

LDI Manager Watch™ Survey for the month ending March 2024



Alexforbes | 5-times winner of the
Best Investment Survey Provider award
at the Africa Global Funds Awards from 2019 to 2023

:alexforbes
insight • advice • impact

LDI MANAGER WATCH™ SURVEY

HOW TO INTERPRET AND USE THIS SURVEY

LDI is a complex area of investment. AF strongly recommends that investors obtain professional assistance in determining whether a specific LDI strategy or LDI manager is appropriate for them. The guide below is not sufficiently comprehensive to enable most investors to reliably choose an LDI manager without further assistance. The guide will help investors appreciate the drivers of differential performance between managers and strategies at specific times in the market.

General

The LDI survey reports on the outperformance LDI asset managers deliver relative to a liability based benchmarks. The survey provides simple numerical measures that encapsulate the risk these managers have exposed clients to as well as the outperformance they have achieved. The survey reports on the performance of 'composites', or groups of portfolios with similar characteristics.

Most LDI hedging techniques are based on algorithmic solutions (or rules based mathematical techniques), suggesting that ineffective hedging techniques will very rapidly show up in this survey. The skill set of managers offering low risk solutions, tracking liabilities closely with tight mandate restrictions will generally show up over even short periods such as one year. It is however always preferable to evaluate these managers over a longer period if this is available. The period used for analysis should include at least one large shift in yield curves. More than one large shift in yields has occurred during the last twelve months; the short history available in this survey is hence adequate for judging manager's ability to create effective hedges.

In addition to focusing on tracking liabilities, some managers target outperformance of liabilities by investing in riskier asset classes such as credit (and potentially view taking on the markets). An evaluation of the approach used and the skills of each manager is required to assess how likely these managers are to deliver alpha in the future. The past performance of these managers can be used as part of this evaluation. Longer periods will be required to accurately form a view of how good the manager is at choosing and managing credit. The exact length will depend on the strategy used, but may require five years or longer. Many LDI managers do not have a track record this long. It is useful in such cases to look at the manager's performance in ordinary credit portfolios.

Investors also need to consider the time frame over which they measure risk when choosing a manager and more importantly, in setting their mandates, mandate restrictions and portfolio targets. For example, listed companies may need to manage pension fund or other sinking fund risks over a very short period to match their reporting requirements. Pension funds that are valued once every three years, with a larger risk appetite and a desire to target growth could use a longer evaluation period such as three years.

Specific measures

Liability outperformance shows how much value, in excess of the growth in liabilities, the manager was able to add for their client. All else being equal, a larger outperformance is preferable. Investors should consider a sufficiently long performance period to smooth over interest, credit and inflation cycles if they are primarily concerned with the longer term performance of their liability hedging activities. For example, certain investors may require close tracking on a monthly basis, whilst others may be more concerned with longer term value add. Investors should therefore give adequate attention to manager performance over periods that match their own reporting, risk evaluation and risk tolerance frequency. Consideration should be given to all the stakeholders associated with the liability in reaching this decision.

Liability convexity and duration are technical measures of certain liability characteristics. In general, the larger these quantities are, the more difficult it is to create an effective hedge. These measures can hence be seen as one of the constraining factors governing managers' efficacy in hedging and adding outperformance. Performance is therefore not necessarily comparable between managers with vastly different liability durations and convexities. A typical defined benefit pensioner liability increasing with full inflation annually has a duration between nine and twelve years at current yields.

The % government bonds shows the portion of the manager's portfolios invested in government issued bonds. All else equal, the lower this percentage is, the greater one would expect the long term outperformance of liabilities to be. This figure may also reflect mandate constraints regarding the inclusion of credit.

The % unlisted exposure shows the proportion of the portfolio which is invested in unlisted instruments. Unlisted instruments may (but are not necessarily) subject to poor valuations or infrequent valuations by the manager. Many unlisted instruments such as swaps may be valued independently by a counterparty bank, partially mitigating this risk.

A brief description of the benchmark used is given for each composite. Only similar composites should be compared directly. For example, swap based and bond based benchmarks are not directly comparable.

