### ALASKA RETIREMENT MANAGEMENT BOARD

### **BOARD of TRUSTEES MEETING**

**OCT** 12, 2023 Alaska Retirement Management Board

### Board of Trustees Meeting

### Monday, October 12, 2023

	Microsoft Tear	ns: Click here to join the meeting	Call In (Audio Only):				
	Meeting ID: 2	87 820 870 088	<b>Phone:</b> 1-907-202-7104				
	Passcode: htYf	sU	<b>Code:</b> 181 089 107#				
١.	10:00 AM	Call to Order					
II.		Roll Call					
III.		Public Meeting Notice					
IV.		Approval of Agenda					
V.		<b>Public/Member Participation, Co</b> (Three Minute Limit. Callers may need to p	mmunications, and Appearances press *6 to unmute.)				
VI.		Approval of Minutes A. September 25, 2023, Manager B. September 27, 2023, Manager	d Accounts Working Group Meeting d Accounts Working Group Meeting				
VII.	10:15 AM	Introduction to Managed Accoun Bob Williams, Chair	ts Analysis				
VIII.	10:30 AM	10:30 AMManaged Accounts AnalysisBen Taylor, Senior Vice President, Head of Tax-Exempt DC ResearchButch Cliff, Executive Vice PresidentSteve Center, Senior Vice PresidentPatrick Wisdom, Vice President					
LUNC	H @ 12:30 PM	(75 MINUTES)					

# IX. 1:45 PM Discussion & Action Item Action: Resolution 2023-18 Relating to Empower's Managed Accounts: "My Total Retirement" for Defined Contribution Plans, Deferred Compensation Plans, and the Supplemental Benefit System Plan X. 2:00 PM Unfinished Business XI. New Business XII. Other Matters to Properly Come Before the Board

- XIII. Public/Member Comments
  - (Three Minute Limit. Callers may need to press \*6 to unmute.)
- XIV. Investment Advisory Council Comments
- XV. Trustee Comments
- XVI. Future Agenda Items
- XVII. 2:15 PM Adjournment

NOTE: Times are approximate, every attempt will be made to stay on schedule; however, adjustments may be made.

#### ALASKA RETIREMENT MANAGEMENT BOARD MANAGED ACCOUNTS WORKING GROUP HYBRID/TEAMS

#### September 25, 2023 12:00 p.m.

Originating at: State Office Building Department of Administration Large Conference Room, 10<sup>th</sup> floor 333 Willoughby Ave., Juneau, AK, 99801

#### Working Group Members Present:

Bob Williams, Chair Adam Crum, DOR Commissioner Sandra Ryan Lorne Bretz Dennis Moen

### Working Group Members Absent:

Paula Vrana, Commissioner of Administration

### **Department of Revenue Staff Present:**

Zach Hanna, Chief Investment Officer Pamela Leary, Director, Treasury Division Alysia Jones, Board Liaison

### Department of Administration, Division of Retirement & Benefits Staff Present:

Ajay Desai, Director, DRB Kevin Worley, Chief Financial Officer Mindy Voigt, Assistant Chief Pension Officer

### **Department of Law Staff Present:**

Ben Hofmeister, Assistant Attorney General Andrew Bocanumenth, Assistant Attorney General

### **Investment Advisory Council Present:**

Dr. William W. Jennings (joined @ 12:41 p.m.)

### **Guests/Presenters:**

Ben Taylor, Senior Vice President, Head of Tax-Exempt DC Research Butch Cliff, Executive Vice President Steve Center, Senior Vice President Patrick Wisdom, Vice President

#### **Other Attendees:**

Marybeth Daubenspeck, Vice President, Government Market

Alaska Retirement Management Board

### PROCEEDINGS

### CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR WILLIAMS called the Managed Accounts Working Group to order at 12:04 p.m. and asked for a roll call.

MS. JONES called the roll and noted that five members of the working group were present.

### PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE

CHAIR WILLIAMS asked to confirm that the public meeting notice was met.

MS. JONES replied, yes, it had.

### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND MINUTES

CHAIR WILLIAMS asked for any additions or changes to the agenda that was presented. Hearing none, the agenda was approved.,

### PUBLIC/MEMBER PARTICIPATION, COMMUNICATIONS AND APPEARANCES

CHAIR WILLIAMS continued to the public comment period and asked if there was anyone online or in the room who wished to address the Working Group. Seeing and hearing none, he moved to the next item on the agenda.

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

CHAIR WILLIAMS asked for a motion:

**MOTION:** A motion to go into executive session per Alaska Statute AS 44.62.310(c)(2) and (c)(3) to discuss next steps for managed accounts for the Alaska Defined Contribution (DC) Plans, following presentations on this topic made by Callan at the June 14<sup>th</sup> and September 13<sup>th</sup> DC Plan Committee meetings, by Empower at the July 26<sup>th</sup> special meeting of the ARM Board and September 13<sup>th</sup> DC Plan Committee meeting, and by T. Rowe Price at the September 13<sup>th</sup> DC Plan Committee meeting. The discussion will include subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation and character of a person. Further, the discussion may include advice from counsel for the ARMB related to the issues set out in the above-mentioned presentations that is confidential by law under the attorneyclient privilege. The following staff, consultants, and legal counsel are asked to join the working group in executive session: From Department of Revenue: Zach Hanna, Pam Leary, & Alysia Jones; from Division of Retirement & Benefits: Ajay Desai, Kevin Worley, and Mindy Voigt; IAC Member: Dr. William Jennings; from Department of Law: Ben Hofmeister and Andrew Bocanumenth; and from Callan: Steve Center, Butch Cliff, Ben Taylor, and Patrick Wisdom. Consultants will be excused from executive session for the presentation of any legal advice. The motion was made by TRUSTEE RYAN; seconded by TRUSTEE BRETZ.

There being no objection, the MOTION was APPROVED.

Alaska Retirement Management Board

(Executive Session from 12:08 p.m. until 2:03 p.m.)

CHAIR WILLIAMS stated that no action was taken.

**MOTION:** A motion to adjourn the Managed Accounts Working Group meeting was made by TRUSTEE RYAN; seconded by TRUSTEE BRETZ.

There being no objection, the MOTION was APPROVED.

(The Managed Accounts Working Group meeting adjourned at 2:06 p.m.)

#### ALASKA RETIREMENT MANAGEMENT BOARD MANAGED ACCOUNTS WORKING GROUP HYBRID/TEAMS

#### September 27, 2023 2:00 p.m.

Originating at: State Office Building Department of Administration Large Conference Room, 10<sup>th</sup> floor 333 Willoughby Ave., Juneau, AK, 99801

### Working Group Members Present:

Bob Williams, Chair Dennis Moen Lorne Bretz Sandra Ryan

### Working Group Members Absent:

Adam Crum, Commissioner of Revenue Paula Vrana, Commissioner of Administration

### **Department of Revenue Staff Present:**

Zach Hanna, Chief Investment Officer Pamela Leary, Director, Treasury Division Alysia Jones, Board Liaison

### Department of Administration, Division of Retirement & Benefits Staff Present:

Ajay Desai, Director, DRB Kevin Worley, Chief Financial Officer

### **Department of Administration**

Dave Donley, Deputy Commissioner

### **Department of Law Staff Present:**

Ben Hofmeister, Assistant Attorney General Andrew Bocanumenth, Assistant Attorney General

### **Investment Advisory Council Present:**

Dr. William W. Jennings

### **Guests/Presenters:**

Ben Taylor, Senior Vice President, Head of Tax-Exempt DC Research Butch Cliff, Executive Vice President Steve Center, Senior Vice President Patrick Wisdom, Vice President

### **Other Attendees:** Marybeth Daubenspeck, Vice President, Government Market

Alaska Retirement Management Board

### PROCEEDINGS

### CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR WILLIAMS called the second meeting of the Managed Accounts Working Group to order at 2:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call.

MS. JONES called the roll and noted that four members of the working group were present.

### PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE

CHAIR WILLIAMS asked to confirm that the public meeting notice was met.

MS. JONES replied, yes, it had.

### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND MINUTES

CHAIR WILLIAMS asked for any additions or changes to the agenda that was presented.

**MOTION:** <u>A motion to approve the agenda was made by TRUSTEE MOEN; seconded by TRUSTEE RYAN.</u>

### **PUBLIC/MEMBER PARTICIPATION, COMMUNICATIONS AND APPEARANCES** CHAIR WILLIAMS continued to the public comment period and asked if there was anyone online or in the room who wished to address the Working Group. Seeing and hearing none, he moved to the next item on the agenda.

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

CHAIR WILLIAMS asked for a motion:

**MOTION:** A motion to go into executive session per Alaska Statute AS 44.62.310(c)(2) and (c)(3) to discuss next steps for managed accounts for the Alaska Defined Contribution (DC) Plans, following presentations on this topic made by Callan at the June 14<sup>th</sup> and September 13<sup>th</sup> DC Plan Committee meetings, by Empower at the July 26<sup>th</sup> special meeting of the ARM Board and September 13<sup>th</sup> DC Plan Committee meeting, and by T. Rowe Price at the September 13<sup>th</sup> DC Plan Committee meeting. The discussion will include subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation and character of a person. Further, the discussion may include advice from counsel for the ARMB related to the issues set out in the above-mentioned presentations that is confidential by law under the attorneyclient privilege. The following staff, consultants, and legal counsel are asked to join the working group in executive session: From Department of Revenue: Zach Hanna, Pam Leary, & Alysia Jones; from Division of Retirement & Benefits: Ajay Desai and Kevin Worley; from Department of Administration: Deputy Commissioner Dave Donley; IAC Member: Dr. William Jennings; from Department of Law: Ben Hofmeister and Andrew Bocanumenth; and from Callan: Butch Cliff, Ben Taylor, and Patrick Wisdom. Consultants will be excused from executive session for the presentation of any legal advice. The motion was made by TRUSTEE BRETZ; seconded by TRUSTEE MOEN.

There being no objection, the MOTION was APPROVED.

Alaska Retirement Management Board

(Executive Session from 2:04 p.m. until 3:34 p.m.)

CHAIR WILLIAMS stated that no action was taken.

**MOTION:** A motion to adjourn the Managed Accounts Working Group meeting was made by TRUSTEE RYAN; seconded by TRUSTEE BRETZ.

There being no objection, the MOTION was APPROVED.

(The Managed Accounts Working Group meeting adjourned at 3:36 p.m.)

## Introduction to Managed Accounts Analysis

October 12, 2023

Bob Williams, Chair

Alaska Retirement Management Board

### Managed Accounts: My Total Retirement

 The Alaska Department of Administration has contracted with Empower to be the recordkeeper for the Defined Contribution, Deferred Compensation, and Supplemental Annuity (SBS-AP) Plans and has included a Managed Account Service ("My Total Retirement," formerly "Reality Investing") that takes discretionary control of a participant's account and implements investment advice for a fee that is based on a percentage of assets under management.

### Managed Accounts: My Total Retirement cont'd

- In a 2023 analysis of defined contribution providers, the ARMB's investment consultant, Callan, found that fee-based managed account services were common and present in 67% of defined contribution plans with assets greater than \$5 billion.
- As of March 31, 2023, there were 10,337 unique ARMB participants enrolled in the Managed Account Service and these accounts had nearly \$1.6 billion in assets. Of these, 7,347 (71%) had 100% of their Alaska plans enrolled in the Empower Managed Account Service.

### ARM Board's Responsibilities

- The Alaska Retirement Management Board (ARMB) was established under AS 37.10.210(a) to serve as trustee of the assets of the State's retirement systems.
- Under AS 37.10.220, the ARMB is to establish and determine the investment objectives and policy for each of the funds entrusted to it.
- AS 37.10.071(c) and AS 37.10.210(a) require the ARMB to apply the prudent investor rule and exercise its fiduciary duty in the sole financial best interest of the funds entrusted to it and treat beneficiaries thereof with impartiality.

### ARM Board's Responsibilities cont'd

 Under AS 37.10.220(a)(5) the ARMB is to provide a range of investment options and establish the rules by which participants can direct their investments among those options with respect to accounts established under the Defined Contribution plans, the Supplemental Annuity Plan ("SBS-AP") and the public employees' Deferred Compensation Plan.

