

Better equities

Looking to redefine 'active'

For professional clients and qualifying investors only

Look to increase your return potential – we believe focused, high-conviction equity portfolios are more likely to outperform after fees in the long run.

Seek to increase your odds of achieving those returns – diversify across lots of managers that have complementary approaches.

Achieve this at potentially no extra cost than traditional approaches.



Better equities

Introduction

Most active equity strategies underperform. Market trends show investors are losing faith in active management and moving to passive strategies*. In some ways this trend is rational given many active equity strategies have over-diversified portfolios with high fees – the odds of long-term success are very low.

However, in a market environment of low expected returns from beta, we believe investors are more in need than ever of active management. So what is to be done? Repeating the same active management approach hoping for better results is not an appealing option. In our opinion, a new approach is required: one that will seek to improve expected returns and, importantly, the likelihood of delivering on those expectations.

We feel that in a low return environment it is even more important that returns are not dwindled away by high fees. The good news is that, for those in a good negotiating position, we feel compelling value for money opportunities are now available from active managers.



The new approach: how to build a better equity portfolio

Here we explain how we achieve each of the key investor needs.

Figure 1. What do investors need from their equity investments?

Investor need	What we have done
1. Seek to increase long-term returns	Designed products with greater potential to add value
2. Seek to reduce the risk of underperformance	Improved portfolio construction approach focusing on greater diversity
3. Seek to reduce cost	Driven down all costs and expenses


1. Seek to increase long-term returns

Legendary investor Sir John Templeton put it simply: “If you want to have better performance than the crowd, you must do things differently from the crowd.” If the crowd is represented by the market then active fund managers need to be building portfolios that differ substantially from the broad market. A useful measure for this is ‘active share’. There is substantial academic research on the performance of active managers that suggests a reliable link between active share and long-term success in equity investing, as shown below.


- **Brands, Brown and Gallaher** wrote in their 2005 paper, “More concentrated funds outperform. Abnormal performance is generated by bets made at the stock level within industries rather than at industry or sector level.”
- **Kacperczyk, Sialm and Zheng** wrote in 2005, “We find that more concentrated funds perform better after adjusting for risk and style differences using the four-factor model of Carhart (1997).”
- **Jiang, Verbeek and Wang** wrote in 2013, “Managers’ highest-conviction stock holdings outperform.”
- **Petajisto** wrote in his 2013 paper, “High active share managers outperform. Active stock pickers that take large but diversified positions away from the index do best.”

*Source: <https://www.ftadviser.com/investments/2016/10/24/most-uk-equity-managers-underperform/>

Figure 2. Excess returns by level of active risk




¹Source: Sebastian and Attaluri, "Conviction in Equity Investing", 2014.



Sebastian and Attaluri's 2014 paper "Conviction in equity investing" provided the chart in *Figure 2* which shows the alpha generated by portfolios split by decile of active risk. The indication is that products with higher active share are better able to overcome fees and potentially deliver returns over time.

In the face of this evidence, you would assume that many active products on the market are highly different to the benchmark. Unfortunately, this is not the case. *Figure 3* shows the number of global equity products in the eVestment database, split by number of stocks in the portfolio which is a rough proxy for active share.

Figure 3. Relationship between products and number of stocks held



²Source: eVestment, Willis Towers Watson. Data as at 30 June 2016. The "Universe" is the eVestment 'All Global Equity' universe.

We believe the reason behind this discrepancy is the potential 'excessive' underperformance against the benchmark in the short term.

To avoid this bumpy ride – which can be intolerable for many clients – we have found managers will often include 'fillers' in their portfolio: lower conviction positions to make the portfolio more like the benchmark dampening relative risk whilst decreasing active share. We believe this vicious cycle leads to sub-optimal equity portfolios that are doomed to (almost always) fail.

Our response to this is simple. We have mandated our high conviction managers to create products that reflect only their best investment ideas, disregarding short-term underperformance. This is not a trivial mandate. Just as we need to build comfort with the managers, the managers have to build confidence in us. In the long-term, however, our data points suggest the highest probability of achieving alpha.

2. Seek to reduce the risk of underperformance

Building a product that guarantees success or which continuously outperforms will, unfortunately, never be possible. But we can put in place an approach that seeks to maximise the chances of long-term success and looks to significantly reduce the risk of material underperformance over a reasonable investment horizon.

Diversity

When hiring one manager, dependency on that manager for long-term success is a one-sided bet. However, combining lots of uncorrelated managers provides far more diversity of thought, research process and decision making, thus increasing the odds of success over the long-term. *Figure 4* illustrates the likely benefits of a multi-manager approach.

Unfortunately, only sophisticated asset owners have the governance required to hire and monitor the appropriate number of managers. So in general, based on our experience, the vast majority of active equity portfolios lack sufficient diversity and underperform.

Figure 4 shows how the probability of suffering different levels of underperformance, at some point within a 10-year period, changes with different numbers of managers. As we have said, the higher expected long-term returns from a single concentrated portfolio comes with potential for more short-term underperformance along the way. Hiring multiple uncorrelated managers may reduce this risk. When using traditional, more diversified products, the probability of a very material drawdown is largely mitigated with the use of around four to five managers. However, we believe with concentrated products, eight or more managers is generally needed.

Another potential way to insulate the portfolio against substantial underperformance risk is to apply an additional risk management overlay to address unintended risks.

Figure 4. **Probability of underperformance**

For Illustrative Purposes only

Figure 4a. **Traditional products**





Figure 4b. **Concentrated products**



Source: Willis Towers Watson. As at 28 February 2017 sd performance is not a reliable indicator of future returns.

