

Our largest shareholder, Asseco Poland S.A., can significantly influence the outcome of matters that require shareholder approval.

Asseco Poland S.A., or Asseco, our largest shareholder, currently owns approximately 25.6% of our outstanding share capital and is furthermore party to a shareholders' agreement with our Chief Executive Officer, under which agreement Asseco has been granted an irrevocable proxy to vote 1,797,973 of our ordinary shares owned by our Chief Executive Officer. As a result, Asseco has effective voting power over an aggregate of 37.3% of our outstanding ordinary shares (which excludes shares that we have repurchased that lack voting rights and shares subject to restrictions that are voted in proportion to the votes of our other shares). Therefore, Asseco can significantly influence the outcome of those matters requiring shareholder approval, including the election of directors and approval of significant corporate transactions. This voting power may have the effect of delaying or preventing a change in control which may otherwise be favorable to our minority shareholders. In addition, potential conflicts of interest may arise in the event that we or any of our investees enters into any agreements or transactions with affiliates of Asseco. Although Israeli law imposes certain procedures (including the requirement to obtain shareholder approval, which in certain cases includes a "majority of the minority") for approval of certain related party transactions, we cannot assure you that these procedures will eliminate the possible detrimental effects of these conflicts of interest. If certain transactions are not approved in accordance with required procedures under applicable Israeli law, these transactions may be void or voidable.

If we are unable to maintain effective internal control over financial reporting in accordance with Sections 302 and 404(a) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, the reliability of our financial statements may be questioned and our share price may suffer.

We are subject to a range of requirements relating to internal controls over financial reporting. Despite our internal control measures, we may still be subject to financial reporting errors or even fraud, which may not be detected. A control system, which is increasingly based on computerized processes, no matter how well conceived and operated, can provide only reasonable, not absolute, assurance that its objectives are met. In addition, the benefit of each control must be considered relative to its cost, and the design of a control system must reflect such reasonable resource constraints. Implementation of changes or updates to our control systems, including implementation of our investees enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems at additional sites, may encounter unexpected difficulties. These inherent limitations include the realities that judgments in decision-making can be faulty and that breakdowns can occur because of simple error or mistake. Further, controls can be circumvented by individual acts, by collusion of two or more persons or by management override of the controls. Over time, a control may be inadequate because of changes in conditions or the degree of compliance with applicable policies or procedures may deteriorate. Failure to maintain effective internal control over financial reporting could result in investigation or sanctions by regulatory authorities, and could adversely affect our operating results, investor confidence in our reported financial information and the market price of our ordinary shares and ADSs.

The enactment of legislation implementing changes in taxation of international business activities, the adoption of other corporate tax reform policies, or changes in tax legislation or policies could impact our future financial position and results of operations.

There can be no assurance that our effective tax rate of 23% for the year ended December 31, 2021 will not change over time as a result of changes in corporate income tax rates or other changes in the tax laws the jurisdictions in which we operate. Any changes in tax laws could have an adverse impact on our financial results. Corporate tax reform, base-erosion efforts and tax transparency continue to be high priorities in many tax jurisdictions where we have business operations. As a result, policies regarding corporate income and other taxes in numerous jurisdictions are under heightened scrutiny and tax reform legislation is being proposed or enacted in a number of jurisdictions.

