From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The Active Versus Passive Management Debate
Challenge, Risk & Future

Thierry Roncalli[*][†]

[*]Amundi Asset Management[1], France

June 21th, 2018

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Foreword

This presentation is not about the performance difference between active management and passive management[a]. This presentation does not promote active or passive management. This presentation does not take the viewpoint of investors or asset managers.

This presentation takes the viewpoint of policy and regulation. This presentation is about the added-value of active management when we consider the efficiency of financial markets[b]. This presentation is about the stability of financial markets. The main question is: What is the minimum proportion of active management in order to ensure that financial markets will continue to work properly? Another important question is: What is the future of alpha and does this alpha will tend to be zero?

---

[a]I think that this debate had been definitively closed.
[b]that is the capital allocation between corporate firms or investment projects.

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Foreword

- Active management could rise from the dead (Forbes, October 2016)
- The end of active investing? (Financial Times, January 2017)
- Active management isn't dead, it's evolving (ETF.com, January 2017)
- The end of an active-investing era (Barron's, February 2017)
- Is there a future for active management? (Greenwich Associates, February 2017)
- Jack (John) Bogle killed active managers. Now he has a plan to save them (CNBC, May 2017).
- The death of active management has been greatly exaggerated (Morningstar, June 2017)
- Active management is not in a death spiral (Financial Times, September 2017)
- GPIF shifts to performance-based fee model for active managers (Asia Asset Management, June 2018)
- The long read: Is it the end of the road for active management? (Funds Europe, June 2018)

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Foreword

"The question is when is active
management good? The answer is never"

Eugene Fama, Morningstar ETF conference,
September 2014

"So people say, 'I'm not going to try to beat
the market. The market is all-knowing.' But
how in the world can the market be
all-knowing, if nobody is trying – well, not as
many people – are trying to beat it?"

Robert Shiller, CNBC, November 2017

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Key messages

- The boundaries of active management have considerably evolved during the past years $\Rightarrow$ its scope has been dramatically reduced!

- The debate "active vs passive management" is now a debate between active management and systematic (or rule-based) management

- Like the SB, there is now a shadow asset management

- Systematic investment management could pose a systemic risk for the financial system

- Active share is an interesting benchmarking measure, but it does not solve the issues of performance and closet indexing

- Financial markets need active management in order to exist $\Rightarrow$ What is the minimum acceptable part of active management?

- The debate of the performance (and benchmarking) of active management is a spurious issue and an endogenous puzzle

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The case of equities
The case of bonds
Extension to other asset classes
The nature of risk factors

From CAPM to factor investing

How to define risk factors?

Risk factors are common factors that explain the cross-section variance of expected returns

- 1964: Market or MKT (or BETA) factor
- 1972: Low beta or BAB factor
- 1981: Size or SMB factor
- 1985: Value or HML factor
- 1991: Low volatility or VOL factor
- 1993: Momentum or WML factor
- 2000: Quality or QMJ factor

From active investing to factor investing **The case of equities**
The rise of systematic management The case of bonds
The active share debate Extension to other asset classes
The performance debate The nature of risk factors

Alpha or beta?

At the security level, there is a lot of idiosyncratic risk or alpha[2]:

	Common Risk	Idiosyncratic Risk
GOOGLE	47%	53%
NETFLIX	24%	76%
MASTERCARD	50%	50%
NOKIA	32%	68%
TOTAL	89%	11%
AIRBUS	56%	44%

Carhart's model with 4 factors, 2010-2014
Source: Roncalli (2017)

---

[2]The linear regression is:

$$R_i = \alpha_i + \sum_{j=1}^{n_{\mathscr{F}}} \beta_i^j \mathscr{F}_j + \varepsilon_i$$

In our case, we measure the alpha as $1 - \mathfrak{R}_i^2$ where:

$$\mathfrak{R}_i^2 = 1 - \frac{\sigma^2(\varepsilon_i)}{\sigma^2(R_i)}$$

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The case of equities
The case of bonds
Extension to other asset classes
The nature of risk factors

The concept of alpha

- Jensen (1968) – **How to measure the performance of ~~active~~ fund managers?**

$$R_t^F = \alpha + \beta R_t^{MKT} + \varepsilon_t$$

Fund	Return	Rank	Beta	Alpha	Rank
A	12%	Best	1.0	−2%	Worst
B	11%	Worst	0.5	4%	Best

Market return = 14%

$$\Rightarrow \bar{\alpha} = -\text{fees}$$

- It is the beginning of passive management:
  - John McQuown (Wells Fargo Bank, 1971)
  - Rex Sinquefield (American National Bank, 1973)

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The case of equities
The case of bonds
Extension to other asset classes
The nature of risk factors

Active management and performance persistence

- Hendricks *et al.* (1993) – **Hot Hands in Mutual Funds**

$$\mathrm{cov}\left(\alpha_t^{\mathsf{Jensen}}, \alpha_{t-1}^{\mathsf{Jensen}}\right) > 0$$

where:

$$\alpha_t^{\mathsf{Jensen}} = R_t^F - \beta^{\mathrm{MKT}} R_t^{MKT}$$

$\Rightarrow$ The persistence of the performance of active management is due to the **persistence of the alpha**

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The case of equities
The case of bonds
Extension to other asset classes
The nature of risk factors

Risk factors and active management

- Grinblatt *et al.* (1995) – **Momentum investors versus Value investors**

  "77% of mutual funds are momentum investors"

- Carhart (1997):