### Callan Periodic Table of Investment Returns

2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Emerging	Real	Emerging	Real	Emerging	U.S.	Emerging	Small Cap	U.S.	Real	Small Cap	Real	Large	Small Cap	Emerging	Cash	Large	Small Cap	Large	Cash
Market	Estate	Market	Estate	Market	Fixed	Market	Equity	Fixed	Estate	Equity	Estate	Сар	Equity	Market	Equivalent	Сар	Equity	Сар	Equivalent
Equity		Equity		Equity	Income	Equity		Income				Equity		Equity		Equity		Equity	
55.82%	37.96%	34.00%	42.12%	39.38%	5.24%	78.51%	26.85%	7.84%	27.73%	38.82%	15.02%	1.38%	21.31%	37.28%	1.87%	31.49%	19.96%	28.71%	1.46%
Small Cap	Emerging	Real	Emerging	Dev ex-	Glbl ex-	High Yield	Real	High Yield	Emerging	Large	Large	U.S.	High Yield	Dev ex-	U.S.	Small Cap	Large	Real	High Yield
Equity	Market	Estate	Market	U.S.	U.S.		Estate		Market	Сар	Сар	Fixed		U.S.	Fixed	Equity	Сар	Estate	
47 250/	Equity	15 250/	Equity	Equity	Fixed	59 240/	10 620/	4 0.00/	Equity	Equity	Equity		17 1 20/	Equity		25 520/	Equity	26.00%	11 1 00/
41.2370	23.33 /0	Dov ov	Dov ov		4.33 /0	Deel	Tmorging	Clbl ov	Dov ov	Dov ov	13.03 /0	Cooh		24.2170			Francing		-11.1370
Estato					Equivalent	Fetato	Markot				U.S. Eivod	Equivalent	Cap	Cap	rigri field		Markot	Equity	U.S. Eixod
LSIALE	Equity	Equity	Equity	U.S. Fixed	Lyuivaient	LSIAIC	Fauity	Eived	Equity	Equity	Income	Lyuivaleni	Fouity	Fouity		Equity	Fouity	Lquity	Income
40.69%	20.38%	14.47%	25.71%	11.03%	2.06%	37.13%	18.88%	4.36%	16.41%	21.02%	<b>5.97%</b>	0.05%	11.96%	21.83%	-2.08%	22.49%	18.31%	14.82%	-13.01%
Dev ex-	Small Cap	Large	Small Cap	U.S.	High Yield	Dev ex-	Hiah Yield	Large	Small Cap	High Yield	Small Cap	Real	Emeraina	Small Cap	Glbl ex-	Real	Glbl ex-	Dev ex-	Dev ex-
U.S.	Equity	Cap	Equity	Fixed		U.S.		Cap	Equity	, i gi i i si	Equity	Estate	Market	Equity	U.S.	Estate	U.S.	U.S.	U.S.
Equity		Equity		Income		Equity		Equity					Equity		Fixed		Fixed	Equity	Equity
39.42%	18.33%	4.91%	18.37%	6.97%	-26.16%	33.67%	15.12%	2.11%	16.35%	7.44%	4.89%	-0.79%	11.19%	14.65%	-2.15%	21.91%	10.11%	12.62%	-14.29%
High Yield	Glbl ex-	Small Cap	Large	Large	Small Cap	Small Cap	Large	Cash	Large	Real	High Yield	Dev ex-	Real	Glbl ex-	Large	Emerging	Dev ex-	High Yield	Large
	U.S.	Equity	Сар	Сар	Equity	Equity	Сар	Equivalent	Сар	Estate		U.S.	Estate	U.S.	Сар	Market	U.S.		Сар
	Fixed		Equity	Equity			Equity		Equity			Equity		Fixed	Equity	Equity	Equity		Equity
28.97%	12.54%	4.55%	15.79%	5.49%	-33.79%	27.17%	15.06%	0.10%	16.00%	3.67%	2.45%	-3.04%	4.06%	10.51%	-4.38%	18.44%	7.59%	5.28%	-18.11%
Large	High Yield	Cash	High Yield	Cash	Large	Large	Dev ex-	Small Cap	High Yield	Cash	Cash	Small Cap	Dev ex-	Real	Real	High Yield	U.S.	Cash	Glbl ex-
Сар		Equivalent		Equivalent	Сар	Сар	U.S.	Equity		Equivalent	Equivalent	Equity	U.S.	Estate	Estate		Fixed	Equivalent	U.S.
Equity	44 4 20/	2.070/	44 050/	E 00%	Equity	Equity	Equity	4 4 9 9 /	45 040/	0.07%	0.029/	A A 40/	Equity	40.269/	E 629/	44.220/		0.05%	Fixed
20.00%	11.13%	J.U/ 70		J.UU%	-37.00%	20.47%	0.90%	-4.10%	13.01%	0.07%	0.03%	-4.41%	2.75%		-3.03%	14.32%		0.05%	-10.70%
	Large	High Yield	Gibi ex-	High Yield	Dev ex-	Gibi ex-	U.S. Eived	Real Estato	U.S. Eived	U.S. Eived	Emerging	High rield	U.S. Eived	High tield		U.S. Eived	High Yield	U.S. Eived	Emerging
Fixed	Fouity		Eived		Equity	Eived	Income	LSIAIC	Income	Income	Fouity		Income		Lquity	Income		Income	Fauity
19.36%	10.88%	2.74%	8.16%	1.87%	-43.56%	7.53%	6.54%	-6.46%	<b>4.21%</b>	-2.02%	-2.19%	-4.47%	<b>2.65%</b>	7.50%	-11.01%	8.72%	7.11%	-1.54%	-20.09%
U.S.	U.S.	U.S.	Cash	Small Cap	Real	U.S	Glbl ex-	Dev ex-	Glbl ex-	Emerging	Glbl ex-	Glbl ex-	Glbl ex-	U.S.	Dev ex-	Glbl ex-	Cash	Emerging	Small Cap
Fixed	Fixed	Fixed	Equivalent	Equity	Estate	Fixed	U.S.	U.S.	U.S.	Market	U.S.	U.S.	U.S.	Fixed	U.S.	U.S.	Equivalent	Market	Equity
Income	Income	Income				Income	Fixed	Equity	Fixed	Equity	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed	Income	Equity	Fixed		Equity	
4.10%	4.34%	2.43%	4.85%	-1.57%	-48.21%	5.93%	4.95%	-12.21%	4.09%	-2.60%	-3.09%	-6.02%	1.49%	3.54%	-14.09%	5.09%	0.67%	-2.54%	-20.44%
Cash	Cash	Glbl ex-	U.S.	Real	Emerging	Cash	Cash	Emerging	Cash	Glbl ex-	Dev ex-	Emerging	Cash	Cash	Emerging	Cash	Real	Glbl ex-	Real
Equivalent	Equivalent	U.S.	Fixed	Estate	Market	Equivalent	Equivalent	Market	Equivalent	U.S.	U.S.	Market	Equivalent	Equivalent	Market	Equivalent	Estate	U.S.	Estate
		Fixed	Income	_	Equity			Equity		Fixed	Equity	Equity			Equity			Fixed	
1.15%	1.33%	-8.65%	4.33%	-7.39%	-53.33%	0.21%	0.13%	-18.42%	0.11%	-3.08%	-4.32%	-14.92%	0.33%	0.86%	-14.57%	2.28%	-9.04%	-7.05%	-25.10%

The Callan Periodic Table of Investment Returns conveys the strong *case for diversification* across asset classes (stocks vs. bonds), capitalizations (large vs. small), and equity markets (U.S. vs. global ex-U.S.). The Table highlights the uncertainty inherent in all capital markets. Rankings change every year. Also noteworthy is the difference between absolute and relative performance, as returns for the top-performing asset class span a wide range over the past 20 years.

A printable copy of The Callan Periodic Table of Investment Returns is available on Callan's website at callan.com/periodic-table/. © 2023 Callan LLC

### Callan Periodic Table of Investment Returns

Callan's Periodic Table of Investment Returns depicts annual returns for 8 asset classes and cash equivalents, ranked from best to worst performance for each calendar year. The asset classes are color-coded to enable easy tracking over time. We describe the well-known, industry-standard market indices that we use as proxies for each asset class below.

- Large Cap Equity (S&P 500) measures the performance of large capitalization U.S. stocks. The S&P 500 is a market-value-weighted index of 500 stocks. The weightings make each company's influence on the Index performance directly proportional to that company's market value.
- Small Cap Equity (Russell 2000) measures the performance of small capitalization U.S. stocks. The Russell 2000 is a market-valueweighted index of the 2,000 smallest stocks in the broad-market Russell 3000 Index.
- Developed ex-U.S. Equity (MSCI World ex USA) is an index that is designed to measure the performance of large and mid cap equities in developed markets in Europe, the Middle East, the Pacific region, and Canada.
- Emerging Market Equity (MSCI Emerging Markets) is an index that is designed to measure the performance of equity markets in 24 emerging countries around the world.
- U.S. Fixed Income (Bloomberg US Aggregate Bond Index) includes U.S. government, corporate, and mortgage-backed securities with maturities of at least one year.
- High Yield (Bloomberg High Yield Bond Index) measures the market of USD-denominated, non-investment grade, fixed-rate, taxable corporate bonds. Securities are classified as high yield if the middle rating of Moody's, Fitch, and S&P is Ba1/BB+/BB+ or below, excluding emerging market debt.
- Global ex-U.S. Fixed Income (Bloomberg Global Aggregate ex US Bond Index) is an unmanaged index that is comprised of several other Bloomberg indices that measure the fixed income performance of regions around the world, excluding the U.S.
- Real Estate (FTSE EPRA Nareit Developed REIT Index) is designed to measure the stock performance of companies engaged in specific real estate activities in the North American, European, and Asian real estate markets.

• Cash Equivalent (90-day T-bill) is a short-term debt obligation backed by the Treasury Department of the U.S. government.

### Callan

Callan was founded as an employee-owned investment consulting firm in 1973. Ever since, we have empowered institutional clients with creative, customized investment solutions backed by proprietary research, exclusive data, and ongoing education. Today, Callan advises on more than \$3 trillion in total institutional investor assets, which makes it among the largest independently owned investment consulting firms in the U.S. We use a client-focused consulting model to serve pension and defined contribution plan sponsors, endowments, foundations, independent investment advisers, investment managers, and other asset owners. Callan has six offices throughout the U.S. Learn more at callan.com.

Corporate Headquarters :San Francisco

Regional Consulting Offices: Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, Portland, and Summit, NJ

The Callan Institute (the "Institute") is, and will be, the sole owner and copyright holder of all material prepared or developed by the Institute. No party has the right to reproduce, revise, resell, disseminate externally, disseminate to any affiliate firms, or post on internal websites any part of any material prepared or developed by the Institute, without the Institute's permission. Institute clients only have the right to utilize such material internally in their business.

callan.co

### NON-PARTICIPANT DIRECTED TARGET ASSET ALLOCATION



### Callan - Equity Analysis



### Callan 2Q23 Performance Report: Individual Option Performance

### Balanced & Target Date Funds

Investment Manager	Last Quarter Return	Last Year Return	3 Year Return	5 Year Return	7 Year Return	5 Year Risk	5 Year Risk Quadrant	5 Year Excess Rtn Ratio	3 Year Tracking Error	5 Year Sharpe Ratio
Asset Allocation										
Alaska Balanced Trust CAI MA Tgt Alloc Cons MFs	<b>2.0</b> 14	<b>5.9</b> 22	<b>3.0</b> 23	<b>4.3</b> 9	<b>4.6</b> 14	<b>8.5</b> 64		<b>0.2</b> 2	<b>0.5</b> 100	<b>0.3</b> 3
Passive Target	1.9 16	6.0 20	2.9 25	4.2 13	4.6 14	8.7 60				0.3 6
Alaska Long-Term Balanced CAI MA Tgt Alloc Mod MFs	<b>3.8</b> 27	<b>10.1</b> 23	<b>6.5</b> 36	<b>6.3</b> 26	<b>7.1</b> 28	<b>13.1</b> 56		<b>0.0</b> 24	<b>0.5</b> 100	<b>0.4</b> 21
Passive Target	3.6 30	10.4 21	6.4 37	6.3 26	7.2 27	13.4 52				0.4 24
Target 2010 Trust CAI Tgt Date 2010	<b>2.1</b> 19	<b>6.2</b> 23	<b>3.9</b> 20	<b>4.5</b> 22	<b>5.2</b> 22	<b>9.2</b> 72		<b>-0.1</b> 25	<b>0.4</b> 100	<b>0.3</b> 12
Custom Index	2.0 29	6.5 19	3.9 20	4.5 22	5.2 21	9.4 58				0.3 13
Target 2015 Trust CAI Tgt Date 2015	<b>2.5</b> 13	<b>7.1</b> 15	<b>4.8</b> 12	<b>5.1</b> 13	<b>6.0</b> 13	<b>10.3</b> 69		<b>0.1</b> 6	<b>0.5</b> 98	<b>0.3</b> 4
Custom Index	2.4 15	7.4 14	4.7 12	5.1 13	6.0 13	10.7 53				0.3 5
Target 2020 Trust CAI Tgt Date 2020	<b>3.1</b> 3	<b>8.5</b> 4	<b>5.9</b> 5	<b>5.8</b> 3	<b>6.9</b> 6	<b>12.1</b> 31		<b>0.1</b> 3	<b>0.5</b> 100	<b>0.4</b> 4
Custom Index	2.9 8	8.7 3	5.8 5	5.8 3	6.9 6	12.5 25				0.3 5
Target 2025 Trust CAI Tgt Date 2025	<b>3.8</b> 1	<b>10.3</b> 2	<b>7.1</b> 2	<b>6.6</b> 2	<b>7.8</b> 3	<b>14.0</b> 26		<b>0.2</b> 2	<b>0.5</b> 100	<b>0.4</b> 2
Custom Index	3.6 1	10.5 2	7.0 2	6.5 2	7.8 3	14.3 20				0.3 3
Target 2030 Trust CAI Tgt Date 2030	<b>4.4</b> 2	<b>11.7</b> 3	<b>8.2</b> 3	<b>7.2</b> 3	<b>8.5</b> 3	<b>15.6</b> 31		<b>0.1</b> 3	<b>0.5</b> 100	<b>0.4</b> 5
Custom Index	4.2 3	<b>11.9</b> 3	8.1 3	7.1 3	8.6 3	15.9 25				0.4 5
Target 2035 Trust CAI Tgt Date 2035	<b>5.0</b> 1	<b>13.1</b> 3	<b>9.2</b> 4	<b>7.7</b> 2	<b>9.2</b> 5	<b>16.9</b> 46		<b>0.2</b> 1	<b>0.5</b> 100	<b>0.4</b> 2
Custom Index	4.8 5	13.3 2	9.1 5	7.7 2	9.2 5	17.2 40				0.4 з
Target 2040 Trust	<b>5.4</b> 6	<b>14.2</b> 14	<b>10.0</b> 8	<b>8.2</b> 1	<b>9.7</b> 7	<b>18.1</b> 55		<b>0.2</b> 1	<b>0.5</b> 100	<b>0.4</b> 3
Custom Index	5.3 10	14.4 10	9.9 10	8.1 2	9.8 6	18.3 50				0.4 4
Target 2045 Trust	<b>5.8</b> 7	<b>15.1</b> 14	<b>10.8</b> 6	<b>8.5</b> 1	<b>10.1</b> 3	<b>18.9</b> 71		<b>0.2</b> 1	<b>0.5</b> 100	<b>0.4</b> 1
Custom Index	5.7 12	15.3 12	10.6 11	8.5 1	10.1 3	19.2 61				0.4 2