For example, there is growing pressure in many jurisdictions and from multinational organizations such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the EU to amend existing international taxation rules in order to align the tax regimes with current global business practices. Specifically, in October 2015, the OECD published its final package of measures for reform of the international tax rules as a product of its Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) initiative, which was endorsed by the G20 finance ministers. Many of the initiatives in the BEPS package required and resulted in specific amendments to the domestic tax legislation of various jurisdictions and to existing tax treaties. We continuously monitor these developments. Although many of the BEPS measures have already been implemented or are currently being implemented globally (including, in certain cases, through adoption of the OECD's "multilateral convention" (to which Israel is also a party) to effect changes to tax treaties which entered into force on July 1, 2018 and through the European Union's "Anti Tax Avoidance" Directives), it is still difficult in some cases to assess to what extent these changes our tax liabilities in the jurisdictions in which we conduct our business or to what extent they may impact the way in which we conduct our business or our effective tax rate due to the unpredictability and interdependency of these potential changes. In January 2019, the OECD announced further work in continuation of the BEPS project, focusing on two "pillars." On October 8, 2021, 136 countries approved a statement known as the OECD BEPS Inclusive Framework, which builds upon the OECD's continuation of the BEPS project. The first pillar is focused on the allocation of taxing rights between countries for in-scope large multinational enterprises (with revenue in excess of Euro 20 Billion and profitability of at least 10%) that sell goods and services into countries with little or no local physical presence. We do not expect to be within the scope of the first Pillar. The second pillar is focused on developing a global minimum tax rate of at least 15 percent applicable to in-scope multinational enterprises (with revenue in excess of Euro 750 million). Israel is one of the 136 jurisdictions that has agreed in principle to the adoption of the global minimum tax rate. Given these developments, it is generally expected that tax authorities in various jurisdictions in which we operate may increase their audit activity and may seek to challenge some of the tax positions we have adopted. It is difficult to assess if and to what extent such challenges, if raised, might impact our effective tax rate.

Further, there are proposals in the United States to introduce further amendments to the federal tax regime applicable to corporations. As of the date of filing, it remains unclear what legislation, if any, would be enacted. If the draft legislation currently being discussed is enacted, it could create the potential for added volatility in our provision for income taxes and might have an adverse impact on our future income tax provision and tax rate.

Risks Related to Operations in Israel and Other Specific Geographic Locations

Political, economic, and military conditions in Israel could negatively impact our business.

We are incorporated under the laws of, and our headquarters and principal research and development facilities are located in, the State of Israel, and approximately 62% and 63% of our consolidated revenues in 2020 and 2021, respectively, were generated from the Israeli market. As a result, political, economic and military conditions in Israel and the Middle East directly affect our operations. Since the establishment of the State of Israel, a number of armed conflicts have taken place between Israel and its Arab neighbors. Although the recent Abraham Accords have enhanced Israel's relations with certain countries in the Middle East, an ongoing state of hostility, varying in degree and intensity, has caused security and economic problems for Israel. In addition, several countries still restrict business with Israel and with companies doing business in Israel. These political, economic and military conditions in Israel—if adverse— as well as the foregoing business restrictions, could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations and future growth.

Conflicts in North Africa and the Middle East, including in Syria, which borders Israel, have resulted in continued political uncertainty and violence in the region. Efforts to improve Israel's relationship with the Palestinian Authority have failed to result in a permanent solution, and there have been numerous periods of hostility in recent years during which Hamas, a terrorist group that controls the Gaza Strip, has attacked Israel with rockets. In addition, Iran continues to take a hostile stance towards Israel, having proceeded with development of a nuclear program and having promised the destruction of Israel periodically. Such instability may affect the economy, could negatively affect business conditions and, therefore, could adversely affect our operations. To date, these matters have not had any material effect on our business and results of operations; however, the regional security situation and worldwide perceptions of it are outside our control and there can be no assurance that these matters will not negatively affect our business, financial condition and results of operations in the future.

Many of our employees (including executive officers) in Israel are obligated to perform military reserve duty, currently consisting of approximately 30 days of service annually (or more for reserves officers or non-officers with certain expertise). Additionally, these employees are subject to being called to active duty at any time upon the outbreak of hostilities. While we have operated effectively under these requirements, no assessment can be made as to the full impact of these requirements on our business or work force and no prediction can be made as to the effect on us of any expansion of these obligations.

As some of our revenues are derived from the Israeli government sector, a reduction of government spending in Israel on IT services may reduce our revenues and profitability; and any delay in the annual budget approval process may negatively impact our cash flows.

Our Matrix and Magic Software subsidiaries perform work for a wide range of Israeli governmental agencies and related subcontractors. Any reduction or elimination for political or economic reasons (such as in the case of COVID-19) of total Israeli government spending may reduce our revenues and profitability. In addition, the Government of Israel has experienced significant delays in the approval of its annual budget in recent years. Such delays in the future could negatively affect our cash flows by delaying the receipt of payments from the government of Israel for services performed.