Traditional products – Assumptions: Net Alpha 1.6%, Tracking error 5.0%, NIR 0.32, Average Correlation of Alphas 0.2

Concentrated products – Assumptions: Net Alpha 2.6%, Tracking error 8.0%, NIR 0.325, Average Correlation of Alphas 0.1

Methodology: The probability figures are calculated from the following monte carlo simulation: A 10 year portfolio track record for the stated number of managers is created by sampling monthly returns from a normal distribution that has return and standard deviation as per the assumptions below. The portfolio simulation is repeated 100,000 times and the probability of outperforming the benchmark is calculated as the number of simulations in which the simulated alpha was greater than zero, divided by 100,000. The portfolio assumptions are as follows:

Traditional managers: Outperformance net of fees is 1.6%pa, tracking error 5%pa. Average Correlation of Alphas between managers = 0.2

Concentrated managers: Outperformance net of fees is 2.6%pa, tracking error 8%pa. Average Correlation of Alphas between managers = 0.1

3. Seek to reduce cost

Costs add up to represent a significant drag on long-term results. Management fees are the most obvious element. Larger asset pools offering long-term relationships with managers are potentially able to negotiate very substantial discounts on standard markets rates.

Beyond headline fees, other expenses can add up unless there is careful cost control:

Transaction costs – By selecting and committing to managers with long-term investment horizons that typically have low turnover, transaction costs may be kept naturally low.

Tax leakage – Tax inefficient vehicles can lead to leakage which will vary on a case-by-case basis but can be a significant amount.

Additional expenses (for example, custody administration) – We believe a few basis points can be saved through better management of other operating costs, particularly for those controlling larger asset pools.

Summary

Industry trends are showing that the status quo of active equity is not delivering. At the same time, we believe investors are in great need of added returns from manager skill due to an environment of expected low return. Getting the best from active management is not easy; to generate potential better returns than the crowd means going beyond typical approaches to manager selection. Our proposal is to meet investor needs by:


- Seeking to increase expected returns through opportunistically engaging with managers to come up with bespoke concentrated portfolios

- Seeking to improve the stability of those returns through improved diversity
- Delivering this at a potentially lower cost through driving down all associated costs in the food chain

Doing this allows asset owners to get more from active equity managers and may provide a differentiated proposition for investors.

Willis Towers Watson's equity investing beliefs

- Most attempts to outperform equity markets will fail. It is not easy. We believe a differentiated approach and genuine skill are required.
- We believe that genuinely skilled managers exist. We invest significant time and effort in identifying them.
- We believe that high active share and concentrated portfolios are advantageous. Academic research supports this.
- Our expectations of success rise when investors engage with investment managers to deliver better outcomes.
- Portfolios can be more robust when they are diversified across many managers with different approaches and specialisms.
- We believe in accessing a broad opportunity set through unrestricted global mandates.
- Contrarian portfolio management can potentially add to long-term returns. Investors should be willing to add capital to underperforming managers and take it away from strong outperformers.
- Costs matter. We seek to deliver value for money by using our scale to reduce costs and using our influence with managers to create bespoke, cost-effective products.




For more information

For further information on better equities, contact your usual Willis Towers Watson consultant or:

Craig Baker

+44 1737 284801

craig.baker@willistowerswatson.com



Reference

¹Sebastian and Attaluri's 2014 paper "Conviction in equity investing".

²Source: eVestment, Willis Towers Watson. Data as at 30 June 2016 The "Universe" is the eVestment 'All Global Equity' universe.



About Willis Towers Watson

Willis Towers Watson (NASDAQ: WLTW) is a leading global advisory, broking and solutions company that helps clients around the world turn risk into a path for growth. With roots dating to 1828, Willis Towers Watson has 40,000 employees serving more than 140 countries. We design and deliver solutions that manage risk, optimise benefits, cultivate talent, and expand the power of capital to protect and strengthen institutions and individuals. Our unique perspective allows us to see the critical intersections between talent, assets and ideas – the dynamic formula that drives business performance. Together, we unlock potential. Learn more at willistowerswatson.com.

Disclaimer

The information included in this presentation is intended for general educational purposes only and should not be relied upon without further review with your Willis Towers Watson consultant. Willis Towers Watson is not a law, accounting or tax firm and this presentation should not be construed as the provision of legal, accounting or tax services or advice. Some of the information included in this presentation might involve the application of law; accordingly, we strongly recommend that audience members consult with their legal counsel and other professional advisors as appropriate to ensure that they are properly advised concerning such matters. Additionally, material developments may occur subsequent to this presentation rendering it incomplete and inaccurate. Willis Towers Watson assumes no obligation to advise you of any such developments or to update the presentation to reflect such developments.

In preparing this material we have relied upon data supplied to us by third parties. While reasonable care has been taken to gauge the reliability of this data, we provide no guarantee as to the accuracy or completeness of this data and Willis Towers Watson and its affiliates and their respective directors, officers and employees accept no responsibility and will not be liable for any errors or misrepresentations in the data made by any third party.

This document may not be reproduced or distributed to any other party, whether in whole or in part, without Willis Towers Watson's prior written permission, except as may be required by law. In the absence of its express written permission to the contrary, Willis Towers Watson and its affiliates and their respective directors, officers and employees accept no responsibility and will not be liable for any consequences howsoever arising from any use of or reliance on the contents of this document including any opinions expressed herein.



willistowerswatson.com/social-media

Copyright © 2017 Willis Towers Watson. All rights reserved.
WTW-EU-17-PUB-6056a

willistowerswatson.com

Willis Towers Watson