Portfolio as a percentage of liability shows the size of the assets managed by the manager relative to the size of the liability the manager is mandated to hedge. For example, a pension fund with a R100 liability that gives their LDI manager R50 and invests R50 into the equity market would have a proportion of 50%. All else being equal, the larger this portion is, the easier it is to hedge a liability. This is hence an additional constraining factor on managers. Portfolios in the survey have been grouped into bands expected to offer similar hedging efficacy.

The minimum funding level shows the lowest funding level that would have applied over various time periods, assuming the investor's liabilities and assets were equal at the start of the period. Assuming all else is equal, larger minimum funding levels are preferable. A minimum funding level is an important risk measure in evaluating how well a manager can manage downside risk relative to the investor's liability.

Tracking error shows the dispersion of portfolio returns relative to the investor's liability. All else being equal, a lower tracking error is preferable. Unfortunately tracking error captures outperformance (desirable) as well as underperformance (undesirable). Where close liability tracking is not essential, the minimum funding level is a superior measure of risk. For example, a manager providing a high degree of outperformance and high minimum funding levels may be a suitable choice even if this manager has a high tracking error.

The risk adjusted outperformance shows the extent to which managers outperform liabilities, adjusted for the tracking error or risk they have introduced. All else equal, a larger risk adjusted return is preferable. The risk adjusted return may however be an inappropriate measure for certain investors with specific liability objectives. For example some risk tolerant investors wish to maximise long term outperformance of liabilities. Such investors should focus on outperformance of liabilities in choosing a manager. Other risk averse investors may wish to track their liabilities as closely as possible. Such investors should focus on choosing a manager based on tracking error.

LDI MANAGER WATCH™ SURVEY

COMMENTARY

General

Longer-dated bond yields generally rose during the first quarter (“Q1”) of 2024. More details on specific yield curve movements are in their dedicated sections below. The unfolding history of these yields influence Liability Driven Investment (LDI) performance over time. The key news items over the quarter are below:

- The current global economic environment, especially for LDI assets like bonds, is driven by high inflation and the resulting higher interest rates from the world’s central banks.
- Inflation continued to be a major concern for global economies, including in South Africa. The South African Reserve Bank’s (SARB’s) main target is to keep local inflation between 3.0% and 6.0%. South African consumer price inflation (CPI, “inflation”) was 7.2% over 2022, higher than the target band. In 2021, it was 5.9% (source: StatsSA).
- The SARB and other central banks increase interest rates intending to reduce future inflation.
- The increased interest rates are response to rising inflation and inflation expectations, where the tighter monetary policy intends to reduce future inflation and current inflation expectations. The SARB’s increases were widely expected due to their hawkish nature in this environment. (“Hawkish” – where a policymaker / central bank focusses policy on curbing inflation).
- This quarter, most of the world’s major maintained their interest rates in the current high inflation environment.
- The South African inflation (CPI) rate for 2023 was 5.1%, which is within the SARB’s target range which is a direct result of the hawkish decision-making by the local central bank to increase interest rates. Many other international central banks have done the same.
- For the third consecutive quarter, the SARB maintained the local interest (repo) rate at 8.25%.
- Consumer Price Inflation in the USA (“US inflation”) was 6.5% over 2022 and 7.0% in 2021. Both are high levels of inflation relative to the US 10-year average inflation over the past 10 years, being 2.8%, which includes these high 2021 and 2022 levels.
- The US inflation index reduced in Q4 of 2023, bringing the total inflation to 3.4% over 2023. The large reduction in annual inflation over 2023 results from recent US Fed hawkishness. However, this is still above the US Fed Chair, Jerome Powell’s, recently stated target of 2.0%.
- The inflation numbers to start 2024 seem to indicate that the Fed’s hawkishness might not end soon, with inflation of 1.8% observed in the first quarter alone.
- The Fed maintained their interest rate of 5.50% for a second consecutive quarter. This is the highest Fed Funds rate since before the global financial crisis of 2008.
- Consumer Price Inflation (CPI) in the European Union (“EU”) was 9.2% over 2022 and 5.0% in 2021. CPI in the United Kingdom (“UK”) was 10.5% in 2022 and 5.4% in 2021. Inflation remains a concern in these areas and their central banks are hawkish in nature like the SARB and the US Fed and have increased interest rates.
- The European Central Bank maintained its interest rate in Q4 of 2023 and in Q1 of 2024, mirroring SA and the USA. The rate remains 4.50%.
- The Bank of England also maintained its interest rate at 5.25%.
- The People’s Bank of China (“PBOC”) also maintained interest rates in Q4 2023 and Q1 of 2024, maintaining the rate at 3.45%.
- Contrasting the local and global hawkishness, the People’s Bank of China (“PBOC”) has a lower interest rate at the end of 2023 compared to the beginning. Since the global COVID shutdown, the PBOC has only decreased interest rates. With the need to protect future levels of growth being more concerning to the PBOC than the need to curb inflation, their position is “dovish” – the opposite of hawkish. South African markets started the year off negatively, with Q1 returns of -2.3% from local equities (JSE Capped SWIX) and -1.8% from local bonds (ALBI).
- Global markets started the year off positively, with Q1 returns of 12.1% in the MSCI All Countries World Index and 1.2% in the FTSE World Government Bonds Index (WGBI).
- The continued military conflict in Ukraine involving Russia and Ukraine may continue to influence markets over 2024, with volatility in markets being exacerbated by the continued violent conflict in Israel and Palestine.