Political relations could limit our ability to sell or buy internationally

We could be adversely affected by the interruption or reduction of trade between Israel and its trading partners. Some countries, companies and organizations continue to participate in a boycott of Israeli firms, other firms doing business with Israel as well as Israeli-owned companies operating in other countries. There can be no assurance that restrictive laws, policies or practices directed towards Israel or Israeli businesses will not have an adverse impact on our business.

Israel's economy may become unstable.

From time to time Israel's economy may experience inflation or deflation, low foreign exchange reserves, fluctuations in world commodity prices, military conflicts, civil and political unrest and budgetary constraints. For these and other reasons, in the past the government of Israel has intervened in the economy employing fiscal and monetary policies, import duties, foreign currency restrictions, controls of wages, prices and foreign currency exchange rates and regulations regarding the lending limits of Israeli banks to companies considered to be in an affiliated group. The Israeli government has periodically changed its policies in these areas. Reoccurrence of previous destabilizing factors could make it more difficult for us to operate our business as we have in the past and could adversely affect our business.

Our business may be materially affected by changes to fiscal and tax policies. Potentially negative or unexpected tax consequences of these policies, or the uncertainty surrounding their potential effects, could adversely affect our results of operations and share price.

As a multinational Group, we are subject to income taxes, withholding taxes and indirect taxes in numerous jurisdictions worldwide. Significant judgment and management attention and resources are required in evaluating our tax positions and our worldwide provision for taxes. In the ordinary course of business, there are many activities and transactions for which the ultimate tax determination is uncertain. In addition, our tax obligations and effective tax rates could be adversely affected by changes in the relevant tax, accounting, and other laws, regulations, principles and interpretations. This may include recognizing tax losses or lower than anticipated earnings in jurisdictions where we have lower statutory rates and higher than anticipated earnings in jurisdictions where we have higher statutory rates, changes in foreign currency exchange rates, or changes in the valuation of our deferred tax assets and liabilities.

We may be audited in various jurisdictions, and such jurisdictions may assess additional taxes against us. If we experience unfavorable results from one or more such tax audits, there could be an adverse effect on our tax rate and therefore on our net income. Although we believe our tax estimates are reasonable, the final determination of any tax audits or litigation could be materially different from our historical tax provisions and accruals, which could have a material adverse effect on our operating results or cash flows in the period or periods for which a determination is made. Additionally, we and our subsidiaries are subject to transfer pricing rules and regulations, including those relating to the flow of funds between each of us and our respective affiliates, which are designed to ensure that appropriate levels of income are reported in each jurisdiction in which we operate.

The tax benefits that will be available to certain of our Israeli subsidiaries and our Israeli affiliate will require us to continue to meet various conditions and may be terminated or reduced in the future, which could increase our costs and taxes.

Some of our Israeli subsidiaries derive and expect to continue to derive significant benefits from various programs, including Israeli tax benefits relating to our "Preferred Technological Enterprise", or PTE, and our "Special Preferred Technological Enterprise," or SPTE, programs. To be eligible for tax benefits as a PTE or SPTE, these Israeli subsidiaries must continue to meet certain conditions including, with respect to Sapiens, consolidated group revenue at the level of Asseco (its and our controlling shareholder) of at least NIS 10 billion. If they do not meet the conditions stipulated in the Israeli Law for the Encouragement of Capital Investments, 5719-1959, or the Investment Law and the regulations promulgated thereunder, as amended, for the PTE, any of the associated tax benefits may be cancelled and they would be required to repay the amount of such benefits, in whole or in part, including interest and consumer price index, or CPI, linkage (or other monetary penalties). Further, in the future these tax benefits may be reduced or discontinued. While we believe that certain of our Israeli subsidiaries have met and continue to meet the conditions that entitle them to previously-obtained Israeli tax benefits, there can be no assurance that the Israeli Tax Authority will agree (for example, with respect to Sapiens, in case the overall revenue at the Asseco group level is lower than NIS 10 billion, or if Asseco no longer controls Sapiens).

The Israeli government grants that Sapiens, one of our subsidiaries, has received require it to meet several conditions and restrict its ability to manufacture products and transfer know-how developed using such grants outside of Israel and require it to satisfy specified conditions.

