

NOVEMBER 2020

bOringINSIGHTS
money

VALUE ASSESSMENTS 2020

Best Practice



Contents

1. Executive Summary	8
2. Introduction	11
2.1 The regulatory backdrop	12
2.2 The FCA's early take on the minimum component parts of value	13
3. What is Value - the Investor Perspective	14
3.1 How end customers assess value	15
3.2 The investor's 4 pillars of value	17
3.3 Pillar one – Price	18
3.3.1 How customers assess price	18
3.3.2 Justifying higher fees to customers	20
3.3.3 Summary	21
3.4 Pillar two – Performance	21
3.4.1 How customers think about performance	21
3.4.2 Customers' use of performance benchmarks	22
3.4.3 Time horizons	24
3.4.4 Overall judgement of good value	25
3.4.5 Summary	26
3.5 Pillar Three – Clarity	26
3.5.1 How customers perceive fund information	26
3.5.2 Recall of fund information	27
3.5.3 Factsheet testing	29
3.5.4 Clarity of objectives on factsheets	29
3.5.5 Clarity of performance information on factsheets	29
3.5.6 Clarity of cost information on factsheets	30
3.5.7 Summary of Clarity	30
3.6 Pillar Four – Service	31
3.6.1 What investors think about service	31
3.6.2 Expectations of service	31
3.6.3 What “good service” means	32
3.6.4 Summary of Service	33
3.7 ESG	34
3.8 Summary	34
4. How does Value play out on a brand level?	36
4.1 Consumer research on Value by individual brand	37
4.1.1. Methodology	37
4.2 Top valued brands – who and why?	38

4.2.1 Brand, trust and performance	38
4.3 Passive and active	40
4.4 Advised versus non-advised	41
4.5 Big brand investors v. small brand investors	43
4.6 Impact of Market Falls throughout 2020	43
4.7 ESG considerations	45
4.8 Summary	46
5. How is Value reported – the component parts	47
5.1 What does the regulator want?	48
5.1.1 FCA components – a starting point	49
5.2 What do consumers want?	49
5.3 Quality of Service – what is included in the reports	50
5.3.1 Included in most:	50
5.3.2 Interesting deviations/additions:	50
5.4 Quality of Service – different approaches and interesting examples	51
5.4.1 Transparency and Clarity	51
5.4.2 Customer feedback and sentiment	52
5.4.3 ESG	56
5.5 Performance – what’s included	58
5.6 Performance – different approaches and interesting examples	61
5.6.1 The devil is in the detail?	61
5.6.2 Underperformance of funds	66
5.7 Performance against comparators	68
5.7.1 Performance against cash	71
5.7.2 Other performance reporting options	72
5.8 Costs and Charges – what’s included	72
5.9 Costs and charges – different approaches and interesting examples	76
5.9.1 The Ongoing Charges Fee is the primary number used	76
5.9.2 Transaction costs and all-in fees remain elusive	76
5.10 A surprising number of managers have not provided specific costs	80
5.11 Comparable Market Rates	81
5.12 Other categories	85
6. How is Value reported – the structure	88
6.1 The 7 FCA components are not born equal	90
6.2 Show key detail in an Appendix	96
6.3 Annual Report or Standalone?	99

6.4 Should there be a firm level overview as well as an individual fund review?	100
7. Good Practice	103
7.1 Address all key consumer questions	104
7.2 Seek consumer input	104
7.3 Personal and clear in tone	104
7.4 Think about design and clarity	106
7.5 Evidence claims made	108
7.6 Are specific at fund level on performance and costs	108
7.7 Identify and explain peer groups	108
7.8 Identify and explain performance	108
7.9 Get the right balance between detail and length	109
7.10 Address ESG as a component part of value	109
7.11 Are clear on conclusions and where improvements are needed	109
7.12 Demonstrate increased governance and impartiality	111
8. Poor Practice	112
8.1 Burying the Value Assessments in the Annual Report	113
8.2 Hide the reports deep on the website	113
8.3 Get stuck in industry detail which can come across as disingenuous	113
8.4 Use the FCA's 7 criteria as the framework	114
8.5 Quality of Service is not the same as delivery of a service	115
8.6 Do not provide specific detail on individual funds	116
8.7 Do not provide details on the peer group for comparison	116
8.8 Do not provide a clear or credible action plan which addresses the identified issues	116
8.9 Make sweeping statements or lack evidence	118
8.10 Only seek intermediary feedback	119
9. Remedial Actions	120
9.1 Investors are moved into cheaper share classes	121
9.2 Fund fees reduced	121
9.3 Greater pressure on underperforming managers	121
9.4 A need to close or merge funds	121
10. Concluding comments	123