Returns: above median third quartile

fourth guartile

below median

Risk:

first quartile

Return

Risk Quadrant:

Risk

Excess Return Ratio: above median third quartile fourth quartile T

Tracking Error: below median second quartile first quartile Sharpe Ratio: above median third quartile



Oct. 12, 2023

### Alaska Retirement Management Board Defined Contribution Plans

Managed Accounts Analysis

**Ben Taylor** Senior Vice President, Head of Tax-Exempt DC Research

Butch Cliff, CFA Executive Vice President

Steve Center, CFA Senior Vice President

Patrick Wisdom Vice President

Important Disclosures regarding the use of this document are included at the end of this document. These disclosures are an integral part of this document and should be considered by the user.

### **Project Overview & Summary Findings**

### **Project Overview**

- The Alaska Retirement Managed Board (ARMB) engaged Callan to conduct a managed account review for the Alaska Defined Contribution (DC) Plans. Callan's process reviews the Plans' current managed account solution provided through Empower and powered by Morningstar.
- This report evaluates unique participants enrolled in the managed account service, returns, and the service's fund selection process. This report utilizes participant-level data provided by Empower and Morningstar.

### **Summary Findings**

- As of March 31, 2023, there are 10,337 unique ARMB participants enrolled in the managed account service, and these accounts have nearly \$1.6 billion in assets. Of these, 7,347 (71%) have 100% of their Alaska DC Plan(s) enrolled in the service. Moreover, 6,312 (61%) have 100% of their Alaska DC Plan(s) enrolled in the service and have not provided information on outside accounts.
- Morningstar's asset allocation methodology considers assets in both advisable accounts (i.e., ARMB DC Plan(s)) and, if provided, non-advisable (i.e., outside) accounts. In some cases, assets administered by Empower for a participant in another plan are also considered.
- Across the unique participants enrolled in the managed account service, 2,851 (28%) have had their equity constrained as a result of Morningstar's funded ratio methodology.
- Across 5-year age bands and over various trailing periods, returns for "Managed Account / Advice" participants have significantly and materially trailed those of "Target Date / Risk-Based" participants.
- Refer to p. 22 of this report for additional detail on Callan's methodology for the returns analysis.
- The key finding is that (1) the Morningstar methodology effectively generates a forecast as to what other financial capital a participant would ordinarily have from other employment prior to joining the Plan(s), and (2) that if those assets are not provided to the model, it will characterize the participant as underfunded for retirement, which can (3) result in constraining their equity position lower, causing (4) significant performance shortfalls relative to either a target date fund, or an allocation that would have been chosen if the information missing from the model had been provided.



**Unique Participant Analysis** 

### Who's Using Managed Accounts?

As of March 31, 2023, there are **10,337 unique ARMB participants** enrolled in the managed account service, and these participants have nearly **\$1.6 billion** in assets. More than half (55%) of enrolled participants are between the ages of 35 and 55.



### Age Distribution of ARMB Managed Account Participants (#)





<25 25-29 30-34 35-39 40-44 45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64 65+

Age Range	<25	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65+	TOTALS
Participants (#)	68	295	722	1,418	1,722	1,324	1,230	1,223	1,147	1,188	10,337
Participant Assets (\$M)	\$0.6	\$8.6	\$37.8	\$141.3	\$231.6	\$193.5	\$211.8	\$239.5	\$240.8	\$255.4	\$1,560.9
Average Participant Balance	\$8,582	\$29,082	\$52,302	\$99,644	\$134,509	\$146,124	\$172,202	\$195,793	\$210,003	\$215,004	\$150,999
Median Participant Balance	\$3,550	\$12,412	\$24,101	\$53,146	\$97,030	\$110,908	\$121,225	\$128,390	\$143,362	\$131,940	\$91,974

Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower and Morningstar.

### Takeaways:

- 1. Roughly 75% of users of the managed account service in the ARMB DC Plans are over 40, and nearly 90% of managed account assets managed in the Plans are held by participants over 40.
- 2. The average balance is materially higher than the median balance, indicating a bifurcated participant experience.

### Where do Managed Account Assets Reside?

Among managed account users, the stable value option has the highest share of assets (22%), followed by the U.S. Bond Index (13%). Of the Plans' investment options, 10 have at least 90% of managed accounts users with a balance.

Percentage of Managed Account



### Distribution of Managed Account Assets

Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower and Morningstar.

Callan Knowledge. Experience. Integrity.

### **Personalization**

The most common personalization provided by ARMB managed account participants is "adjusted" retirement age, which includes those who confirmed the default retirement age of 65. Specifically, 31% of all ARMB managed account participants have adjusted their retirement age to an age other the service's default of 65.

ARMB Managed Account Participants			ARMB Mar By # of Pe	naged rsona	Acc lizat	ount ions F	Partic Provic	ipan <sup>:</sup> led	ts	
Personalization Options	# Provided	% Provided	7,000							
"Adjusted" Retirement Age	9,808	95%	6,000		6,268	3				
Pensions	1,872	18%	ø 5.000							
Retirement Need	1,870	18%	Account							
Social Security	1,533	15%	d 4,000							
Spouse	1,277	12%	000,5 artic							
Outside Account	1,180	11%	₩ 2,000			1,296				
Constrained	449	4%	1,000	405			1,029	656	422	004
Life Expectancy	320	3%	0		1	2	2		E	204
TOTAL	10,337			U	I	∠ # of P	د ersona	4 alizatio	ວ ons Pr	ovidec

5

8

### Takeaways:

- 1. The most common customization provided is retirement age. However, merely interacting with this variable in the model counts as customizing it, even if it is left at 65. In reality, only 31% of participants have adjusted it to a different age.
- 2. Relatively few other customizations are provided by participants.
- 3. Adding back Social Security is a common personalization for participants over the age of 50, whereby for those over 50, 26% of participants have customized to add back in Social Security, with an average benefit per year added of \$16,584.

### **Equity Analysis**

### Equity by Age

<u>Note</u>: Yellow line represents Alaska TDF glidepath. Green line represents average total equity for ARMB participants with 100% of their Alaska DC Plan(s) enrolled in the managed account service and with no outside accounts provided (6,312) by 5-year age cohorts. Gray shaded area represents 90<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> percentile equity for off-the-shelf TDF glidepaths.



Age Range	<25	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65+
Average Equity, ARMB 100% Managed Account Participants With No Outside Accounts Provided	81%	83%	80%	70%	66%	61%	57%	51%	47%	45%
% ARMB Managed Account Participants With No Outside Accounts Within +/- 10% Equity of Age-Aligning AK TDF	25%	36%	34%	21%	16%	8%	8%	10%	13%	39%
% ARMB Managed Account Participants With No Outside Accounts Within +/- 20% Equity of Age-Aligning AK TDF	26%	36%	38%	29%	26%	25%	31%	33%	50%	59%

Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower, Morningstar, and Callan.

### Callan

### Takeaways:

- 1. The average equity of portfolios constructed by the Morningstar managed account service is materially lower than either the average target date fund, the Plans' custom target date fund, or the Morningstar moderate glidepath.
- 2. Prior to age 60, the equity gap between the average managed account portfolio and an age-equivalent target date fund is so large that at all ages, more than half of managed account users have portfolios that are more than 20% lower in equity exposure than they would be had they invested in the Plans' age-equivalent custom target date fund.

### Equity Analysis (Cont.)



Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower, Morningstar, and Callan.

### **Equity Analysis (Cont.)**

Participant Age Band	Average Participant Equity in Advisable & Non-Advisable (Outside) Accounts (Morningstar-Provided Data)	Average Participant Equity in Advisable Accounts (Empower-Provided Data)
<25	84%	86%
25-29	87%	86%
30-34	82%	82%
35-39	70%	71%
40-44	65%	66%
45-49	60%	61%
50-54	55%	57%
55-59	51%	52%
60-64	46%	47%
>=65	44%	45%

Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower, Morningstar, and Callan.

### Takeaways:

- 1. It is possible that lower equity positions result from the managed account creating a "completion portfolio" that adopts lower-risk portfolios to pair with higher equity positions held elsewhere.
- To test this hypothesis, Callan compared two groups. The first group on p. 10 is a representation of all managed account participants in the ARMB DC Plans, in blue. In green, we represent the experience of participants who had (1) 100% of their assets invested in the ARMB DC Plans controlled by the managed account service, and (2) did not add outside account balances into the model.
- 3. As is clearly apparent from the graphic, the two lines are nearly overlapping, and both diverge materially from the target date funds. The same is shown in the data table that follows the graphic.
- 4. The principal explanation for the divergence in equity is found in the practice of constraining the equity exposure of participants who are determined to fall short of a "funding ratio" threshold within the model. This itself is likely triggered more commonly due to the demographics of the Plans.

### **Equity Analysis (Cont.)**

- Callan ran two multiple linear regressions:
  - Dependent variable = Managed Account Actual Equity – Age-Aligning Alaska Target Date Fund Equity
  - Independent variables (categorical, not directional) = Retirement Age (RA), Retirement Need (RN), Pension (P), Social Security (SS), Spouse (S), Outside Account(s) (OA), Constrained (C), Life Expectancy (LE)
- Interpreting the regression results:
  - Intercepts of -15% / -17% indicate managed account actual equity is 15% / 17% lower, on average, than age-aligning Alaska target date fund equity when no personalizations are provided
  - When retirement age is "adjusted", managed account actual equity is 4% / 2% lower, on average, than age-aligning Alaska target date fund equity

Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower, Morningstar, and Callan.

Callan

The below table displays the intercepts and coefficients for each independent variable in the regressions.

Participant Group	All managed account participants (10,337)	Participants with 100% of their Alaska DC Plan(s) enrolled in M* and with no outside accounts provided (6,312)
Variable	Coe	fficients
Intercept	-15%	-17%
"Adjusted" Retirement Age	-4%	-2%
Retirement Need	5%	4%
Pensions	3%	4%
Social Security	6%	8%
Spouse	3%	6%
Outside Account	-2%	0%
Constrained	5%	5%
Life Expectancy	-1%	-1%
	Participant GroupVariableVariableIntercept'Adjusted'' Retirement AgeRetirement NeeddPensionsSocial SecuritySpouseOutside AccountConstrainedLife Expectancy	Participant GroupAll managed account participants (10,337)VariableCoeIntercept-15%"Adjusted" Retirement Age-4%Retirement Need5%Pensions3%Social Security6%Spouse3%Outside Account-2%Constrained5%Life Expectancy-1%

### Takeaways:

- Depending upon the comparison point used (all managed account users, or just those over whose assets the model has 100% control), the intercept estimate can be interpreted to mean that in the absence of any other customization, equity is either 15% lower, or 17% lower, on average, when compared to the Plans' age-aligning target date fund.
- 2. Contrary to intuition, when items such as a Social Security benefit, or the presence of a defined benefit pension are added, the model **adds equity**, rather than reducing it.
- 3. Callan's findings are that this is primarily explained by the funding ratio methodology. Under this methodology, if a participant in the ARMB DC Plans is assessed to have a funding ratio below 70%, the participant is constrained to a lower equity position, as shown on the graphic on the subsequent page. The funding ratio thresholds and equity constraints are the actual constraints in place for the Plans.

### **Funding Ratio Equity Constraints**



Data as of March 31, 2023. Source: Morningstar.

### **Financial Capital Equity Reduction for Constrained Participants**

The below chart plots the extent of equity reduction for the 2,851 ARMB managed account participants whose equity has been constrained by their funded ratio.



Data as of March 31, 2023. Source: Morningstar.

Callan Knowledge. Experience. Integrity.