One of our Israeli subsidiaries (an Israeli subsidiary of Sapiens) received grants in the past from the government of Israel through the Israeli National Authority for Technological Innovation, or the Innovation Authority (formerly operating as Office of the Chief Scientist of the Ministry of Economy of the State of Israel, or the OCS), for the financing of a portion of its research and development expenditures in Israel with respect to Sapiens legacy technology. In consideration for receiving grants from the Innovation Authority, that subsidiary is obligated to pay the Innovation Authority royalties from the revenues generated from the sale of products (and related services) developed (in whole or in part) using the Innovation Authority funds, in an amount that is up to 100% to 150% of the aggregate amount of the total grants that it received from the Innovation Authority, plus annual interest for grants received after January 1, 1999. The subsidiary must fully and originally own any intellectual property developed using the Innovation Authority grants and any right derived therefrom unless transfer thereof is approved in accordance with the provisions of the Israeli Encouragement of Research, Development and Technological Innovation Law, 5744-1984, or the Innovation Law (formerly known as the Encouragement of Industrial Research and Development Law, 5744-1984, or the Research Law), and related regulations.

When a company develops know-how, technology or products using grants provided by the Innovation Authority, the terms of these grants and the Innovation Law restrict the transfer of such know-how, and the transfer of manufacturing or manufacturing rights of such products, technologies or know-how outside of Israel. Even after the repayment of such grants in full, our subsidiary will remain subject to the restrictions set forth under the Innovation Law, including:

- *Transfer of know-how outside of Israel.* Any transfer of the know-how that was developed with the funding of the Innovation Authority, outside of Israel, requires prior approval of the Innovation Authority, and the payment of a redemption fee.
- *Local manufacturing obligation.* The terms of the grants under the Innovation Law require that the manufacturing of products resulting from Innovation Authority-funded programs be carried out in Israel, unless a prior written approval of the Innovation Authority is obtained (except for a transfer of up to 10% of the production rights, for which a notification to the Innovation Authority is sufficient).
- *Certain reporting obligations.* Sapiens, as any recipient of a grant or a benefit under the Innovation Law, is required to file reports on the progress of activities for which the grant was provided as well as on its revenues from know-how and products funded by the Innovation Authority. In addition, our subsidiary is required to notify the Innovation Authority of certain events detailed in the Innovation Law.

Therefore, if aspects of our subsidiary's technologies are deemed to have been developed with Innovation Authority funding, the discretionary approval of an Innovation Authority committee would be required for any transfer to third parties outside of Israel of know-how or manufacturing or manufacturing rights related to those aspects of such technologies. Our subsidiary may not receive those approvals. Furthermore, the Innovation Authority may impose certain conditions on any arrangement under which it permits our subsidiary to transfer technology or development out of Israel.

The transfer of Innovation Authority-supported technology or know-how outside of Israel may involve the payment of significant amounts, depending upon the value of the transferred technology or know-how, the amount of Innovation Authority support, the time of completion of the Innovation Authority-supported research project and other factors. Furthermore, the consideration available to shareholders in a transaction involving the transfer outside of Israel of technology or know-how developed with the Innovation Authority's funding (such as a merger or similar transaction) may be reduced by any amounts that are required to be paid to the Innovation Authority.

Our Israeli subsidiary received grants from the Innovation Authority prior to an extensive amendment to the Research Law that came into effect as of January 1, 2016, or the Amendment, which may also affect the terms of existing grants. The Amendment provides for an interim transition period (which has not yet expired), after which time our subsidiary's grants will be subject to terms of the Amendment. Under the Research Law, as amended by the Amendment, the Innovation Authority is provided with a power to modify the terms of existing grants. Such changes, if introduced by the Innovation Authority in the future, may impact the terms governing our subsidiary's grants.

As we continue to expand our business in emerging markets, such as India, we face increasing challenges that could adversely impact our results of operations, reputation and business.

