



Bedell  
Group

Presentation to STEP December, 2008  
Investment Risk Management: A Trustee's  
Perspective

# What are the legal issues for trustees?

- ◆ Duties
- ◆ Powers
- ◆ The standard of care to be met
- ◆ Delegation

# What are my duties as trustee?

- ◆ To carry out the terms of the trust subject to any overriding provisions of applicable law.
- ◆ To exercise the powers only in the interests of the beneficiaries.
- ◆ To preserve the value of the trust fund?
- ◆ To diversify the investments?

# What are my powers as trustee?

- ◆ Subject to the terms of the trust a trustee shall in relation to the trust property have all the same powers as a natural person acting as the beneficial owner of such property.
- ◆ A trustee shall exercise the trustee's powers only in the interests of the beneficiaries and in accordance with the terms of the trust.
- ◆ Have any powers been reserved to the settlor or a protector?
- ◆ Have they been otherwise restricted?

# What standard of care must I meet?

- ◆ Prudent person
- ◆ English test “ordinary prudent man of business” Speight v Gaunt (1883)
- ◆ Prudent investor rule applied in US (and likely to have some influence in other jurisdictions)
- ◆ Professional trustee will be held to a higher standard of care Bartlett v Barclays Bank (1980)

# Can my powers be delegated?

Delegation (article 25 TJJ modified):

- (1) Subject to the terms of the trust, a trustee may delegate the execution or exercise of any of his or her trusts or powers.
- (3) A trustee who, in good faith and without neglect, makes such delegation or permits the continuation thereof shall not be liable for any loss arising from a delegation.

# Case study – The litigation

- ◆ The plaintiff was a Beneficiary of a trust.
- ◆ The first defendants were the Trustees (a bank owned trust company).
- ◆ The second defendant was the bank Investment Manager (who owned the trust company).

# Case study – The litigation

- ◆ The Beneficiary alleged that the bank's in-house Investment Manager acted negligently and/or in breach of contract in the way in which they managed the portfolio.
- ◆ The Beneficiary sued the Trustees for:
  - Compensation for the decline in value of the portfolio.
  - Lost opportunity of increasing the capital value of the portfolio.



## Case study – What went wrong?

- ◆ Inadequate risk profiling and failure to discuss the investment objectives with the Beneficiaries.
  - Trustees did not complete an investment questionnaire.
- ◆ The Trustee appointed their own Investment Manager as a matter of course.
  - Were alternatives considered?
- ◆ Income targets were set.
  - The portfolio was not structured to meet these requirements.
- ◆ The investments were predominantly in equities.
  - Performance fell to third / fourth quartile.

## Case study – What went wrong?

- ◆ Portfolio had a high technology stock bias prior to 2000.
  - In subsequent years materially underperformed.
- ◆ Failure to monitor the investment performance against an appropriate benchmark or peer group.
  - Portfolio was only monitored on a half-yearly basis.
- ◆ Trail fees were taken by the Trustees.
  - These were not declared to the settlor / Beneficiaries.

## Case study – What should have happened?

- ◆ The Trustees should have considered their duties regarding investments including restrictions in the trust deed and in the governing law.
- ◆ The Trustees should have considered the needs of the Beneficiaries.
- ◆ Consideration should have been given by the Trustees as to whether they would undertake the investment management or delegate it.

## Case study – What should have happened?

- ◆ After due consideration the Trustees could have decided that they would delegate the function to their own in-house Investment Manager.
- ◆ The Trustees should have taken all necessary steps to ensure that the bank was formally appointed as the Investment Manager with an appropriate mandate.
- ◆ The investment performance should have been monitored on a regular basis and periodically re-appraised in line with the changing circumstances of the trust.

## Case study – What were the warning signs?

- ◆ The Beneficiary's frequent complaints regarding performance – Highlighted lack of risk profiling and investment objectives.
- ◆ Performance – 3rd / 4th quartile – Should have been spotted if an appropriate benchmark or peer group analysis had been used. Relegation criteria?
- ◆ Infrequent monitoring of the portfolio – During the last bear market six monthly reviews would have been materially inadequate.
- ◆ No independent review of investment agreement.

## Case study – The outcome

- ◆ Trustees accepted responsibility, leading to:

Settlement out of court - **Trail fees were a factor in the settlement** as their receipt had not been declared by the Trustees.

Compensation awarded to the Beneficiaries and paid by the Trustees amounted to **25% of the value of the portfolio** at the start of the relationship.

- ◆ The bank and the Trustees lost a long term relationship due to poor investment performance and their failure to address basic investment issues.

# Summary of legal issues and solutions

## ◆ Duties

- understand them
- remove duty to preserve and enhance
- no obligation to diversify
- anti Bartlett clause

## ◆ Powers

- as wide as possible (or intentionally narrow?)
- reserve powers to settlor or protector

# Summary of legal issues and solutions

## ◆ Delegation

- do you have adequate power?
- delegate to whom?
- how do you ensure adequate ongoing monitoring?
- bank trust companies need to be able to manage their inherent conflict of interests when appointing the bank as investment manager

- ◆ **Ultimately** you can manage down the duties but there will still be an “irreducible core” of obligations.



# Trustee Risk Management



## In relation to our case study, what would have helped the Trustees?

- ◆ Understanding the requirements and the objectives of the trust in the context of the governing law.
- ◆ Meaningful and on-going dialogue with the Beneficiaries so that their requirements are assessed and understood.
- ◆ Clearly defined process for choosing an investment manager – Can you delegate to an associated company? If not, what are the procedures for choosing an alternative manager?

# In relation to our case study, what would have helped the Trustees?

- ◆ Risk profiling procedures - These should have been completed and applied.
- ◆ Benchmarks – These should have been defined in accordance with the mandate and agreed at the outset.
- ◆ Ongoing monitoring – This should have been performed on a regular basis, if necessary outsourced.
- ◆ Performance relegation criteria – This should have been defined and clear, providing guidance to the Trustees.

# Trustee Checklist

- ◆ Duties – Do you understand them?
- ◆ Settlor / Beneficiary expectations – Have you discussed them?
- ◆ Risk profiling – Do you have a company policy/procedure?
- ◆ Powers – Who is going to do what?
- ◆ Delegation – Should you employ outside expertise?

# Trustee Checklist

- ◆ Mandate – Is the understanding correct?
- ◆ Conflicts – How do you manage these?
- ◆ Trail fees – Transparency issues.
- ◆ Performance monitoring – Is it done and who by?
- ◆ Performance relegation criteria – What happens if you think you should remove and investment manager?

# Conclusion – Be careful out there!

- ◆ Understand your responsibilities.
- ◆ Understand how to discharge them.

# Otherwise.....

- ◆ You will lose clients and....
- ◆ You will get sued!

# Contact Details

**Fred Milner**



Bedell Group  
Rue de la Pélisserie 16,  
CH-1211 Geneva, Switzerland



Direct Tel: 00 41 22 312 5983  
fred.milner@bedellgroup.com  
www.bedellgroup.com

**Ray Scott**



Peritus Investment Consultancy  
Walchestrasse 23,  
CH-8006 Zurich, Switzerland



Direct Tel: 00 41 43 299 4486  
ray.scott@peritus.co.uk  
www.peritus.co.uk