### Takeaways:

- 1. The blue dots on the prior page represent the magnitude of the equity constraint applied to an individual participant.
- 2. The X-Axis of this graphic uses Morningstar's nomenclature, which is years to retirement. As an example, someone with a target retirement age of 65, who is 65, would show as a zero on this chart. Callan's slides normally use age.
- 3. The green line shows the simple average (not asset-weighted) level of equity constraint in place for each age cohort.
- 4. Notably, while the magnitude is smaller, the **majority** of participants 30+ years away from retirement are constrained.
- 5. The average level of constraint in the 20 years leading up to retirement hovers near 20%, consistent with Callan's statistical analysis, and the degree of difference shown in the constraint graphic on p. 15.
### **Estimated Expense**

- The managed account service has the below fee schedule shown in the left table.
- Based on participant balances as of March 31, 2023, the total estimated advisory fee for the service is \$5,562,612.

Asset Range	Advisory Fee	# ARMB Participants	% ARMB Participants
Up to \$100,000	0.45%	5,382	52%
Next \$150,000	0.35%	2,899	28%
Next \$150,000	0.25%	1,216	12%
> \$400,000	0.15%	840	8%

Estimated Expense Type*	%
Estimated Asset-Weighted Advisory Expense	0.36%
Estimated Equal-Weighted Advisory Expense	0.42%
Estimated Asset-Weighted Total Expense	0.52%
Estimated Equal-Weighted Total Expense	0.58%



#### **Average Equal-Weighted Total Expense Ratios**

\*Estimated expense types represent estimated annual expenses based on participant balances as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower and Morningstar.

### **Effect of Returns & Fees on Accumulated Assets**

The chart displays projected asset accumulation over a 10-year period assuming a starting balance of about \$150,000 and a quarterly participant contribution of \$1,300. The **green line** assumes an annualized return equal to the median 10-year return for Target Date / Risk-Based participants between the ages of 61 and 65 (6.6%). The **blue line** assumes the same annualized return, less the fee differential between the total expense for the managed account service and the age-aligning Alaska Target Date Fund. The total expense for the managed account service advisory expenses, based on the assumed balance at each age, and observed average underlying fund expenses by 5-year participant age bands. The **orange line** assumes an annualized return equal to the median 10-year return for Managed Account / Advice participants between the ages of 61 and 65 with 100% of their Alaska DC Plan(s) enrolled in the managed account service and no outside accounts provided (5.3%).



Note: Historical returns information in this analysis is not indicative of future results. Data as of March 31, 2023. Source: Callan.

### Takeaways:

- The chart on p. 19 is a stylized illustration. As such, it is not a representation of any individual participant account, or an average experience. It is also time-period dependent and uses the longest time period for which Callan was provided performance data.
- 2. The purpose of the chart is to illustrate the difference in impact of different features of a managed account vis a vis a target date fund. These features are as follows:
  - There is an additional fee burden associated with paying for the managed account service. There is also a fee difference between the portfolios composed of options within the lineup and those offered by the target date funds.
  - There is a performance difference, which comes from the underlying funds utilized by the service as compared to the target date funds.
- Because the illustration used the observed annualized median return for managed account participants aged 61-65 over the 10-year period for which Callan was supplied performance data, the differences between the accumulated values can be interpreted to illustrate the following:
  - A fee impact over the 10-year period of approximately 4% of the theoretical total balance.
  - A combined effect of fees and fund selection/asset allocation of 10%.
  - An approximate effect of fund selection/asset allocation, irrespective of fees, of ~7%.



**Returns Analysis** 

# **Returns Analysis Methodology**

• The following section examines historical returns for 2 subsets of ARMB participants:

- Managed Accounts / Advice Participants who have had 100% of their Alaska DC Plan(s) enrolled in the managed account service for the entirety of a trailing period and who did not provide information on outside accounts.
- Target Date / Risk-Based Participants who were 100% invested in one or more Alaska Target Date Funds in all of their Alaska DC Plans as of March 31, 2023. Notably, participants may be invested in an Alaska Target Date Fund other than the one they would be defaulted into provided their date of birth.
- All returns shown are money weighted, net of fees (e.g., quoted recordkeeping fee, investment management fees, advisory fees), and only include participants with account balances greater than \$2,500.
- For participants in multiple ARMB DC Plans, plan returns are weighted based on plan account balances as of March 31, 2023, to generate a total aggregated return for each participant.
- All plan-level return and balance data was provided by Empower.

### Annualized Returns – Ages <=25

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-1.7%	13.4%			
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.8%	12.2%			
Median	-6.9%	6.3%			
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-10.2%	2.3%			
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-12.0%	0.5%			

#### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	2.4%	15.7%	7.5%	8.4%	
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-0.1%	14.8%	7.0%	8.1%	
Median	-3.6%	9.9%	6.5%	7.1%	
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.9%	6.6%	6.0%	6.6%	
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.4%	4.4%	4.6%	5.2%	

### Annualized Returns – Ages 26-30

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.5%	13.6%	5.8%		
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.2%	12.1%	5.5%		
Median	-6.4%	9.6%	5.1%		
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-8.1%	6.6%	4.8%		
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-11.0%	4.5%	4.1%		

#### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	0.3%	16.1%	7.5%	9.0%	8.3%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.2%	15.5%	7.2%	8.7%	8.1%
Median	-5.4%	12.4%	6.8%	8.2%	7.7%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.9%	9.0%	6.4%	7.6%	7.2%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.3%	5.9%	5.9%	6.4%	5.6%

### Annualized Returns – Ages 31-35

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.2%	14.3%	6.0%	7.8%	6.7%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.3%	13.0%	5.6%	7.5%	6.7%
Median	-6.3%	11.6%	5.2%	7.1%	6.7%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.6%	8.9%	4.6%	6.7%	6.7%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-10.8%	6.4%	3.9%	6.5%	6.7%

#### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-1.5%	16.2%	7.5%	9.2%	8.7%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.7%	16.0%	7.3%	9.0%	8.4%
Median	-6.0%	14.1%	7.1%	8.5%	8.2%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.8%	11.2%	6.7%	8.0%	7.9%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.1%	7.7%	6.3%	7.6%	7.6%

### Annualized Returns – Ages 36-40

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.5%	15.3%	6.0%	8.0%	7.5%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.4%	13.8%	5.8%	7.6%	7.2%
Median	-6.5%	12.1%	5.3%	7.2%	6.9%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-8.0%	10.5%	4.8%	6.8%	6.6%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-10.4%	7.6%	4.2%	5.8%	5.8%

#### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.6%	16.3%	7.5%	9.3%	8.8%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.2%	16.1%	7.4%	9.1%	8.6%
Median	-6.2%	14.6%	7.2%	8.7%	8.3%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.8%	12.1%	6.9%	8.2%	8.1%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.1%	8.7%	6.5%	7.8%	7.8%

### Annualized Returns – Ages 41-45

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.3%	14.5%	6.0%	7.8%	7.4%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.1%	13.3%	5.7%	7.4%	7.0%
Median	-6.1%	11.5%	5.2%	7.1%	6.7%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.6%	10.0%	4.8%	6.5%	6.4%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-9.7%	8.1%	4.4%	5.8%	5.6%

#### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.3%	16.3%	7.5%	9.3%	8.8%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.0%	16.0%	7.3%	9.1%	8.6%
Median	-6.0%	14.2%	7.1%	8.6%	8.3%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.7%	11.6%	6.8%	8.2%	8.0%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.0%	8.2%	6.4%	7.7%	7.8%

### Annualized Returns – Ages 46-50

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.3%	13.6%	5.9%	7.4%	7.1%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.0%	12.0%	5.5%	7.0%	6.8%
Median	-5.9%	10.6%	5.1%	6.7%	6.5%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.2%	9.4%	4.8%	6.3%	6.2%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-8.6%	7.5%	4.3%	5.7%	5.4%

#### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.4%	15.3%	7.2%	9.0%	8.6%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.7%	14.9%	7.0%	8.7%	8.3%
Median	-5.7%	13.2%	6.8%	8.3%	8.1%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.4%	10.7%	6.5%	7.9%	7.8%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.7%	7.3%	6.1%	7.3%	7.5%

### Annualized Returns – Ages 51-55

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.9%	12.9%	5.9%	7.4%	7.2%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.7%	11.3%	5.4%	6.7%	6.5%
Median	-5.5%	9.9%	5.0%	6.3%	6.2%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.8%	8.8%	4.7%	6.0%	5.9%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.9%	7.3%	4.3%	5.5%	5.5%

#### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.1%	14.1%	6.8%	8.5%	8.2%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.4%	13.7%	6.7%	8.2%	7.9%
Median	-5.4%	12.3%	6.4%	7.8%	7.6%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.0%	10.1%	6.1%	7.4%	7.4%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.3%	6.9%	5.7%	6.8%	7.1%

### Annualized Returns – Ages 56-60

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90th Percentile	-3.6%	11.5%	5.5%	7.0%	6.6%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.3%	10.0%	5.0%	6.4%	6.1%
Median	-5.1%	8.9%	4.7%	5.8%	5.6%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.3%	7.8%	4.4%	5.4%	5.2%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.3%	6.2%	4.0%	4.9%	4.8%

#### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.3%	12.8%	6.4%	7.9%	7.7%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.2%	12.4%	6.2%	7.6%	7.4%
Median	-4.9%	11.1%	6.0%	7.3%	7.2%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.5%	9.1%	5.6%	6.8%	6.9%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.8%	6.6%	5.3%	6.3%	6.5%

### Annualized Returns – Ages 61-65

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.7%	10.6%	5.3%	6.3%	6.1%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.1%	9.2%	4.8%	5.8%	5.6%
Median	-4.9%	8.1%	4.5%	5.4%	5.3%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.8%	7.3%	4.2%	5.1%	5.0%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.8%	6.4%	3.9%	4.7%	4.7%

#### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.3%	11.3%	5.9%	7.3%	7.2%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.8%	11.0%	5.7%	7.1%	6.9%
Median	-4.5%	9.8%	5.5%	6.6%	6.6%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.0%	8.3%	5.2%	6.3%	6.3%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.3%	5.7%	4.8%	5.8%	6.0%

### Annualized Returns – Ages 66-70

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.5%	10.4%	5.3%	6.0%	5.7%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.1%	9.0%	4.8%	5.5%	5.3%
Median	-4.9%	7.9%	4.3%	5.0%	4.7%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.0%	6.7%	4.1%	4.6%	4.4%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.9%	5.6%	3.5%	4.1%	4.1%

#### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.7%	9.6%	5.3%	6.7%	6.6%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.7%	9.5%	5.2%	6.4%	6.4%
Median	-4.3%	8.7%	5.0%	6.0%	6.0%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.5%	7.5%	4.7%	5.7%	5.7%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.9%	5.6%	4.2%	5.3%	5.5%

### Annualized Returns – Ages 71-75

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.7%	10.9%	5.4%	7.3%	5.6%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.3%	9.7%	5.0%	6.6%	5.4%
Median	-5.3%	8.4%	4.6%	5.5%	4.6%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.5%	7.1%	4.2%	4.9%	4.4%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.6%	6.2%	3.9%	4.5%	4.2%

#### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.5%	8.6%	5.0%	6.1%	6.2%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.3%	7.8%	4.7%	5.6%	5.7%
Median	-3.8%	7.6%	4.5%	5.4%	5.4%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.0%	6.7%	4.2%	5.1%	5.1%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.5%	4.4%	3.8%	4.7%	4.7%

### Annualized Returns – Ages >=76

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90th Percentile	-4.0%	11.2%	5.5%	6.6%	5.7%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.5%	10.3%	5.1%	5.8%	5.3%
Median	-5.6%	8.7%	4.6%	5.5%	5.0%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.4%	7.4%	4.3%	5.3%	4.9%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-8.7%	6.5%	4.0%	4.7%	4.8%

#### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.4%	8.4%	4.8%	6.3%	6.0%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.0%	7.1%	4.3%	5.6%	5.5%
Median	-3.6%	6.4%	3.9%	5.0%	4.9%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.9%	5.7%	3.7%	4.6%	4.6%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.3%	4.8%	3.3%	4.4%	4.4%



**Fund Selection** 

## Forward-Looking Alpha Forecasts and Fund Selection

While asset allocation is determined via a separate process, Morningstar does also utilize a methodology for determining which funds to utilize in order achieve the desired asset allocation for a given participant.

An evaluation of these techniques as applied to the Alaska Plans yielded several observations, including:

- There is room for improvement with respect to quality control. Initial investigations revealed that one fund (BlackRock Strategic Completion NL F) was incorrectly benchmarked in a clearly noticeable fashion, and incorrectly utilized until this was pointed about by Callan. A subsequent re-evaluation resulted in increased usage of this fund.
- There is no clear theoretical basis for the use of blended 12- and 36-month trailing performance deviations to forecast future performance deviations. Additionally, doing so would run contrary to expected mean reversion.
- The calculation methodology utilizes standard Morningstar peer group benchmarks for each asset class to calculate outperformance for the calculation, irrespective of whether there are clear and known benchmark mismatches that will cause errors. For example, the S&P 500 index is measured against a composite benchmark that uses the Russell 1000 Total Return and Russell 2500 Total Return indexes to represent US Large Cap and US Mid Cap. As a result, a composite benchmark created from a returns-based style analysis reflected significant persistent "alpha" for this index fund, when the result of that was caused by index construction rather than any actual "alpha".
- The realized impact of these differences is likely to be small in a lineup from an institutional plan sponsor such as ARMB, due to the relatively small number of options for each asset class.