Approximately forty percent (40%) of Sapiens' employees are currently located in India. Our significant presence in India, in particular Sapiens' Research & Development personnel and its personnel for the delivery of its professional services, poses a number of challenges. Those challenges are related to more volatile economic conditions, poor protection of intellectual property, inadequate protection against crime (including counterfeiting, corruption and fraud), lack of due process, and inadvertent breaches of local laws or regulations. In addition, local business practices may be inconsistent with international regulatory requirements, such as anti-corruption and anti-bribery laws and regulations (including the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and the U.K. Bribery Act) to which we are subject. It is possible that some of Sapiens' employees, subcontractors, agents or partners may violate such legal and regulatory requirements, which may expose it to criminal or civil enforcement actions, including penalties and suspension or disqualification from U.S. federal procurement contracting. If Sapiens fails to comply with such legal and regulatory requirements, our business and reputation may be harmed.

Conducting business in India involves unique challenges, including potential political instability; threats of terrorism; the transparency, consistency and effectiveness of business regulation; corruption; the protection of intellectual property; and the availability of sufficient qualified local personnel. Any of these or other challenges associated with operating in India may adversely affect our business or operations. Terrorist activity in India and Pakistan has contributed to tensions between those countries and our operations in India may be adversely affected by future political and other events in the region.

It may be difficult to serve process and enforce judgments against our directors and officers in the United States or in Israel.

We are organized under the laws of the State of Israel. All of our executive officers and directors are nonresidents of the United States, and a substantial portion of our assets and the assets of these persons are located outside of the United States. Therefore, it may be difficult to:

- effect service of process within the United States on us or any of our executive officers or directors;
- enforce court judgments obtained in the United States including those predicated upon the civil liability provisions of the United States federal securities laws, against us or against any of our executive officers or directors, in the United States or Israel; and
- bring an original action in an Israeli court against us or against any of our executive officers or directors to enforce liabilities based upon the United States federal securities laws.

Israeli courts may refuse to hear a claim based on an alleged violation of U.S. securities laws reasoning that Israel is not the most appropriate forum in which to bring such a claim. In addition, even if an Israeli court agrees to hear a claim, it may determine that Israeli law and not U.S. law is applicable to the claim. If U.S. law is found to be applicable, the content of applicable U.S. law must be proven as a fact by expert witnesses, which can be a time consuming and costly process. Certain matters of procedure will also be governed by Israeli law. There is little binding case law in Israel that addresses the matters described above. As a result of the difficulty associated with enforcing a judgment against us in Israel, an investor may not be able to collect any damages awarded by either a U.S. or foreign court.

Provisions of Israeli law may delay, prevent or make difficult an acquisition of us, which could prevent a change of control and therefore depress the price of our shares.

The Companies Law regulates mergers and requires that tender offers for acquisitions of shares above specified thresholds be approved via special shareholder approvals. The Companies Law furthermore requires shareholder approvals for transactions involving directors, officers or significant shareholders and regulates other matters that may be relevant to these types of transactions. Furthermore, Israeli tax considerations may make potential transactions unappealing to us or to some of our shareholders. These provisions of Israeli corporate and tax law may have the effect of delaying, preventing or complicating a merger with, or other acquisition of, us. This could cause our ordinary shares to trade at prices below the price for which third parties might be willing to pay to gain control of us. Third parties who are otherwise willing to pay a premium over prevailing market prices to gain control of us may be unable or unwilling to do so because of these provisions of Israeli law. Asseco's control of a significant percentage of our outstanding ordinary shares may also discourage potential acquirers from paying a premium to our shareholders pursuant to a change of control transaction. Please see the risk factor above titled "Our largest shareholder, Asseco Poland S.A., can significantly influence the outcome of matters that require shareholder approval."

Your rights and responsibilities as a shareholder are governed by Israeli law and differ in some respects from the rights and responsibilities of shareholders under U.S. law.

We are incorporated under Israeli law. The rights and responsibilities of holders of our ordinary shares are governed by our memorandum of association, amended and restated articles of association, which we sometimes refer to as our articles, and Israeli law. These rights and responsibilities differ in some respects from the rights and responsibilities of shareholders in typical U.S. corporations. In particular, a shareholder of an Israeli company has a duty to act in good faith in exercising the rights thereof and fulfilling the obligations thereof toward the company and other shareholders and to refrain from abusing the power thereof in the company, including, among other things, in voting at the general meeting of shareholders on certain matters. Israeli law provides that these duties are applicable in shareholder votes at the general meeting with respect to, among other things, amendments to a company's articles of association, increases in a company's authorized share capital, mergers and acquisitions and transactions involving interests of officers, directors or other interested parties which require the shareholders' approval. In addition, a controlling shareholder of an Israeli company or a shareholder who knows that he or she possesses the power to determine the outcome of a vote at a meeting of our shareholders, or who has, by virtue of the company's articles of association, the power to appoint or prevent the appointment of an office holder in the company, or any other power with respect to the company, has a duty of fairness toward the company. The Companies Law does not establish criteria for determining whether or not a shareholder has acted in good faith.

