



Multi-Asset Class Investing: Part 1 — Forces Behind a Trend

SUMMARY

Recently, we've observed a strong up-tick in activity around Multi-Asset Class (MAC) investment products and strategies. We see managers across the globe expanding current MAC offerings and introducing new ones, consequently generating demand for new support around analytic methodologies, data and technology.

This series explores our view of the MAC phenomenon in depth, from origins to solutions. In this first of three installments, we look at market and industry trends that seem to be driving the evolution of MAC toward more sophisticated strategies and methods.

Why do we need to revisit MAC?

Good question — it's not as though strategies with more than one asset class haven't been attempted previously. Examples would include "balanced" and "60/40" funds, which have been around for as long as we can remember.

Furthermore, methods for analyzing and attributing risk & performance to these portfolios don't — at first glance — seem to be lacking, either. There are dozens of papers and articles that address the analysis of balanced stock/bond portfolios. Many more detail specific methods for multi-level attribution, an important requirement for MAC portfolios. Most vendors' performance platforms support at least some of those methods.

And yet, over the last three years, we've been helping more and more clients who are either bootstrapping new MAC strategies, or designing and implementing methodologies in support of existing products. While the roster of MAC alternatives continues to grow at a rapid pace, the current inventory of off-the-shelf tools designed to analyze these products doesn't seem to be cutting it any more. Seems it's time to take a step back, look around, and see what's up with this trend.

Flight-to-passive investment puts pressure on active managers to prove their worth

As the New York Times writes, Vanguard is growing faster than everybody else combined. In the last three years, net inflow topped \$823 billion, while the rest of the mutual fund industry — over 4000 firms in all, only managed \$97 billion. That's over 85 cents of every inflow dollar, folks.

Admittedly, Vanguard still does run active products; almost 29% of their \$4.2 trillion AUM are in active funds. Still, there's not much joy to be had denying a trend in those kinds of numbers. Fees are being squeezed, and assets are declining. Active managers have been weighed, they have been measured, and they have been found wanting. In what world could they possibly beat the market?

Multi-Asset Class Investing: Part 1

Perceptions of risk mature: From forbidden territory to valuable investment tool

MAC is all about finding and allocating to risky asset classes — as long as they're uncorrelated. Reducing whole portfolio volatility (in alignment with investor objectives) is, more and more frequently, becoming an intentional method of improving outcomes.

To this end, the inclusion in the portfolio of asset classes previously viewed as unacceptably risky is becoming more commonplace. Out-of-country and out-of-benchmark bets, derivatives, illiquid asset classes are all becoming better understood and utilized as tools for diversifying and controlling investment risk, and not the anathemata they were once considered previously.

Passive presents a bumpy road toward investor objectives

As we've alluded before, a plethora of ETFs and index funds do not an allocation make. Passing off the single most crucial investment decision to the investor — who may have no more than a cursory acquaintance with correlation — is bound to result in some less-than-ideal outcomes.

Even in a managed context, it has become painfully obvious that passive allocation fails to meet basic investor objectives. The volatility of portfolios with static "strategic" allocations to major asset classes is unnecessarily high, and the drawdowns that result can be decimating. This insight is particularly relevant in the defined contribution space, where sequencing and longevity risk are dominant threats to investor objectives. As a result, active MAC management is becoming a beacon to those who realize they are approaching potentially rocky shores, and is likely only to shine more brightly as these trends play out.

Front vs. middle office: a shift in the balance of power

There was a time when portfolio managers could obtain just about any analytic they requested. If they said they needed an attribution system, somebody built one; if a risk model was an absolute must-have, then someone made it so.

In that era, vendor solutions for such analytics were non-existent, or at best very primitive. Over time, vendor systems matured and became more full-featured; implementing one, however, incurred a high overhead in terms of operational data and technology management. The middle office came into being, growing in size and responsibility over time to shoulder these burdens.