# **Forward-Looking Alpha Calculation Steps**

The steps undertaken to calculate the forward-looking alpha and tracking error used for fund selection by Morningstar for each fund are as follows:

- 1. Run a returns-based style analysis (essentially a regression of returns vs. returns of selected indexes), which results in "style weights" for the fund in question, relative to each index.
- 2. Use the weights derived in step 1 to create a custom benchmark for the fund, using the weights derived from the regression.
- 3. Determine the "excess return" for the fund vs. the custom benchmark for the fund.
- 4. Calculate the 12 month "alpha" and "tracking error" for the fund. Note that for the "alpha" calculation, this involves adding back in the fee to the net of fees returns used in steps 1-3. It is not risk-adjusted.
- 5. Perform the same calculation in #4, but for 36 months instead of 12.
- 6. A pooled calculation using weights for the two time periods is conducted, creating a blended calculated forward-looking "alpha" and "tracking error" calculation vis a vis the custom benchmark produced in step 2.
- 7. The calculation is readjusted to account for fees to convert expectations back into a net of fees calculation. This final result is the calculated forward-looking "alpha" and "tracking error".

# Portfolio Construction and use of Forward-Looking Alpha and Tracking Error

- While the Morningstar white paper (chapter 4) that covers fund selection refers to calculations that incorporate Morningstar analyst ratings in the fund selection process, the actual calculations reviewed by Callan for the ARMB DC Plans do not include this step.
- Additional optimization constraints are applied, consistent with the asset allocation process more broadly. However, ultimately the key inputs for fund selection are the forward-looking alpha (net of fees) and tracking error, and funds are selected for each portfolio consistent with the highest forward-looking alpha for a given level of acceptable tracking error.

**Summary:** The forward-looking alpha and tracking error estimation process lacks a clear theoretical underpinning, is inconsistently applied, ignores benchmark mismatches in the returnsbased style analysis by design, creates spurious forecasts (such as persistent forward-looking alpha for an index fund of 43 basis points, in the Alaska Plans), and can misclassify funds (e.g., BlackRock Strategic Completion). However, for a lineup with relatively few investment choices within each asset class, it is unlikely to cause significant changes to target portfolios, as there are relatively few options from which to select for a given exposure.

# **Summary Commentary**

- 1. The Morningstar methodology offered by Empower employs an overall lifecycle investing approach, in which a combination of financial and human capital exist for any participant using the service.
- 2. This methodology inherently generates a hypothesis as to what other financial capital a participant has accumulated during their working life.
- 3. The methodology also includes a practice of constraining the equity allocation of participants that are assessed to have funding ratios below 70%.
- 4. It is possible to chronically trigger this equity constraint in plans where many components of a participant's outof-plan assets are not visible to the model, and when a participant doesn't fully customize to reflect these assets.
- 5. The performance record of the managed account service over nearly all measured periods over the past decade, ending March 31, 2023, shows investors utilizing the managed account service for all their assets within the ARMB DC Plans materially trail the performance of investors in an age-equivalent target date fund.
- 6. The principal explanatory variable for this performance differential is the presence of the equity constraint, which is itself associated with the funding ratio threshold of 70%. The application of the funding ratio constraint is influenced by the degree of customization (or lack thereof) provided by ARMB participants using the service, which is observed to be low, as well as the demographics of these participants.

### **Disclosures**

Information contained in this document may include confidential, trade secret and/or proprietary information of Callan and the client. It is incumbent upon the user to maintain such information in strict confidence. Neither this document nor any specific information contained herein is to be used other than by the intended recipient for its intended purpose.

The investment managers included in this review book are per the request of the client. The information related to each investment manager is being provided solely for comparison purposes and is not the result of Callan's Manager Search process. Callan has neither rejected nor endorsed these investment managers or their respective strategies. The content of this document is particular to the client and should not be relied upon by any other individual or entity. There can be no assurance that the performance of any account or investment will be comparable to the performance information presented in this document.

Certain information herein has been compiled by Callan from a variety of sources believed to be reliable but for which Callan has not necessarily verified for accuracy or completeness. Information contained herein may not be current. Callan has no obligation to bring current the information contained herein.

This content of this document may consist of statements of opinion, which are made as of the date they are expressed and are not statements of fact. The opinions expressed herein may change based upon changes in economic, market, financial and political conditions and other factors. Callan has no obligation to bring current the opinions expressed herein.

The statements made herein may include forward-looking statement regarding future results. The forward-looking statements herein: (i) are best estimations consistent with the information available as of the date hereof and (ii) involve known and unknown risks and uncertainties. Actual results may vary, perhaps materially, from the future results projected in this document. Undue reliance should not be placed on forward-looking statements.

Callan disclaims any responsibility for reviewing the risks of individual securities or the compliance/non-compliance of individual security holdings with a client's investment policy guidelines.

This document should not be construed as legal or tax advice on any matter. You should consult with legal and tax advisers before applying any of this information to your particular situation.

Reference to, or inclusion in this document of, any product, service or entity should not necessarily be construed as recommendation, approval, or endorsement or such product, service or entity by Callan.

This document is provided in connection with Callan's consulting services and should not be viewed as an advertisement of Callan, or of the strategies or products discussed or referenced herein.

The issues considered and risks highlighted herein are not comprehensive and other risks may exist that the user of this document may deem material regarding the enclosed information.

Any decision you make on the basis of this document is sole responsibility of the client, as the intended recipient, and it is incumbent upon you to make an independent determination of the suitability and consequences of such a decision.

Callan undertakes no obligation to update the information contained herein except as specifically requested by the client. Past performance is no guarantee of future results.

#### State of Alaska ALASKA RETIREMENT MANAGEMENT BOARD Relating to the Empower Managed Account Service: "My Total Retirement" for Defined Contribution Plans, Deferred Compensation Plan, and the Supplemental Annuity Plan

Resolution 2023-18

WHEREAS, the Alaska Retirement Management Board ("ARMB") was established under AS 37.10.210(a) to serve as trustee of the assets of the State's retirement systems; and

WHEREAS, under AS 37.10.220, the ARMB is to establish and determine the investment objectives and policy for each of the funds entrusted to it; and

WHEREAS, AS 37.10.071(c) and AS 37.10.210(a) require the ARMB to apply the prudent investor rule and exercise its fiduciary duty in the sole financial best interest of the funds entrusted to it and treat beneficiaries thereof with impartiality; and

WHEREAS, under AS 37.10.220(a)(5) the ARMB is to provide a range of investment options and establish the rules by which participants can direct their investments among those options with respect to accounts established under the Defined Contribution plans, the Supplemental Annuity Plan ("SBS-AP"), and the public employees' Deferred Compensation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Department of Administration has contracted with Empower to be the recordkeeper for the Defined Contribution, Deferred Compensation, and Supplemental Annuity Plans and has included a Managed Account Service ("My Total Retirement," formerly "Reality Investing") that takes discretionary control of a participant's account and implements investment advice for a fee that is based on a percentage of assets under management; and

WHEREAS, in a 2023 analysis of defined contribution providers, the ARMB's investment consultant, Callan, found that fee-based managed account services were common and present in 67% of defined contribution plans with assets greater than \$5 billion (Exhibit 1, page 4); and

WHEREAS, at the September 14, 2022, ARMB Defined Contribution Plan Committee meeting, Empower provided an overview of its Managed Account Service. During that meeting the Committee asked Empower for more information related to the performance of the service; and

WHEREAS, during the November 2022 and March 2023 Defined Contribution Plan Committee meetings, Empower presented additional information regarding the performance of its Managed Account Service that was incorrect; and

WHEREAS, on March 16, 2023, the ARMB directed staff to engage with Callan to conduct a thorough analysis of the Empower Managed Account Service, including the performance of the service; and

WHEREAS, the Callan ARMB Managed Account Analysis (Exhibit 2) provides an analysis of the Empower Manage Account Service and focuses on the level of participant engagement, asset allocation, account performance, and fund selection. The report uses information and data provided by Empower and their Independent Financial Expert, Morningstar; and

WHEREAS, the Callan ARMB Managed Account Analysis focused on unique participants enrolled in the Managed Account service. As of March 31, 2023, there were 10,337 unique ARMB participants enrolled in the Managed Account Service and these accounts had nearly \$1.6 billion in assets. Of these, 7,347 (71%) had 100% of their Alaska plans enrolled in the Empower Managed Account Service (page 3); and

WHEREAS, the Callan ARMB Managed Account Analysis showed that the majority of Managed Accounts had low levels of participant engagement (pages 6-7), a significant underweight to equity investments compared to 70 target date fund peers (pages 8-9 and 13-14), and average fees that were over five times higher than the Alaska Target Date Funds (page 18) – the current default option for participants; and

WHEREAS, the Callan ARMB Managed Account Analysis found that across the unique participants enrolled in the Managed Account service, 2,851 (28%) had the level of portfolio equity exposure reduced due to the Managed Account Service Funding Ratio methodology (pages 15-17), even though most participants did not provide meaningful additional account information or personalization. This resulted in the median Managed Account participant having materially lower equity exposure in their portfolio when compared to the Alaska Target Date Glidepath (pages 10-14), or to the Morningstar Moderate Glide Path, which is similar; and

WHEREAS, in the Callan ARMB Managed Account Analysis the dollar-weighted returns for Managed Accounts were calculated and compared to Alaska's corresponding Target Date Funds. The median Managed Account Service account underperformed the median Target Date Fund across almost all age groups and time periods (pages 22-34). The underperformance of the median participant in the Managed Account Service was the result of a combination of factors including a higher level of fees and lower level of average equity exposure.

# NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ALASKA RETIREMENT MANAGEMENT BOARD, that

- 1. The ARMB expects the current Managed Account structure to continue to have lower investment performance due to the combined effect of its asset allocation, higher fees, and low participant engagement.
- 2. The ARMB recommends that the Department of Administration close Managed Accounts to all new participants in any Alaska retirement plan.
- 3. The ARMB directs staff to work with the Department of Administration and others to provide the board with additional recommendations with respect to Managed Accounts.

Exhibits:

- 1. Callan Best Practices for Evaluating Managed Accounts
- 2. Callan ARMB Managed Account Analysis

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this \_\_\_\_\_ day of October, 2023

Chair

ATTEST:

Secretary



# Best Practices for Evaluating Managed Accounts

National Conference Scottsdale, Arizona April 2–4, 2023

Craig Chaikin, CFA Investment Consulting Jamie McAllister Defined Contribution Consulting

Ben Taylor Defined Contribution Consulting

### **Presenters**



Craig Chaikin, CFA Jamie McAllister Ben Taylor



### **Overview**

### Advice and managed accounts

Multiple solutions are available to provide personalized advice, guidance, and/or management for DC participants.

These products range from offering basic information and guidance to those that will actually implement advice on the participant's behalf.

- ▶ Basic information and guidance offer general information, typically not personalized.
- Online advice providers offer specific investment advice tailored to the DC participant's needs. They are suitable for "hands-on" participants who want additional guidance.
- Managed accounts are geared for do-it-for-me investors, as the 3(38) provider implements the advice by taking discretionary control of the participant's account (typically for a fee).

Plan sponsors can offer both advice and managed accounts or treat them as separate standalone features.

Target date funds and managed accounts may compete to act as the plan's QDIA but can also be offered side-by-side.



# **Range of Inputs and Features Available**

Both advice and managed accounts generally have:



Retirement income forecasting



Phone support



Communications Support



Reporting





Discretionary implementation of solutions



Ongoing asset-based fees



Integration with DC recordkeeper



Incorporate Social Security and outside assets



ocial Incorporate pretax, nd after tax, Roth, ets catch-up



Data updates



# **DC Trends: Managed Accounts and Advice**

### Types of services offered by size

- Smaller plans are more likely to offer guidance, advice, seminars, and financial wellness services than plans with more than \$1 billion in assets.
- Larger plans were more likely to offer a managed account service.





# **Managed Account Marketplace is Highly Concentrated**

- There are a handful of major vendors in the managed account marketplace, dominated by three large players.
- Of these, only two are available on more than one recordkeeping platform.
- This means that when plans change recordkeepers, or evaluate a solution, platform methodology differences can have significant impacts on the recordkeeper search process and participants.







### **Managed Account Fees**

- Managed account asset-based fees tend to decrease when a plan has more assets invested in managed accounts.
- Managed accounts can be a significant source of revenue.

#### Fees by Plan Size



Source: Callan DC client data



# Frames of Due Diligence for Managed Accounts

Prohibited transaction exemption





# **Frames of Due Diligence for Managed Accounts**

TCW / model prohibited transaction exemption



Effective August 1, 1997, Department of Labor issued **Prohibited Transaction Exemption (PTE 97-60)** 



TCW needed to engage a financial expert



TCW cannot receive compensation for asset allocation or investment advice, only for proprietary funds



TCW disclosures

#### Exemptive relief for:

Receipt of variable fees resulting from providing investment advice to plan participants

2 The purchase and sale of proprietary investments



# **Frames of Due Diligence for Managed Accounts**

IFE / SunAmerica prohibited transaction exemption



December 14, 2001 letter provided exemption for prohibited transaction restrictions



Inferred independence between the fiduciary and expert



Outlined similar disclosures to TCW exemption

Ultimately developed into similar exemptions in Pension Protection Act ERISA §408(g) and IRC §4975(f)(8)

Allows model developer and fiduciary to be affiliated or the same entity; requires model be certified by an independent financial expert

Exemption allows the fiduciary advisor to recommend, through the computer model, proprietary products and products that pay the fiduciary advisor a commission.