As a foreign private issuer whose ADSs are listed on the Nasdaq Global Select Market, we may follow certain home country corporate governance practices instead of certain Nasdaq requirements.

As a foreign private issuer whose ADSs are listed on the Nasdaq Global Select Market, we are permitted to follow certain home country corporate governance practices instead of certain requirements of the Listing Rules of the Nasdaq Stock Market. A foreign private issuer that elects to follow a home country practice instead of such requirements must submit to Nasdaq in advance a written statement from independent counsel in such issuer's home country certifying that the issuer's practices are not prohibited by the home country's laws. In addition, a foreign private issuer must disclose in its annual reports filed with the SEC or on its website, each such requirement that it does not follow and describe the home country practice followed by the issuer in lieu of any such requirement. In keeping with these leniencies, we have elected to follow home country practice with regard to, among other things, composition of our board of directors, director nomination procedure, compensation of officers, quorum at shareholders' meetings and timing of our annual shareholders' meetings. We have furthermore elected to follow our home country law, in lieu of those rules of the Nasdaq Stock Market that require that we obtain shareholder approval for certain dilutive events, such as for the establishment or amendment of certain equity based compensation plans, an issuance that will result in a change of control of the company, certain transactions other than a public offering involving issuances of a 20% or more interest in the company and certain acquisitions of the stock or assets of another company. Accordingly, our shareholders and ADS holders may not be afforded the same protection as provided under Nasdaq's corporate governance rules.

Our U.S. shareholders may suffer adverse tax consequences if we are classified as a passive foreign investment company or as a "controlled foreign corporation".

Generally, if for any taxable year 75% or more of our gross income is passive income, or at least 50% of the average quarterly value of our assets (which may be measured in part by the market value of our ordinary shares, which is subject to change) are held for the production of, or produce, passive income, we would be characterized as a passive foreign investment company, or PFIC, for U.S. federal income tax purposes under the Code. Based on our gross income and gross assets, and the nature of our business, we believe that we were not classified as a PFIC for the taxable year ended December 31, 2021. Because PFIC status is determined annually based on our income, assets and activities for the entire taxable year, it is not possible to determine whether we will be characterized as a PFIC for the taxable year ending December 31, 2022, or for any subsequent year, until we finalize our financial statements for that year. Furthermore, because the value of our gross assets is likely to be determined in large part by reference to our market capitalization, a decline in the value of our ordinary shares may result in our becoming a PFIC. Accordingly, there can be no assurance that we will not be considered a PFIC for any taxable year. Our characterization as a PFIC could result in material adverse tax consequences for you if you are a U.S. investor, including having gains realized on the sale of our ordinary shares treated as ordinary income, rather than a capital gain, the loss of the preferential rate applicable to dividends received on our ordinary shares by individuals who are U.S. holders, and having interest charges apply to distributions by us and the proceeds of share sales. Certain elections exist that may alleviate some of the adverse consequences of PFIC status and would result in an alternative treatment (such as mark-to-market treatment) of our ordinary shares. Prospective U.S. investors should consult their own tax advisers regarding the potential application of the PFIC rules to them. Prospective U.S. investors should refer to "Item 10.E. Taxation—U.S. Federal Income Tax Considerations" for discussion of additional U.S. income tax considerations applicable to them based on our treatment as a PFIC.