Bond managers continue to face the challenges of a volatile market, where developed nation bonds have lower yields and emerging market bonds have higher risks.

Positive performance would be expected to have favourable effects for LDI hedging strategies, since many defined benefit funds have elected to combine interest- and inflation-hedging with growth assets (like SA and global equities). Liabilities and their immunising bond (LDI) portfolios have performed similarly over the quarter, so the rising values of growth assets would, generally, lift funding levels, depending on the relative level of de-risking.

Inflation-linked bond section

Real yields (I2050) in the long end increased by 22 basis points from around 4.87% at the end of Q4 (December 2023) to 5.09% at the end of this quarter (March 2024). Yields generally increased across the long and short ends of the real yield curve.

High real yields present an opportunity for funds to hedge real liabilities, including those that have not been able to do so in the past. It may be worth re-visiting this topic if you are a decision-making agent for an entity with defined liabilities (such as a defined benefit retirement fund or an insurer) without existing LDI assets. However, this opportunity would need to contrast against the potential loss of higher expected returns (due to reduced allocations to growth assets like equities and property). We recommend discussing this with an LDI expert or your valuator.

Higher yields also benefit funds transitioning unhedged active members into a hedged pensioner pool, as the transfer (and subsequent expansion of the LDI hedge) may occur at a higher yield than was previously possible.

Nominal bond section

Long-dated nominal bond yields increased over the quarter with bond yields of the R2040 increasing by 77 basis points from 12.14% at the end of Q4 (December 2023) to 12.91% at the end of this quarter (March 2024).

Considering the 2030 maturity (R2030), the yields in the medium end of the curve also increased. This quarter, yields on the R2030 increased by 85 basis points from 9.76% at the end of Q4 (December 2023) to 10.61% at the end of this quarter (March 2024). Yields in the short term generally remained flat. In combination, the result is a steeper yield curve compared to last quarter.

Conclusion

Manager returns were diverse over the quarter. Given the broad range of characteristics seen in the participants’ composites, this is as expected. For example, the levels of allocations to credit and the benchmark durations vary notably.

Participating managers broadly coped well with a challenging and volatile environment, with most delivering positive (or zero) outperformance. However, one can only draw limited conclusions from the small sample of participating LDI managers in the Survey, and we recommend caution when analysing these managers. Investors should seek bespoke advice when considering LDI.