List of figures

Figure 1: Selection of responses to “What makes you say [your provider] offers value for money?”	15
Figure 2: Categorised responses for why a fund manager offers value for money	16
Figure 3: Importance of factors when assessing value for money	16
Figure 4: Four pillars of value	17
Figure 5: Quotations from in-depth interviews	18
Figure 6: Calculating costs from typical information provided	19
Figure 7: Attitudes towards what is a fair price to pay a fund manager	20
Figure 8: Quotations from in-depth interviews on performance	22
Figure 9: Desired fee allocation for achieving performance	23
Figure 10: Method of checking fund performance	23
Figure 11: Frequency of checking funds	24
Figure 12: Length of time needed to judge performance of a fund	24
Figure 13: Length of time for holding a particular fund	25
Figure 14: Value for money scenarios	25
Figure 15: Quotations from focus interviews	27
Figure 16: Awareness of funds objectives	27
Figure 17: Reading of Key Investor Information Documents (KIID)	28
Figure 18: Quotations from focus interviews on clarity	28
Figure 19: Quotations from investors about their service expectations	31
Figure 20: Quotations from investors about service expectations	32
Figure 21: Quotations from investors about service expectations	33
Figure 22: Quotations from investors about service expectations	33
Figure 23: Top ten brands for Value in 2019 and 2020	38
Figure 24: Drivers of value and areas for improvement - average for all fund managers	39
Figure 25: Average of respondents by investment approach	40
Figure 26: Ratings of brands by investment approach	41
Figure 27: Gap between scores from advised and non-advised investors in Q3 2020	42
Figure 28: Reasons given for value, in context of market falls in Q1 2020	44
Figure 29: How do different brands fare when ESG is introduced to the value question?	45
Figure 30: Hargreaves Lansdown understands that transparency is a core component of Service	51
Figure 31: Artemis makes clarity and understanding a key part of Quality of Service assessment	52
Figure 32: Janus Henderson carry out customer testing	52
Figure 33: Aberdeen Standard Investments reports back on customer sentiment	53
Figure 34: SJP Customer Feedback Research	53
Figure 35: HSBC have included a comprehensive list of factors within its QoS assessment	54
Figure 36: HSBC’s assessment summary is detailed and informative	54
Figure 37: Columbia Threadneedle review service as provided to 3 different types of customer	55
Figure 38: Invesco conducted an internal comparison	55
Figure 39: Current Average Carbon Footprint for SJP funds	56
Figure 40: Invesco covers ESG in Quality of Service	57
Figure 41: Ninety One covers Investment Stewardship under Quality of Service.	57
Figure 42: LGIM includes references to voting and stewardship in the Quality of Service assessment	58
Figure 43: Timescales for performance reporting across all 26 published reports	59

Figure 44: Benchmarks, peer groups and comparators used by all 26 published firms	60
Figure 45: Are annualised or rolling returns provided?	61
Figure 46: Fund specific performance and cost reporting across all 26 firms	62
Figure 47: Vanguard's detailed performance relative to peer group	63
Figure 48: BlackRock does not include performance specifics at fund level, despite doing this for costs	64
Figure 49: The Schroders report is one that misses the opportunity to cite the actual performance	64
Figure 50: Jupiter's reporting at a fund level	65
Figure 51: Fundsmith use FEF's performance as a proxy for that of the FSEF	65
Figure 52: HSBC's performance reporting is very thorough and easy to follow	66
Figure 53: Ninety One cite Covid-19 and Brexit as contributing factors to the underperformance of its UK Special Situations Fund	66
Figure 54: Note from Stephanie Butcher Invesco CIO, taking accountability for underperformance	67
Figure 55: Invesco runs through the virtues of rolling periods vs annualised performance	67
Figure 56: Invesco remind investors of their investment style throughout the report	68
Figure 57: Jupiter's explanation of the market impact of Covid-19	68
Figure 58: Orbis reports performance net of fees and against both the peer group mean and median	69
Figure 59: Baillie Gifford explains why as active managers performance measured against a benchmark should not be looked at in isolation	69
Figure 60: In the individual fund pages Baillie Gifford shows 5-year annualised performance against the Fund Target and the Index	69
Figure 61: Invesco include fund objective	70
Figure 62: Franklin Templeton shows the Income Fund's Dividends compared to the yield of its Benchmark. 70	
Figure 63: Franklin Templeton shows performance for each share class	71
Figure 64: Franklin Templeton report performance vs ongoing charges against similar funds	71
Figure 65: Rathbones report against cash	72
Figure 66: HSBC compare fund performance against cash	72
Figure 67: Cost disclosure and comparison methodologies per firm	73
Figure 68: To what degree are fees broken down and disclosed at firm level?	74
Figure 69: A minority of firms provide no specific detail on what charges have been assessed or how	76
Figure 70: Columbia Threadneedle show both an OCF and a Total Cost of Investing	76
Figure 71: HSBC clearly breakdown the cost for all its funds	77
Figure 72: HSBC highlight the different charges that make up the OCF	77
Figure 73: Rathbones is a notable exception to the majority who do not include transaction fees	78
Figure 74: Rathbones' transparency is undone by complexity	78
Figure 75: JPM explanation of AFM methodology	79
Figure 76: Ninety One inconsistent with fee terminology	79
Figure 77: RLAM Fees not shown in the fund assessment	80
Figure 78: M&G has provided a generic response for each fund and has not assessed costs individually	81
Figure 79: Vanguard show comparable market rates against the Morningstar sector average on a single page	82
Figure 80: SJP more clarity needed on peer group	83
Figure 81: Costs compared against sector medians or 'peers' need to have these groups named and specified	83
Figure 82: Limited detail on what the peer group in question is	84