The front office found their influence in the selection, implementation and enhancement of these and other applications to have waned. Middle office "solutions" became entrenched, and focused more toward client reporting and GIP than on granular analysis. As their needs changed and grew, portfolio managers adopted the DIY approach: we'll just download returns and contributions, and build what we need in Excel and Access.

As one would imagine, this approach was destined to have a finite limit of feasibility. Spaghetti-linked spreadsheets — with undocumented macros and embedded SQL queries to ad-hoc tables — cannot scale. As new accounts, mandates, strategies and products were added to the management mix, the structure of the process became overwhelmed, threatening to eventually crash under its own weight.

In the MAC world, perhaps; it might just be the last bastion wherein active fees can reasonably be justified. Look at these characteristics which all recommend active MAC management:

- It's differentiable* – Most people think of "active management" and equate it with "stock picking." Asset selection may or may not be exercised within specific classes of a MAC strategy; nevertheless, class allocation is by far the strongest part of its appeal. *Not a calculus joke.
- It carries greater impact. Asset allocation has been shown, over and over again, to be by far the largest contributor to portfolio performance.
- It's not easy. As Greg Cooper of Schrodgers cogently points out, passive allocation doesn't cut it. Active allocation requires a deep understanding of risk and correlation, more than most asset owners are able to muster.

Multi-Asset Class Investing: Part 1

- It's a compass in the jungle of passive options. Passive investing sounds simple, doesn't it? Yet, with thousands of ETFs and index funds available — more indices than stocks! — how can the asset owner hope to make an allocation decision without informed guidance?
- No Global MAC benchmark exists. For example, there is no investible passive alternative for a GMAC strategy — by definition, it's an active process.

However, there are some people looking to remedy that situation ...

Global asset class benchmarking takes its first steps

A published GMAC benchmark would be intrinsically attractive to both managers and owners. Recent research into the weights, returns, and contributions of such an index, by asset class, has made substantial progress toward this goal. As demand for MAC strategies grows, we expect so to see commensurate development on the benchmark side of the attribution equation.

Moreover, these DIY analytics were producing performance results that differed from the book of record. Free from settlement, valuation or audit constraints, it is hardly surprising that front office performance, based on an investment view, would differ materially from middle office, accounting view results. As managers were often asked to supply their custom attributions for bespoke RFPs, chaos naturally ensued.

Perhaps it is a coincidence of historical timing, perhaps a function of its challenging and complex analytic requirements; whatever the cause, MAC looks to be a force that is changing this dynamic. Wherever substantial investment is being made in MAC products and strategies, it becomes increasingly obvious that neither skunkworks spreadsheets nor existing middle office infrastructure can support the complexity of investment and operational processes necessary to keep that machine running, reliably and accurately.

Conclusions

For a number of reasons — including market pressures, industry maturation, historical legacy — it appears that MAC (and global MAC in particular) are maturing into sophisticated strategies for enhancing the active return/risk proposition. It also seems abundantly clear that new methodology, data and technology approaches need to be designed and developed to measure, analyze and attribute performance and risk to the MAC investment process. Why, you ask? Tune in right here, as ...

Next up: *Multi-Asset Class Investing: What Do We Need to Do Differently?*

OK, so MAC is not only here to stay, it's growing and evolving — how will that impact you? How are active MAC managers different from the rest? We've already got active managers, and a truckload of methodology, data and technology supporting them. Will those tools work for MAC equally well?



Mark R. David, CFA

Mark directs the Performance, Risk & Analytics practice at Meradia, assisting asset managers and owners fulfill their proprietary, complex and data-intensive investment analytic requirements. His area of special expertise is performance attribution, a topic on which he has published several articles, and speaks regularly at industry forums.

Prior to joining Meradia, Mark founded Essex River Analytics, an independent consulting firm which he led for over 20 years, specialising in the domains of performance attribution, quantitative portfolio construction and factor modeling.

610.738.4394

mdavid@meradia.com

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/markdavidessexriver/>



Meradia

1735 Market Street Suite A-410
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone: 610-738-7787
Fax: 610-738-7797

info@meradia.com
www.meradia.com