Certain U.S. holders of our ordinary shares may suffer adverse tax consequences if we or any of our non-U.S. subsidiaries are characterized as a “controlled foreign corporation”, or a CFC, under Section 957(a) of the Code. A non-U.S. corporation is considered a CFC if more than fifty percent of the voting power or the total value of the shares is owned, or is considered to be owned, by U.S. shareholders who each own shares representing ten percent or more of the voting or total value of the shares of such non-U.S. corporation, who refer to as 10% U.S. Shareholders. Generally, 10% U.S. Shareholders of a CFC are currently required to include in their gross income their pro-rata share of the CFC’s “Subpart F income”, a portion of the CFC’s earnings, to the extent the CFC holds certain U.S. property, and certain other new items under H.R. 1, originally known as the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, or the TCJA. Such 10% U.S. Shareholders are subject to current U.S. federal income tax with respect to such items, even if the CFC has not made an actual distribution to such shareholders. “Subpart F income” includes, among other things, certain passive income (such as income from dividends, interests, royalties, rents and annuities or gain from the sale of property that produces such types of income) and certain sales and services income arising in connection with transactions between the CFC and a person related to the CFC. Certain changes to the CFC constructive ownership rules introduced by the TCJA may cause one or more of our non-U.S. subsidiaries to be treated as CFCs and may also impact our CFC status. This may result in negative U.S. federal income tax consequences for 10% U.S. Shareholders of our ordinary shares. The CFC rules are complex and therefore no assurances can be given that we are not or will not become a CFC. Certain changes to the CFC constructive ownership rules introduced by recent U.S. tax legislation could, under certain circumstances, cause us to be classified as a CFC. Current or prospective 10% U.S. Shareholders should consult their tax advisors regarding the U.S. tax consequences of acquiring, owning, or disposing our ordinary shares and the impact of the TCJA, especially the changes to the rules relating to CFCs.

We may have difficulty protecting our interests as a shareholder of Sapiens, which is a Cayman Islands company.

Following the completion of the migration of its legal jurisdiction to the Cayman Islands in August 2018, Sapiens’ corporate affairs are governed by its memorandum of association, or the Memorandum, its articles of association, or the Articles, the Companies Act (as revised) of the Cayman Islands, or the Companies Act and the common law of the Cayman Islands. The rights of Sapiens’ shareholders— such as Formula— and the fiduciary responsibilities of Sapiens’ directors under the laws of the Cayman Islands are, in some respects, not as clearly established under statutes or judicial precedent in the Cayman Islands as in jurisdictions in the United States. Therefore, we may have more difficulty in protecting our interests than would shareholders of a corporation incorporated in a jurisdiction in the United States, due to the comparatively less developed nature of Cayman Islands law in this area.

The Companies Act permits mergers and consolidations between Cayman Islands companies and between Cayman Islands companies and non-Cayman Islands companies. Dissenting shareholders have the right to be paid the fair value of their shares (which, if not agreed between the parties, will be determined by the Cayman Islands court) if they follow the required procedures, subject to certain exceptions. Court approval is not required for a merger or consolidation which is effected in compliance with these statutory procedures.

In addition, there are statutory provisions that facilitate the reconstruction and amalgamation of companies, provided that the arrangement is approved by a majority in number of each class of shareholders and creditors with whom the arrangement is to be made, and who must in addition represent three-fourths in value of each such class of shareholders or creditors, as the case may be, that are present and voting either in person or by proxy at a meeting convened for that purpose. The convening of the meeting and subsequently the arrangement must be sanctioned by the Grand Court of the Cayman Islands. A dissenting shareholder has the right to express to the court the view that the transaction ought not to be approved.

When a takeover offer is made and accepted by holders of 90.0% of the affected shares within four months, the offeror may, within a two-month period, notify the holders of the remaining shares that it requires them to transfer such shares on the terms of the offer. An objection can be made to the Grand Court of the Cayman Islands within one month of the notice, but this is unlikely to succeed unless there is evidence of fraud, bad faith or collusion.

If the arrangement and reconstruction is thus approved, the dissenting shareholder would have no rights comparable to appraisal rights, which would otherwise ordinarily be available to dissenting shareholders of a corporation incorporated in a jurisdiction in the United States, providing rights to receive payment in cash for the judicially determined value of the shares. This may make it more difficult for you to assess the value of any consideration you may receive in a merger or consolidation or to require that the offeror give you additional consideration if you believe the consideration offered is insufficient.