BEE AND ESG DETAILS AS AT THE END OF MARCH 2024						
Manager	Empowerment Rating	Total empowerment Shareholding (%)	Empowerment Shareholding		We endorse/are signatories to:	
			Ownership/Partner(s)	Empowerment shareholding composition as a percentage of total empowerment ownership	CRISA (Code for Responsible Investing in South Africa)	PRI (United Nations Principles for Responsible Investing)
Ashburton	Level 1	30.10%	BEE Partners Shareholding Other Royal Bafokeng Holdings (Pty) Ltd	17.28% 70.76% 11.96%	Yes	Yes
Ninety One	Level 1	29.14%	Ninety One Limited	100.00%	Yes	Yes
STANLIB	Level 1	35.75%	Liberty Holdings Limited	100.00%	Yes	Yes

LDI MANAGER WATCH™ SURVEY

Objective - The portfolios included in this survey represent liability-driven investment funds with benchmarks expressly referencing investor liabilities.

INVESTMENT DATA TO THE END OF MARCH 2024												
	3rd Party Assets	OUTPERFORMANCE OF LIABILITY					LIABILITY CHARACTERISTICS				PORTFOLIO CHARACTERISTICS	
		Month	Quarter	1 Year	3 Years (p.a.)	5 Years (p.a.)	Liability benchmark duration	Liability benchmark convexity	% exposure to credit assets	% unlisted exposure	Portfolio Size (R m)	Benchmark
INFLATION-LINKED BOND YIELD CURVE BENCHMARKING												
Ashburton	Yes	0.08%	0.48%	-0.20%	-0.08%	0.09%	6.06	60.01	1.70%	0.00%	668.50	Liability benchmark, zero spread
STANLIB Composite 1	Yes	0.10%	0.78%	5.79%	6.50%	6.48%	7.59	98.09	100.00%	12.37%	1 552.04	Liability benchmark, zero spread
STANLIB Composite 3		0.02%	0.08%	0.10%	0.26%	0.23%	11.62	222.08	0.00%	0.00%	879.15	Liability benchmark, zero spread
NOMINAL BOND YIELD CURVE BENCHMARKING												
Ninety One	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.13	9.00	0.00%	0.00%	4 763.49	Liability benchmark, zero spread
STANLIB Composite 2	Yes	-0.14%	-0.03%	0.28%	0.65%	0.83%	6.51	75.15		0.00%	459.97	Liability benchmark, -25bps spread
TOTAL											8 323.14	
INDICES												
All Bond Index		-1.93%	-1.80%	4.19%	7.41%	7.05%						
JSE ASSA SA Gov ILB Index		0.23%	-0.35%	5.70%	7.09%	6.44%						
STeFi		0.70%	2.06%	8.39%	6.08%	6.00%						

LDI MANAGER WATCH™ SURVEY

Objective - The portfolios included in this survey represent liability-driven investment funds with benchmarks expressly referencing investor liabilities.

INVESTMENT DATA TO THE END OF MARCH 2024												
RISK STATISTICS												
	LDI portfolio as a percentage of liability (P = Physical / E = Effective)				Minimum funding level assuming an artificial starting level of 100% at the start of the period				Tracking error (annualised)			
	<25%	25-50%	50-75%	>75%	Quarter	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	Quarter	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years
INFLATION-LINKED BOND YIELD CURVE BENCHMARKING												
Ashburton			PE		99.97%	99.29%	99.26%	99.49%	0.83%	0.83%	0.84%	2.01%
STANLIB Composite 1			P	E	100.68%	100.38%	100.60%	100.33%	3.07%	2.17%	1.81%	1.79%
STANLIB Composite 3				PE	100.01%	99.89%	99.93%	99.70%	0.08%	0.15%	0.31%	0.60%
NOMINAL BOND YIELD CURVE BENCHMARKING												
Ninety One				PE	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
STANLIB Composite 2				PE	99.97%	99.95%	99.91%	100.08%	0.41%	0.50%	0.43%	0.61%

LDI MANAGER WATCH™ SURVEY

Objective - The portfolios included in this survey represent liability-driven investment funds with benchmarks expressly referencing investor liabilities.