# **Due Diligence for Managed Accounts**

Information we collect





### What Data Are Used to Create Allocations?

- Among the top two providers, there is great uniformity among what data are used to create allocations.
- For other providers, the amount of data used diminishes quickly and is derived from other variables.
- Many allocations are similar to aligning participants along one of several risk-based glidepaths, requiring relatively simple selection criteria.
- Most variables change little over time.

#### **Recordkeeper Platform**

Age

Salary

Pretax, Roth, post-tax contribution Pretax, Roth, post-tax balance SMART / auto-increase Employer match Profit sharing State of residence (tax) Retirement need Gender Defined benefit plans (if provided) Cash balance plans (if provided) Company stock allocation Employee incentive stock options Current investment allocation

#### **Derived from Platform**

Mortality (age + gender) Retirement age (age) Social security (age + earnings) Income tax (salary + state)

### Participant Provides Spouse age Spouse gender Spouse retire age Spouse social security Spouse life expectancy

Spouse defined benefit Household cash flows Spousal accounts Outside accounts Risk preference

**Bequest** 



## **Common Implementation Pitfalls**

Mandatory employee contributions, a pension, etc. are not correctly, if at all, accounted for in income replacement projections and resulting asset allocations.



- Self-discovery often does not provide significant participant information.
- Process only shifts some participants modestly along various glidepaths.

 Glidepath easily replicated with a tool for participants to self-assess risk, a custom recordkeeping solution.



### **Case Study**

### Large public defined contribution plan

### Overview

- \$5 billion in assets across multiple plans and over 200,000 accounts
- Managed account usage was approximately 9,800 participants
- Recordkeeper had a contingent fee that incentivized pushing managed account
- Callan examined direct implementation of managed accounts across the plans and found:
  - Glidepath was not very responsive (only at certain points of the path) to the presence of the defined benefit plan.
  - Glidepaths remained highly consistent over time-the service was not routinely altering asset allocation.

### **Recordkeeper RFP Questions**

- What do we do with the large existing managed account user population?
- Retaining the existing methodology cuts out several providers who don't have the platform.
- Changing methodology will change participant outcomes and pricing substantially.

Recordkeepers claim managed accounts promote "engagement" and higher savings rates. Is this true, or, are engaged users more prone to use services **because** they are engaged?



### **Scenario Testing: Examples of Participant Profiles**

We tested scenarios that varied inputs such as age, balance, defined benefit pension tenure (5-year increments), outside assets, salary, gender, and risk tolerance to test which variables would shift asset allocations, and to what extent.





## Participant A 35 and 45 Years Old Moderate Risk





- Total equity ranges from 61% for an alternative to 89% for the incumbent.
- Only two of the three use real assets.

- Total equity diverges further as age progresses, now ranging from 84% for the incumbent, down to 37% for an alternative.
- Total fixed income varies from 16% to 58% for the same participant, at the same age.



# Participant A at 55 and 65 Years Old Moderate Risk





- As age extends, the divergences grow, partially due to the assumption of total assets being held constant at a later stage in the career, thus requiring more savings.
- Total equity ranges from to 29% for an alternative to 79% for the incumbent, while fixed income ranges from 21% to 68%.

- For this near-retiree, recommended equity ranges between 25% and 61%
- Dispersion declines for fixed income also, down to a range of 38% to 73%.



# **Scenario Testing Results**

### Participant A, ages 35, 45, 55, 65, moderate risk

- The scenario tests reveal substantial differences in portfolio construction for the same profiles.
- For one vendor, the presence of a pension has almost no effect on outcomes.
- For another vendor, the presence of a pension only affected outcomes for some participants, and modestly.
- For the third vendor, the presence of a pension affected outcomes significantly.

Result: Any methodology transition would have radically shifted participant portfolios.

#### Equity and Fixed Income Asset Allocation Ranges





### **Case Study**

### Managed accounts vs. advice

### Participant Equity Ranges by Target Date Fund



- > Advice users had wider dispersion of equity allocation than managed account users
- Both showed a tighter equity dispersion in longer dated funds
  - Largest band in lowest quartile, which is likely the result of those users turning on/using the service



### **Case Study**

Pre and Post Managed Account Adoption Equity Ranges by Target Date Fund



# **Service Platform Impacts Participant Behavior in Crises**

Change in equity allocations 1/1/20-6/30/20



Change measured relative to each participant's starting asset allocation (12/31/19) and doing nothing through 6/30/20.



### What Did the Plan Do and Conclusions

### **Plan Actions**

- ► The plan retained the current model provider.
- Due to a recordkeeper transition, the plan required the incoming recordkeeper to have participants opt back in to use the managed account service.
- If participants did not opt back into the service after a communications campaign, the service was turned off.
- 70% of participants did not opt back in and were unenrolled.

#### Conclusions

- Participants engagement with managed accounts is often due to them seeking tools to manage their assets, rather than the service itself causing improvements in engagement.
- Managed accounts offer something close to a glidepath, unless the participants significantly customize the data utilized, and have unusual circumstances or risk preferences.
- Managed accounts do show signs of value-add by inhibiting bad trading habits for a minority of participants.
- The asset allocation results vary widely, and determining model fit to each plan population is of utmost importance.





### Managed accounts are not a commodity.

- For existing managed accounts: review the implementation on a regular basis to ensure participants are receiving value for the fees paid.
- When considering adding managed accounts: conduct a due diligence process, including scenario testing, to assess the value-add for participants.







The Callan Institute's mission is to improve the best practices of the institutional investment community through research, education, and dialogue.

Follow us for notifications about our latest research and events



Twitter: @CallanLLC



LinkedIn: Callan

# **Biographies**

**Craig Chaikin, CFA,** is a senior vice president and consultant in Callan's Denver consulting office. His responsibilities include client education, strategic planning and implementation, portfolio and fee reviews, investment policy development, and fulfilling client requests. He is a member of Callan's Defined Contribution Committee. Craig is a holder of the right to use the Chartered Financial Analyst® designation.

Jamie McAllister is a senior vice president and defined contribution (DC) consultant in Callan's Chicago consulting office. Jamie is responsible for providing support to Callan's DC clients and consultants, including DC provider searches, structure reviews, fee analyses, as well as maintaining the recordkeeping database and developing DC research. She is a member of Callan's Editorial Committee and a shareholder of the firm.

**Ben Taylor** is a senior vice president and head of tax-exempt defined contribution (DC) research. Ben leads research into public sector and nonprofit DC plans for the firm. He is a member of the Callan Institute Advisory Committee and a shareholder of the firm.



# Frames of Due Diligence for Managed Accounts

### TCW / model prohibited transaction exemption

- Effective August 1, 1997, Department of Labor issued prohibited transaction exemption (PTE 97-60)
  - Allowed TCW to provide investment allocation and investment advice to participants in individual account plans under §401(a)
  - Included TCW recommendations to invest in group trusts managed by TCW containing mutual funds for a sister company
- TCW needed to engage a Financial Expert
  - Sole discretion over construction and implementation of asset allocation models
  - Independent from, no pre-existing relationship with nor under the control of TCW or affiliates
- TCW disclosures
  - Program terms and conditions
  - A reference guide
  - Mathematical formulas for asset allocation modeling, if requested
- TCW cannot receive compensation for asset allocation or investment advice, only for proprietary funds – Allowed TCW to pay direct expenses (e.g., Financial Expert, legal, audit, etc.) and be reimbursed by the Trusts
- Exemptive relief for: 1) receipt of variable fees resulting from providing investment advice to plan participants 2) the purchase and sale of proprietary investments



# Frames of Due Diligence for Managed Accounts

### IFE / SunAmerica prohibited transaction exemption

- December 14, 2001 letter, provided exemption for prohibited transaction restrictions
  - Fiduciary advisor can use a computer model developed by an independent financial expert to implement model asset allocation portfolios, both on a discretionary and non-discretionary basis
  - Increased compensation to SunAmerica resulting from the model would not be a prohibited transaction under ERISA §406(b)(1) or (3)
  - SunAmerica would still be acting as a fiduciary under ERISA §404
- Inferred independence between the fiduciary and expert:
  - Control and discretion of expert
  - Lack of any affiliation between fiduciary advisor and expert
  - Financial arrangements between the fiduciary advisor and expert
  - Proportion of expert's revenue derived from fiduciary advisor
- Outlined similar disclosures to TCW exemption
- Ultimately developed into similar exemptions in Pension Protection Act ERISA §408(g) and IRC §4975(f)(8)
  - Allows model developer and fiduciary to be affiliated or the same entity; requires model be certified by an independent financial expert
  - Exemption allows the fiduciary advisor to recommend, through the computer model, proprietary products and products that pay the fiduciary advisor a commission





Oct. 12, 2023

### Alaska Retirement Management Board Defined Contribution Plans

Managed Accounts Analysis

Ben Taylor Senior Vice President, Head of Tax-Exempt DC Research

Butch Cliff, CFA Executive Vice President

Steve Center, CFA Senior Vice President

Patrick Wisdom Vice President

Important Disclosures regarding the use of this document are included at the end of this document. These disclosures are an integral part of this document and should be considered by the user.

# **Project Overview & Summary Findings**

### **Project Overview**

- The Alaska Retirement Managed Board (ARMB) engaged Callan to conduct a managed account review for the Alaska Defined Contribution (DC) Plans. Callan's process reviews the Plans' current managed account solution provided through Empower and powered by Morningstar.
- This report evaluates unique participants enrolled in the managed account service, returns, and the service's fund selection process. This report utilizes participant-level data provided by Empower and Morningstar.

### **Summary Findings**

- As of March 31, 2023, there are 10,337 unique ARMB participants enrolled in the managed account service, and these accounts have nearly \$1.6 billion in assets. Of these, 7,347 (71%) have 100% of their Alaska DC Plan(s) enrolled in the service. Moreover, 6,312 (61%) have 100% of their Alaska DC Plan(s) enrolled in the service and have not provided information on outside accounts.
- Morningstar's asset allocation methodology considers assets in both advisable accounts (i.e., ARMB DC Plan(s)) and, if provided, non-advisable (i.e., outside) accounts. In some cases, assets administered by Empower for a participant in another plan are also considered.
- Across the unique participants enrolled in the managed account service, 2,851 (28%) have had their equity constrained as a result of Morningstar's funded ratio methodology.
- Across 5-year age bands and over various trailing periods, returns for "Managed Account / Advice" participants have significantly and materially trailed those of "Target Date / Risk-Based" participants.
- Refer to p. 22 of this report for additional detail on Callan's methodology for the returns analysis.
- The key finding is that (1) the Morningstar methodology effectively generates a forecast as to what other financial capital a participant would ordinarily have from other employment prior to joining the Plan(s), and (2) that if those assets are not provided to the model, it will characterize the participant as underfunded for retirement, which can (3) result in constraining their equity position lower, causing (4) significant performance shortfalls relative to either a target date fund, or an allocation that would have been chosen if the information missing from the model had been provided.



**Unique Participant Analysis** 

## Who's Using Managed Accounts?

As of March 31, 2023, there are **10,337 unique ARMB participants** enrolled in the managed account service, and these participants have nearly **\$1.6 billion** in assets. More than half (55%) of enrolled participants are between the ages of 35 and 55.



### Age Distribution of ARMB Managed Account Participants (#)





<25 25-29 30-34 35-39 40-44 45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64 65+

Age Range	<25	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65+	TOTALS
Participants (#)	68	295	722	1,418	1,722	1,324	1,230	1,223	1,147	1,188	10,337
Participant Assets (\$M)	\$0.6	\$8.6	\$37.8	\$141.3	\$231.6	\$193.5	\$211.8	\$239.5	\$240.8	\$255.4	\$1,560.9
Average Participant Balance	\$8,582	\$29,082	\$52,302	\$99,644	\$134,509	\$146,124	\$172,202	\$195,793	\$210,003	\$215,004	\$150,999
Median Participant Balance	\$3,550	\$12,412	\$24,101	\$53,146	\$97,030	\$110,908	\$121,225	\$128,390	\$143,362	\$131,940	\$91,974

Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower and Morningstar.

## Takeaways:

- 1. Roughly 75% of users of the managed account service in the ARMB DC Plans are over 40, and nearly 90% of managed account assets managed in the Plans are held by participants over 40.
- 2. The average balance is materially higher than the median balance, indicating a bifurcated participant experience.

## Where do Managed Account Assets Reside?

Among managed account users, the stable value option has the highest share of assets (22%), followed by the U.S. Bond Index (13%). Of the Plans' investment options, 10 have at least 90% of managed accounts users with a balance.

**Percentage of Managed Account** 



### Distribution of Managed Account Assets

Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower and Morningstar.

Callan Knowledge. Experience. Integrity.

### **Personalization**

The most common personalization provided by ARMB managed account participants is "adjusted" retirement age, which includes those who confirmed the default retirement age of 65. Specifically, 31% of all ARMB managed account participants have adjusted their retirement age to an age other the service's default of 65.