Figure 83: BlackRock's Comparable Market Rates section	84
Figure 84: Franklin Templeton shows OCF in both £ and % form	85
Figure 85: JPM defines A share class but not others referenced in the report	86
Figure 86: RLAM make reference to the different share classes with no explanation	86
Figure 87: Jupiter break down and explain the different unit classes	86
Figure 88: Hargreaves Lansdown's economies of scale section says little and is unsubstantiated	87
Figure 89: Morgan Stanley's Value Assessment statement contains almost no supporting data	87
Figure 90: SJP indicates whether funds are delivered responsibly	90
Figure 91: Franklin Templeton add Diversity & Inclusion as their eighth criterion	91
Figure 92: M&G have weighted Performance and QoS more strongly than the other 5 criteria	91
Figure 93: Baillie Gifford focus on price, service and performance	92
Figure 94: Aberdeen Standard Investments reports back against the three criteria of Service, Performance and Cost	92
Figure 95: Artemis also reports back against Performance, Costs and Charges and Services	93
Figure 96: BlackRock's commitment to delivering value	93
Figure 97: Invesco has a lot of repetition in the individual fund assessment pages	94
Figure 98: How to consider value reporting	95
Figure 99: JPM has split the criteria between fund umbrella and fund to avoid replication	95
Figure 100: Ninety One shows detail in an Appendix	96
Figure 101: Displaying costs at a firm level	97
Figure 102: JPM Glossary	98
Figure 103: Royal London's Glossary of Terms is very comprehensive	99
Figure 104: Should two different funds have a carbon copy detailed one-pager?	100
Figure 105: Columbia Threadneedle provide a firm level Value Assessment	101
Figure 106: Columbia Threadneedle fund level reporting	101
Figure 107: Schroders has a clear introduction and accountability	105
Figure 108: Columbia Threadneedle start the report with "A message to our customers"	105
Figure 109: RLAM 'about us' section	106
Figure 110: Orbis' report is well laid out and uses design to assist with communication	107
Figure 111: SJP's AoV report has a clear layout	107
Figure 112: Schroders articulate drivers of underperformance alongside actions taken	108
Figure 113: Vanguard continually asks, "How can we improve?"	109
Figure 114: Aberdeen Standard Investments clearly identifies 'problem children'	110
Figure 115: And then identifies remedial actions in a more detailed section which is reported on an exceptions basis only.	110
Figure 116: Baillie Gifford include a word from its iNeds in the executive summary	111
Figure 117: Reports in the Annual Report tend to contain less specific information and detail	113
Figure 118: LGIM announce their move towards fee simplification	114
Figure 119: Vanguard's summary gives the FCA's 7 criteria equal prominence	115
Figure 120: Quality of Service is not the same as an audit committee	116
Figure 121: How credible is it for a fund which has not met its objective to be described as delivering value?	117
Figure 122: Vanguard description of quality of service	118
Figure 123: "We have relied on subjective judgement...."	119
Figure 124: RLAM Feedback from customers	119
Figure 125: Schroders has since closed a range identified as problematic in the Value Assessment statements	122