfejn is-soċjetà appellanta ma kinitx għaddiet informazzjoni importanti, u ċertament tgħid il-Qorti li hawn is-soċjetà appellanta wriet nuqqas kbir min-naħa tagħha li għabet l-inkarigu tagħha fix-xejn, għal dak ta' sempliċi amministrazzjoni tal-Iskema.

37. L-Arbitru għadda sabiex jittratta l-kwistjoni tan-ness kawżali tad-danni sofferti mill-appellat. Beda billi osserva li t-telf soffert ma setax jingħad li seħħ minħabba l-andament negattiv tal-investimenti riżultat tas-suq u tar-riskji inerenti u/jew tal-allegat frodi tal-konsulent finanzjarju, kif allegat mis-soċjetà appellanta. Qal li kien hemm evidenza biżżejjed u konvinċenti ta' nuqqasijiet da parti tas-soċjetà appellanta fit-twettiq tal-obbligazzjonijiet u d-doveri tagħha kemm bħala *Trustee* u anki bħala Amministratur tal-Iskema tal-Irtirar, li kienu juru nuqqas ta' diligenza. Qal li l-istess nuqqasijiet saħansitra ma ħallew l-ebda mod li bih seta' jiġi minimizzat it-telf u fil-fatt ikkontribwew għall-istess telf, u b'hekk l-Iskema ma kinitx laħqet l-għan prinċipali tagħha. Fil-fehma tal-Arbitru, it-telf kien ġie kkawżat mill-azzjonijiet tal-partijiet prinċipali nvoluti fl-Iskema u min-nuqqas tagħhom, fosthom tas-soċjetà appellanta. Qal li seħħew diversi avvenimenti li din tal-aħħar kienet obbligata u setgħet saħansitra twaqqaf u tinforma lill-appellat dwarhom. Il-Qorti tikkondividi l-fehma sħiħa tal-Arbitru. Jirriżulta b'mod ċar li kienu proprju n-nuqqasijiet tas-soċjetà appellanta, kif ikkonsidrati aktar 'il fuq f'din is-sentenza, li waslu għat-telf soffert mill-appellat. Is-soċjetà appellanta ttentat teħles mir-responsabbiltà tan-nuqqasijiet tagħha, billi tirrileva li ma kinitx hi, imma l-konsulent finanzjarju tal-appellat li kien mexxih lejn l-investimenti li eventwalment fallew mhux biss b'mod reali, iżda kienu fallew wkoll l-aspettattivi tiegħu. Dan filwaqt li s-soċjetà appellanta tgħid ukoll li hija bl-ebda mod ma kienet tenuta taċċerta l-identità tal-imsemmi konsulent finanzjarju, u fl-istess ħin tħares dak kollu li kien qed isir, inkluż il-kompattibilità tal-istruzzjonijiet mal-profil tal-appellat u anki l-andament tal-investimenti, u żzomm linja ta' komunikazzjoni miftuħa mal-appellat. Imma kif ġie kkonsidrat minn din il-Qorti, id-difiża tas-soċjetà appellanta ma tistax

tirnexxi fid-dawl tal-obbligi legali u regulatorji tagħha, u huwa proprju għalhekk li n-nuqqasijiet tagħha għandhom jitqiesu li kkontribwew lejn it-telf soffert mill-appellat mill-investimenti tiegħu.

38. Fir-rimarki finali tiegħu, l-Arbitru jagħmel riassunt ta' dak kollu li huwa kien ikkonstata u kkonsidra kif imfisser hawn fuq. Il-Qorti tqis li għandha tirrileva s-segwenti punti prinċipali minn dan ir-riassunt, li huma deċiżivi fil-kwistjoni odjerna, jiġifieri li s-soċjetà appellanta:

- (i) għalkemm ma kinitx responsabbli sabiex tagħti parir finanzjarju lill-appellat u lanqas kellha r-rwol ta' amministratur tal-investimenti, hija kienet tenuta tassigura li l-kompożizzjoni tal-portafoll tal-appellat kien jipprova għal diversifikazzjoni adegwata u li kien iħares ir-rekwiziti applikabbli sabiex b'hekk ukoll jintlehaq l-għan prinċipali tal-Iskema permezz tal-prudenza;
- (ii) kienet tenuta tikkonsidra l-prodotti in kwistjoni u mill-ewwel u ta' mill-inqas turi t-tħassib tagħha dwar ċerti investimenti f'noti strutturati formanti parti mill-portafoll tal-appellata, u ma kellhiex tħalli li jsiru investimenti riskjużi għaliex dawn kienu kontra l-oġġettivi tal-Iskema tal-Irtirar u fost affarijiet oħra ma kienux fl-aħjar interess tal-appellat; u
- (iii) kien straħ fuqha l-appellat, u anki terzi nvoluti fl-istruttura tal-Iskema, sabiex jintlehaq l-għan tagħhom li jirċievi benefiċċji tal-irtirar filwaqt li tiġi assicurata l-pensjoni.

39. Għalhekk l-Arbitru esprima l-fehma, liema fehma din il-Qorti tikkondividi pjenament, li filwaqt li kien mifhum li t-telf dejjem jista' jsir fuq investimenti f'portafoll, dawn setgħu jitnaqqsu u jinżamm il-kapital originali kif investit, permezz ta' diversifikazzjoni tal-investimenti tajba, bilanċjata u prudenti. Imma fil-każ odjern kien jirrizulta pjenament li seta' jingħad li mill-inqas kien hemm nuqqas ċar ta' diligenza min-naħa tas-soċjetà appellanta fl-amministrazzjoni generali tal-Iskema u anki fl-esekuzzjoni tal-obbligi tagħha bħala *trustee*, partikolarment meta wieħed iqis l-obbligu ta' sorveljanza tal-Iskema u l-istruttura tal-portafoll fejn kellu x'jaqsam il-konsulent finanzjarju. Qal li fil-fatt is-soċjetà appellanta ma kinitx laħqet *ir-'reasonable and legitimate expectations'* tal-appellat skont il-para. (ċ) tas-subartikolu 19(3) tal-Kap. 555. Il-Qorti filwaqt li tiddikjara li hija qiegħda tagħmel tagħha l-ħsibijiet kollha tal-Arbitru, tgħid li m'għandhiex aktar x'izzid mad-deċiżjoni appellata tasew mirquma u studjata tiegħu.

40. Għaldaqstant il-Qorti ma ssibx li l-aggravji mressqa mis-soċjetà appellanta huma ġustifikati, u tiċhadhom.

Decide

Għar-raġunijiet premissi l-Qorti tiddeċiedi dwar l-appell tas-soċjetà appellanta billi tiċħdu, filwaqt li tikkonferma d-deċiżjoni appellata fl-intier tagħha.

L-ispejjeż tal-proċeduri quddiem l-Arbitru għandhom jibqgħu kif deċiżi, filwaqt li l-ispejjeż ta' dan l-appell għandhom ikunu a karigu tas-soċjetà appellanta.

Moqrija.

**Onor. Dr Lawrence Mintoff LL.D.
Imħallef**

**Rosemarie Calleja
Deputat Registratur**