ARMB Managed Account Participants			ARMB Mar By # of Pe	naged rsona	Acc lizat	ount ions F	Partic Provid	ipant led	ts	
Personalization Options	# Provided	% Provided	7,000		c					
"Adjusted" Retirement Age	9,808	95%	6,000		0,200	5				
Pensions	1,872	18%	<u>ب</u> 5,000							
Retirement Need	1,870	18%								
Social Security	1,533	15%	aipant ∌							
Spouse	1,277	12%	000,5 Durtic							
Outside Account	1,180	11%	# 2,000			1,296				
Constrained	449	4%	1,000	405			1,029	656	422	00.4
Life Expectancy	320	3%	0		1	2	2		5	204
TOTAL	10,337		U	I	∠ # of P	ۍ ersona	4 alizatio	ວ ons Pr	ovidec	

Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower and Morningstar.

5

8

### Takeaways:

- 1. The most common customization provided is retirement age. However, merely interacting with this variable in the model counts as customizing it, even if it is left at 65. In reality, only 31% of participants have adjusted it to a different age.
- 2. Relatively few other customizations are provided by participants.
- 3. Adding back Social Security is a common personalization for participants over the age of 50, whereby for those over 50, 26% of participants have customized to add back in Social Security, with an average benefit per year added of \$16,584.

# **Equity Analysis**

### Equity by Age

<u>Note</u>: Yellow line represents Alaska TDF glidepath. Green line represents average total equity for ARMB participants with 100% of their Alaska DC Plan(s) enrolled in the managed account service and with no outside accounts provided (6,312) by 5-year age cohorts. Gray shaded area represents 90<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> percentile equity for off-the-shelf TDF glidepaths.



Age Range	<25	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65+
Average Equity, ARMB 100% Managed Account Participants With No Outside Accounts Provided	81%	83%	80%	70%	66%	61%	57%	51%	47%	45%
% ARMB Managed Account Participants With No Outside Accounts Within +/- 10% Equity of Age-Aligning AK TDF	25%	36%	34%	21%	16%	8%	8%	10%	13%	39%
% ARMB Managed Account Participants With No Outside Accounts Within +/- 20% Equity of Age-Aligning AK TDF	26%	36%	38%	29%	26%	25%	31%	33%	50%	59%

Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower, Morningstar, and Callan.

# Callan

### Takeaways:

- 1. The average equity of portfolios constructed by the Morningstar managed account service is materially lower than either the average target date fund, the Plans' custom target date fund, or the Morningstar moderate glidepath.
- 2. Prior to age 60, the equity gap between the average managed account portfolio and an age-equivalent target date fund is so large that at all ages, more than half of managed account users have portfolios that are more than 20% lower in equity exposure than they would be had they invested in the Plans' age-equivalent custom target date fund.

# Equity Analysis (Cont.)



Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower, Morningstar, and Callan.

# **Equity Analysis (Cont.)**

Participant Age Band	Average Participant Equity in Advisable & Non-Advisable (Outside) Accounts (Morningstar-Provided Data)	Average Participant Equity in Advisable Accounts (Empower-Provided Data)
<25	84%	86%
25-29	87%	86%
30-34	82%	82%
35-39	70%	71%
40-44	65%	66%
45-49	60%	61%
50-54	55%	57%
55-59	51%	52%
60-64	46%	47%
>=65	44%	45%

Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower, Morningstar, and Callan.

### Takeaways:

- 1. It is possible that lower equity positions result from the managed account creating a "completion portfolio" that adopts lower-risk portfolios to pair with higher equity positions held elsewhere.
- To test this hypothesis, Callan compared two groups. The first group on p. 10 is a representation of all managed account participants in the ARMB DC Plans, in blue. In green, we represent the experience of participants who had (1) 100% of their assets invested in the ARMB DC Plans controlled by the managed account service, and (2) did not add outside account balances into the model.
- 3. As is clearly apparent from the graphic, the two lines are nearly overlapping, and both diverge materially from the target date funds. The same is shown in the data table that follows the graphic.
- 4. The principal explanation for the divergence in equity is found in the practice of constraining the equity exposure of participants who are determined to fall short of a "funding ratio" threshold within the model. This itself is likely triggered more commonly due to the demographics of the Plans.

# **Equity Analysis (Cont.)**

- Callan ran two multiple linear regressions:
  - Dependent variable = Managed Account Actual Equity – Age-Aligning Alaska Target Date Fund Equity
  - Independent variables (categorical, not directional) = Retirement Age (RA), Retirement Need (RN), Pension (P), Social Security (SS), Spouse (S), Outside Account(s) (OA), Constrained (C), Life Expectancy (LE)
- Interpreting the regression results:
  - Intercepts of -15% / -17% indicate managed account actual equity is 15% / 17% lower, on average, than age-aligning Alaska target date fund equity when no personalizations are provided
  - When retirement age is "adjusted", managed account actual equity is 4% / 2% lower, on average, than age-aligning Alaska target date fund equity

Data as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower, Morningstar, and Callan.

Callan

The below table displays the intercepts and coefficients for each independent variable in the regressions.

Participant Group	All managed account participants (10,337)	Participants with 100% of their Alaska DC Plan(s) enrolled in M* and with no outside accounts provided (6,312)					
Variable	Coefficients						
Intercept	-15%	-17%					
"Adjusted" Retirement Age	-4%	-2%					
Retirement Need	5%	4%					
Pensions	3%	4%					
Social Security	6%	8%					
Spouse	3%	6%					
Outside Account	-2%	0%					
Constrained	5%	5%					
Life Expectancy	-1%	-1%					
	Participant GroupVariableVariableIntercept'Adjusted'' Retirement AgeRetirement NeeddPensionsSocial SecuritySpouseOutside AccountConstrainedLife Expectancy	Participant GroupAll managed account participants (10,337)VariableCoeIntercept-15%"Adjusted" Retirement Age-4%Retirement Need5%Pensions3%Social Security6%Spouse3%Outside Account-2%Constrained5%Life Expectancy-1%					

### Takeaways:

- Depending upon the comparison point used (all managed account users, or just those over whose assets the model has 100% control), the intercept estimate can be interpreted to mean that in the absence of any other customization, equity is either 15% lower, or 17% lower, on average, when compared to the Plans' age-aligning target date fund.
- 2. Contrary to intuition, when items such as a Social Security benefit, or the presence of a defined benefit pension are added, the model **adds equity**, rather than reducing it.
- 3. Callan's findings are that this is primarily explained by the funding ratio methodology. Under this methodology, if a participant in the ARMB DC Plans is assessed to have a funding ratio below 70%, the participant is constrained to a lower equity position, as shown on the graphic on the subsequent page. The funding ratio thresholds and equity constraints are the actual constraints in place for the Plans.

# **Funding Ratio Equity Constraints**



Data as of March 31, 2023. Source: Morningstar.

# **Financial Capital Equity Reduction for Constrained Participants**

The below chart plots the extent of equity reduction for the 2,851 ARMB managed account participants whose equity has been constrained by their funded ratio.



Data as of March 31, 2023. Source: Morningstar.

Callan Knowledge. Experience. Integrity.

### Takeaways:

- 1. The blue dots on the prior page represent the magnitude of the equity constraint applied to an individual participant.
- 2. The X-Axis of this graphic uses Morningstar's nomenclature, which is years to retirement. As an example, someone with a target retirement age of 65, who is 65, would show as a zero on this chart. Callan's slides normally use age.
- 3. The green line shows the simple average (not asset-weighted) level of equity constraint in place for each age cohort.
- 4. Notably, while the magnitude is smaller, the **majority** of participants 30+ years away from retirement are constrained.
- 5. The average level of constraint in the 20 years leading up to retirement hovers near 20%, consistent with Callan's statistical analysis, and the degree of difference shown in the constraint graphic on p. 15.
# **Estimated Expense**

- The managed account service has the below fee schedule shown in the left table.
- Based on participant balances as of March 31, 2023, the total estimated advisory fee for the service is \$5,562,612.

Asset Range	Advisory Fee	# ARMB Participants	% ARMB Participants
Up to \$100,000	0.45%	5,382	52%
Next \$150,000	0.35%	2,899	28%
Next \$150,000	0.25%	1,216	12%
> \$400,000	0.15%	840	8%

Estimated Expense Type*	%
Estimated Asset-Weighted Advisory Expense	0.36%
Estimated Equal-Weighted Advisory Expense	0.42%
Estimated Asset-Weighted Total Expense	0.52%
Estimated Equal-Weighted Total Expense	0.58%



### **Average Equal-Weighted Total Expense Ratios**

\*Estimated expense types represent estimated annual expenses based on participant balances as of March 31, 2023. Sources: Empower and Morningstar.

# **Effect of Returns & Fees on Accumulated Assets**

The chart displays projected asset accumulation over a 10-year period assuming a starting balance of about \$150,000 and a quarterly participant contribution of \$1,300. The **green line** assumes an annualized return equal to the median 10-year return for Target Date / Risk-Based participants between the ages of 61 and 65 (6.6%). The **blue line** assumes the same annualized return, less the fee differential between the total expense for the managed account service and the age-aligning Alaska Target Date Fund. The total expense for the managed account service advisory expenses, based on the assumed balance at each age, and observed average underlying fund expenses by 5-year participant age bands. The **orange line** assumes an annualized return equal to the median 10-year return for Managed Account / Advice participants between the ages of 61 and 65 with 100% of their Alaska DC Plan(s) enrolled in the managed account service and no outside accounts provided (5.3%).



Note: Historical returns information in this analysis is not indicative of future results. Data as of March 31, 2023. Source: Callan.

# Takeaways:

- The chart on p. 19 is a stylized illustration. As such, it is not a representation of any individual participant account, or an average experience. It is also time-period dependent and uses the longest time period for which Callan was provided performance data.
- 2. The purpose of the chart is to illustrate the difference in impact of different features of a managed account vis a vis a target date fund. These features are as follows:
  - There is an additional fee burden associated with paying for the managed account service. There is also a fee difference between the portfolios composed of options within the lineup and those offered by the target date funds.
  - There is a performance difference, which comes from the underlying funds utilized by the service as compared to the target date funds.
- Because the illustration used the observed annualized median return for managed account participants aged 61-65 over the 10-year period for which Callan was supplied performance data, the differences between the accumulated values can be interpreted to illustrate the following:
  - A fee impact over the 10-year period of approximately 4% of the theoretical total balance.
  - A combined effect of fees and fund selection/asset allocation of 10%.
  - An approximate effect of fund selection/asset allocation, irrespective of fees, of ~7%.



**Returns Analysis** 

# **Returns Analysis Methodology**

• The following section examines historical returns for 2 subsets of ARMB participants:

- Managed Accounts / Advice Participants who have had 100% of their Alaska DC Plan(s) enrolled in the managed account service for the entirety of a trailing period and who did not provide information on outside accounts.
- Target Date / Risk-Based Participants who were 100% invested in one or more Alaska Target Date Funds in all of their Alaska DC Plans as of March 31, 2023. Notably, participants may be invested in an Alaska Target Date Fund other than the one they would be defaulted into provided their date of birth.
- All returns shown are money weighted, net of fees (e.g., quoted recordkeeping fee, investment management fees, advisory fees), and only include participants with account balances greater than \$2,500.
- For participants in multiple ARMB DC Plans, plan returns are weighted based on plan account balances as of March 31, 2023, to generate a total aggregated return for each participant.
- All plan-level return and balance data was provided by Empower.