INVESTMENT DATA TO THE END OF MARCH 2024			
	1 Year	3 Years (p.a.)	5 Years (p.a.)
INFLATION-LINKED BOND YIELD CURVE BENCHMARKING			
Ashburton	-0.24	-0.09	0.05
STANLIB Composite 1	2.67	3.59	3.63
STANLIB Composite 3	0.71	0.84	0.38
NOMINAL BOND YIELD CURVE BENCHMARKING			
Ninety One	Zero tracking error	Zero tracking error	Zero tracking error
STANLIB Composite 2	0.56	1.50	1.34

LDI MANAGER WATCH™ SURVEY

EXPLANATORY NOTES

General Disclaimers :

This document has been prepared for use by clients of the Alexforbes Group. Any other third party that is not a client of the Alexforbes Group and for whose specific use this document has not been supplied, must be aware that Alexforbes Group shall not be liable for any damage, loss or liability of any nature incurred by any third party and resulting from the information contained herein.

The information contained herein is supplied on an "as is" basis and has not been compiled to meet any third party's individual requirements. It is the responsibility of any third party to satisfy himself or herself, prior to relying on this information that the content meets the third party's individual requirements.

Nothing in this document, when read in isolation and without professional advice, should be construed as solicitation, offer, advice, recommendation, or any other enticement to acquire or dispose of any financial product, advice or investment, or to engage in any financial transaction or investment. A third party should consult with an authorised financial advisor prior to making any financial decisions.

Alexforbes has taken all reasonable steps to ensure the quality and accuracy of the contents of this document and encourages all readers to report incorrect and untrue information, subject to the right of Alexforbes to determine, in its sole and absolute discretion, the contents of this document. Irrespective of the attempts by Alexforbes to ensure the correctness of this document, Alexforbes does not make any warranties or representations that the content will in all cases be true, correct or free from any errors. In particular, certain aspects of this document might rely on or be based on information supplied to Alexforbes by other persons or institutions.

Performance figures are shown gross of fees and taxes. Past history is not necessarily a guide to future performance.

Quantitative figures are calculated on three year performance returns.

FAIS Notice and Disclaimer: This information is not advice as defined and contemplated in the Financial Advisory and Intermediary Services Act, 37 of 2002, as amended. Alexforbes shall not be liable for any actions taken by any person based on the correctness of this information.

General :

Managers are ranked from highest to lowest active return. In some cases rankings may be different due to return differences disguised by the rounding. Rankings are purely for illustrative purposes.

Statistical Definitions :

The Median is the value above or below which half the managers fall.

The Upper Quartile is the value above which one quarter of the managers fall.

The Lower Quartile is the value below which one quarter of the managers fall.

Risk Analysis Definitions :

"Active return" is the return earned by the manager in excess of the benchmark, measured geometrically.

"Active Return" is a measure of the value that the manager has added or detracted over the benchmark return.

"Risk adjusted return" is the annualised standard deviation of the monthly "Active Returns".

"Risk adjusted return" is a measure of the variability of the manager's returns relative to the benchmark returns.

"Minimum funding level" is the minimum cumulative active return during the measurement period added to one.

"Tracking Error" is a measure of the manager's ability to manage funding level risks.

"Prescribed Duration Measure" is the average of the time at which liability cashflows are paid, weighted by the proportion of present value paid at each time.

$$\text{Prescribed Duration Measure} = \frac{\sum_{t \text{ in } T} PV(t) * t}{\sum_{t \text{ in } T} PV(t)}$$

"Prescribed Duration Measure" is one of many factors affecting the difficulty of hedging a liability or adding outperformance. In general, the larger this value, the more challenging the mandate will be.

"Prescribed Convexity Measure" is the average of the squares of the times at which liability cashflows are paid, weighted by the proportion of present value paid at each time.

$$\text{Prescribed Convexity Measure} = \frac{\sum_{t \text{ in } T} PV(t) * t^2}{\sum_{t \text{ in } T} PV(t)}$$

"Prescribed Convexity Measure" is one of many factors affecting the difficulty of hedging a liability or adding outperformance. In general, the larger this value, the more challenging the mandate will be.