# Annualized Returns – Ages <=25

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-1.7%	13.4%			
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.8%	12.2%			
Median	-6.9%	6.3%			
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-10.2%	2.3%			
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-12.0%	0.5%			

### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	2.4%	15.7%	7.5%	8.4%	
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-0.1%	14.8%	7.0%	8.1%	
Median	-3.6%	9.9%	6.5%	7.1%	
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.9%	6.6%	6.0%	6.6%	
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.4%	4.4%	4.6%	5.2%	

# Annualized Returns – Ages 26-30

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

#### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.5%	13.6%	5.8%		
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.2%	12.1%	5.5%		
Median	-6.4%	9.6%	5.1%		
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-8.1%	6.6%	4.8%		
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-11.0%	4.5%	4.1%		

### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	0.3%	16.1%	7.5%	9.0%	8.3%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.2%	15.5%	7.2%	8.7%	8.1%
Median	-5.4%	12.4%	6.8%	8.2%	7.7%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.9%	9.0%	6.4%	7.6%	7.2%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.3%	5.9%	5.9%	6.4%	5.6%

# Annualized Returns – Ages 31-35

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.2%	14.3%	6.0%	7.8%	6.7%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.3%	13.0%	5.6%	7.5%	6.7%
Median	-6.3%	11.6%	5.2%	7.1%	6.7%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.6%	8.9%	4.6%	6.7%	6.7%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-10.8%	6.4%	3.9%	6.5%	6.7%

## Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-1.5%	16.2%	7.5%	9.2%	8.7%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.7%	16.0%	7.3%	9.0%	8.4%
Median	-6.0%	14.1%	7.1%	8.5%	8.2%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.8%	11.2%	6.7%	8.0%	7.9%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.1%	7.7%	6.3%	7.6%	7.6%

# Annualized Returns – Ages 36-40

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.5%	15.3%	6.0%	8.0%	7.5%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.4%	13.8%	5.8%	7.6%	7.2%
Median	-6.5%	12.1%	5.3%	7.2%	6.9%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-8.0%	10.5%	4.8%	6.8%	6.6%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-10.4%	7.6%	4.2%	5.8%	5.8%

### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.6%	16.3%	7.5%	9.3%	8.8%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.2%	16.1%	7.4%	9.1%	8.6%
Median	-6.2%	14.6%	7.2%	8.7%	8.3%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.8%	12.1%	6.9%	8.2%	8.1%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.1%	8.7%	6.5%	7.8%	7.8%

# Annualized Returns – Ages 41-45

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.3%	14.5%	6.0%	7.8%	7.4%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.1%	13.3%	5.7%	7.4%	7.0%
Median	-6.1%	11.5%	5.2%	7.1%	6.7%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.6%	10.0%	4.8%	6.5%	6.4%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-9.7%	8.1%	4.4%	5.8%	5.6%

## Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.3%	16.3%	7.5%	9.3%	8.8%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.0%	16.0%	7.3%	9.1%	8.6%
Median	-6.0%	14.2%	7.1%	8.6%	8.3%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.7%	11.6%	6.8%	8.2%	8.0%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.0%	8.2%	6.4%	7.7%	7.8%

# Annualized Returns – Ages 46-50

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.3%	13.6%	5.9%	7.4%	7.1%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.0%	12.0%	5.5%	7.0%	6.8%
Median	-5.9%	10.6%	5.1%	6.7%	6.5%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.2%	9.4%	4.8%	6.3%	6.2%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-8.6%	7.5%	4.3%	5.7%	5.4%

### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.4%	15.3%	7.2%	9.0%	8.6%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.7%	14.9%	7.0%	8.7%	8.3%
Median	-5.7%	13.2%	6.8%	8.3%	8.1%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.4%	10.7%	6.5%	7.9%	7.8%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.7%	7.3%	6.1%	7.3%	7.5%

# Annualized Returns – Ages 51-55

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.9%	12.9%	5.9%	7.4%	7.2%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.7%	11.3%	5.4%	6.7%	6.5%
Median	-5.5%	9.9%	5.0%	6.3%	6.2%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.8%	8.8%	4.7%	6.0%	5.9%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.9%	7.3%	4.3%	5.5%	5.5%

## Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.1%	14.1%	6.8%	8.5%	8.2%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.4%	13.7%	6.7%	8.2%	7.9%
Median	-5.4%	12.3%	6.4%	7.8%	7.6%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.0%	10.1%	6.1%	7.4%	7.4%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.3%	6.9%	5.7%	6.8%	7.1%

# Annualized Returns – Ages 56-60

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.6%	11.5%	5.5%	7.0%	6.6%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.3%	10.0%	5.0%	6.4%	6.1%
Median	-5.1%	8.9%	4.7%	5.8%	5.6%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.3%	7.8%	4.4%	5.4%	5.2%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.3%	6.2%	4.0%	4.9%	4.8%

### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.3%	12.8%	6.4%	7.9%	7.7%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.2%	12.4%	6.2%	7.6%	7.4%
Median	-4.9%	11.1%	6.0%	7.3%	7.2%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.5%	9.1%	5.6%	6.8%	6.9%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.8%	6.6%	5.3%	6.3%	6.5%

# Annualized Returns – Ages 61-65

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.7%	10.6%	5.3%	6.3%	6.1%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.1%	9.2%	4.8%	5.8%	5.6%
Median	-4.9%	8.1%	4.5%	5.4%	5.3%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.8%	7.3%	4.2%	5.1%	5.0%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.8%	6.4%	3.9%	4.7%	4.7%

## Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.3%	11.3%	5.9%	7.3%	7.2%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.8%	11.0%	5.7%	7.1%	6.9%
Median	-4.5%	9.8%	5.5%	6.6%	6.6%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.0%	8.3%	5.2%	6.3%	6.3%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-5.3%	5.7%	4.8%	5.8%	6.0%

# Annualized Returns – Ages 66-70

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.5%	10.4%	5.3%	6.0%	5.7%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.1%	9.0%	4.8%	5.5%	5.3%
Median	-4.9%	7.9%	4.3%	5.0%	4.7%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.0%	6.7%	4.1%	4.6%	4.4%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.9%	5.6%	3.5%	4.1%	4.1%

### Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.7%	9.6%	5.3%	6.7%	6.6%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.7%	9.5%	5.2%	6.4%	6.4%
Median	-4.3%	8.7%	5.0%	6.0%	6.0%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.5%	7.5%	4.7%	5.7%	5.7%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.9%	5.6%	4.2%	5.3%	5.5%

# Annualized Returns – Ages 71-75

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.7%	10.9%	5.4%	7.3%	5.6%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.3%	9.7%	5.0%	6.6%	5.4%
Median	-5.3%	8.4%	4.6%	5.5%	4.6%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.5%	7.1%	4.2%	4.9%	4.4%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-7.6%	6.2%	3.9%	4.5%	4.2%

## Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.5%	8.6%	5.0%	6.1%	6.2%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.3%	7.8%	4.7%	5.6%	5.7%
Median	-3.8%	7.6%	4.5%	5.4%	5.4%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.0%	6.7%	4.2%	5.1%	5.1%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.5%	4.4%	3.8%	4.7%	4.7%

# Annualized Returns – Ages >=76

Distribution returns for Managed Accounts / Advice and Target Date / Risk-Based represent money-weighted returns. Refer to p. 22 for additional details on methodology.

### Returns for Managed Accounts / Advice, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90th Percentile	-4.0%	11.2%	5.5%	6.6%	5.7%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.5%	10.3%	5.1%	5.8%	5.3%
Median	-5.6%	8.7%	4.6%	5.5%	5.0%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-6.4%	7.4%	4.3%	5.3%	4.9%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-8.7%	6.5%	4.0%	4.7%	4.8%

## Returns for Target Date / Risk-Based, Money Weighted & Net of Fees

	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-2.4%	8.4%	4.8%	6.3%	6.0%
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.0%	7.1%	4.3%	5.6%	5.5%
Median	-3.6%	6.4%	3.9%	5.0%	4.9%
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-3.9%	5.7%	3.7%	4.6%	4.6%
10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	-4.3%	4.8%	3.3%	4.4%	4.4%



**Fund Selection** 

# **Forward-Looking Alpha Forecasts and Fund Selection**

While asset allocation is determined via a separate process, Morningstar does also utilize a methodology for determining which funds to utilize in order achieve the desired asset allocation for a given participant.

An evaluation of these techniques as applied to the Alaska Plans yielded several observations, including:

- There is room for improvement with respect to quality control. Initial investigations revealed that one fund (BlackRock Strategic Completion NL F) was incorrectly benchmarked in a clearly noticeable fashion, and incorrectly utilized until this was pointed about by Callan. A subsequent re-evaluation resulted in increased usage of this fund.
- There is no clear theoretical basis for the use of blended 12- and 36-month trailing performance deviations to forecast future performance deviations. Additionally, doing so would run contrary to expected mean reversion.
- The calculation methodology utilizes standard Morningstar peer group benchmarks for each asset class to calculate outperformance for the calculation, irrespective of whether there are clear and known benchmark mismatches that will cause errors. For example, the S&P 500 index is measured against a composite benchmark that uses the Russell 1000 Total Return and Russell 2500 Total Return indexes to represent US Large Cap and US Mid Cap. As a result, a composite benchmark created from a returns-based style analysis reflected significant persistent "alpha" for this index fund, when the result of that was caused by index construction rather than any actual "alpha".
- The realized impact of these differences is likely to be small in a lineup from an institutional plan sponsor such as ARMB, due to the relatively small number of options for each asset class.

# Forward-Looking Alpha Calculation Steps

The steps undertaken to calculate the forward-looking alpha and tracking error used for fund selection by Morningstar for each fund are as follows:

- 1. Run a returns-based style analysis (essentially a regression of returns vs. returns of selected indexes), which results in "style weights" for the fund in question, relative to each index.
- 2. Use the weights derived in step 1 to create a custom benchmark for the fund, using the weights derived from the regression.
- 3. Determine the "excess return" for the fund vs. the custom benchmark for the fund.
- 4. Calculate the 12 month "alpha" and "tracking error" for the fund. Note that for the "alpha" calculation, this involves adding back in the fee to the net of fees returns used in steps 1-3. It is not risk-adjusted.
- 5. Perform the same calculation in #4, but for 36 months instead of 12.
- 6. A pooled calculation using weights for the two time periods is conducted, creating a blended calculated forward-looking "alpha" and "tracking error" calculation vis a vis the custom benchmark produced in step 2.
- 7. The calculation is readjusted to account for fees to convert expectations back into a net of fees calculation. This final result is the calculated forward-looking "alpha" and "tracking error".

# Portfolio Construction and use of Forward-Looking Alpha and Tracking Error

- While the Morningstar white paper (chapter 4) that covers fund selection refers to calculations that incorporate Morningstar analyst ratings in the fund selection process, the actual calculations reviewed by Callan for the ARMB DC Plans do not include this step.
- Additional optimization constraints are applied, consistent with the asset allocation process more broadly. However, ultimately the key inputs for fund selection are the forward-looking alpha (net of fees) and tracking error, and funds are selected for each portfolio consistent with the highest forward-looking alpha for a given level of acceptable tracking error.

**Summary:** The forward-looking alpha and tracking error estimation process lacks a clear theoretical underpinning, is inconsistently applied, ignores benchmark mismatches in the returnsbased style analysis by design, creates spurious forecasts (such as persistent forward-looking alpha for an index fund of 43 basis points, in the Alaska Plans), and can misclassify funds (e.g., BlackRock Strategic Completion). However, for a lineup with relatively few investment choices within each asset class, it is unlikely to cause significant changes to target portfolios, as there are relatively few options from which to select for a given exposure.

# **Summary Commentary**

- 1. The Morningstar methodology offered by Empower employs an overall lifecycle investing approach, in which a combination of financial and human capital exist for any participant using the service.
- 2. This methodology inherently generates a hypothesis as to what other financial capital a participant has accumulated during their working life.
- 3. The methodology also includes a practice of constraining the equity allocation of participants that are assessed to have funding ratios below 70%.
- 4. It is possible to chronically trigger this equity constraint in plans where many components of a participant's outof-plan assets are not visible to the model, and when a participant doesn't fully customize to reflect these assets.
- 5. The performance record of the managed account service over nearly all measured periods over the past decade, ending March 31, 2023, shows investors utilizing the managed account service for all their assets within the ARMB DC Plans materially trail the performance of investors in an age-equivalent target date fund.
- 6. The principal explanatory variable for this performance differential is the presence of the equity constraint, which is itself associated with the funding ratio threshold of 70%. The application of the funding ratio constraint is influenced by the degree of customization (or lack thereof) provided by ARMB participants using the service, which is observed to be low, as well as the demographics of these participants.

# **Disclosures**

Information contained in this document may include confidential, trade secret and/or proprietary information of Callan and the client. It is incumbent upon the user to maintain such information in strict confidence. Neither this document nor any specific information contained herein is to be used other than by the intended recipient for its intended purpose.

The investment managers included in this review book are per the request of the client. The information related to each investment manager is being provided solely for comparison purposes and is not the result of Callan's Manager Search process. Callan has neither rejected nor endorsed these investment managers or their respective strategies. The content of this document is particular to the client and should not be relied upon by any other individual or entity. There can be no assurance that the performance of any account or investment will be comparable to the performance information presented in this document.

Certain information herein has been compiled by Callan from a variety of sources believed to be reliable but for which Callan has not necessarily verified for accuracy or completeness. Information contained herein may not be current. Callan has no obligation to bring current the information contained herein.

This content of this document may consist of statements of opinion, which are made as of the date they are expressed and are not statements of fact. The opinions expressed herein may change based upon changes in economic, market, financial and political conditions and other factors. Callan has no obligation to bring current the opinions expressed herein.

The statements made herein may include forward-looking statement regarding future results. The forward-looking statements herein: (i) are best estimations consistent with the information available as of the date hereof and (ii) involve known and unknown risks and uncertainties. Actual results may vary, perhaps materially, from the future results projected in this document. Undue reliance should not be placed on forward-looking statements.

Callan disclaims any responsibility for reviewing the risks of individual securities or the compliance/non-compliance of individual security holdings with a client's investment policy guidelines.

This document should not be construed as legal or tax advice on any matter. You should consult with legal and tax advisers before applying any of this information to your particular situation.

Reference to, or inclusion in this document of, any product, service or entity should not necessarily be construed as recommendation, approval, or endorsement or such product, service or entity by Callan.

This document is provided in connection with Callan's consulting services and should not be viewed as an advertisement of Callan, or of the strategies or products discussed or referenced herein.

The issues considered and risks highlighted herein are not comprehensive and other risks may exist that the user of this document may deem material regarding the enclosed information.

Any decision you make on the basis of this document is sole responsibility of the client, as the intended recipient, and it is incumbent upon you to make an independent determination of the suitability and consequences of such a decision.

Callan undertakes no obligation to update the information contained herein except as specifically requested by the client. Past performance is no guarantee of future results.