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{cov}\left(\alpha_t^{\text{Jensen}}, \alpha_{t-1}^{\text{Jensen}}\right) > 0 \\ \operatorname{cov}\left(\alpha_t^{\text{Carhart}}, \alpha_{t-1}^{\text{Carhart}}\right) = 0 \end{cases}$$

where:

$$\alpha_t^{\text{Carhart}} = R_t^F - \beta^{\text{MKT}} R_t^{\text{MKT}} - \beta^{\text{SMB}} R_t^{\text{SMB}} - \beta^{\text{HML}} R_t^{\text{HML}} - \beta^{\text{WML}} R_t^{\text{WML}}$$

$\Rightarrow$ The (short-term) persistence of the performance of active management is due to the (short-term) **persistence of the performance of risk factors**

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The case of equities
The case of bonds
Extension to other asset classes
The nature of risk factors

Diversification and alpha

David Swensen's rule for effective stock picking

Concentrated portfolio ⇒ No more than 20 bets?

Figure: Carhart's alpha decreases with the number of holding assets


US equity markets, 2000-2014
Source: Roncalli (2017)

"*If you can identify six wonderful businesses, that is all the diversification you need. And you will make a lot of money. And I can guarantee that going into the seventh one instead of putting more money into your first one is going to be terrible mistake. Very few people have gotten rich on their seventh best idea.*" (Warren Buffett, University of Florida, 1998).

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The case of equities
The case of bonds
Extension to other asset classes
The nature of risk factors

Diversification and alpha

Figure: What proportion of return variance is explained by the 4-factor model?

Morningstar database, 880 mutual funds, European equities
Carhart's model with 4 factors, 2010-2014
Source: Roncalli (2017)

How many bets are there in large portfolios of institutional investors?

1986 Less than 10% of institutional portfolio return is explained by security picking and market timing (Brinson *et al.*, 1986)

2009 Professors' Report on the Norwegian GPFG: Risk factors represent 99.1% of the fund return variation (Ang *et al.*, 2009)

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The case of equities
The case of bonds
Extension to other asset classes
The nature of risk factors

Risk factors versus alpha

What lessons can we draw from this?

Idiosyncratic risks and specific bets disappear in (large) diversified portfolios. Performance of institutional investors is then exposed to (common) risk factors.

Alpha is not scalable, but risk factors are scalable

$\Rightarrow$ Risk factors are the only bets that are compatible with diversification

Alpha

- Concentration
- (Discretionary) active management

$\neq$

Beta(s)

- Diversification
- ~~Passive~~ Rule-based (active) management

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The case of equities
The case of bonds
Extension to other asset classes
The nature of risk factors

Factor investing in bonds

Conventional bond model (or the 'equivalent' CAPM)

The total return $R_i(t)$ of Bond i at time t is equal to:

$$R_i(t) = a(t) - \mathrm{MD}_i(t)\, R^I(t) - \mathrm{DTS}_i(t)\, R^S(t) + \mathrm{LTP}_i(t)\, R^L(t) + u_i(t)$$

where:

- $a(t)$ is the constant/carry/zero intercept
- $\mathrm{MD}_i(t)$ is the modified duration
- $\mathrm{DTS}_i(t)$ is the duration-times-spread
- $\mathrm{LTP}_i(t)$ is the liquidity-time-price
- $u_i(t)$ is the residual

$\Rightarrow R^I(t)$, $R^S(t)$ and $R^L(t)$ are the return components due to interest rate movements, credit spread variation and liquidity dynamics.

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The case of equities
The case of bonds
Extension to other asset classes
The nature of risk factors

Factor investing in bonds

Figure: ~~Carhart's~~ Conventional alpha decreases with the number of holding assets

EURO IG corporate bonds, 2000-2017
Source: Amundi Research (2018)

- There is less traditional alpha in the bond market than in the stock market
- What does this result become when introducing alternative risk factors?
- Factor investing in fixed income = new topic in asset management

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The case of equities
The case of bonds
Extension to other asset classes
The nature of risk factors

The concept of alternative risk premia

- In the multi-asset case, we can show that the common risk factors are:
  - Traditional risk premia (e.g. equity and bond risk premia)
  - Alternative risk premia (e.g. carry and momentum risk premia)

- Alternative risk premia explains a significant part of hedge fund returns:
  - L/S equity strategies
  - CTA strategies
  - Relative value strategies

- Hedge Fund AUM decrease[3] (convergence between traditional AM and Alternative management)

- Alpha strategy (satellite portfolio) $\Rightarrow$ strategic asset allocation (SAA or core portfolio)

---

[3]When considering alpha strategies — the growth of HF industry AUM is due to the shift of HFs to traditional asset management (smart beta, risk parity, factor investing, alternative beta, etc.)

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The case of equities
The case of bonds
Extension to other asset classes
The nature of risk factors

The nature of risk factors

- Discretionary active management $\Rightarrow$ specific/idiosyncratic risks & rule-based management $\Rightarrow$ factor investing and systematic risks?
- Are common risk factors exogenous or endogenous?
  - Do risk factors exist without active management?

    Risk factors first, active management second

    or

    Active management first, risk factors second

  - Quality vs Low beta, Momentum vs Size
- Factor investing needs active investing
- Imagine a world without active managers, stock pickers, hedge funds, etc.

$\Rightarrow$ **Should active management be reduced to alpha management?**

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

The case of equities
The case of bonds
Extension to other asset classes
The nature of risk factors

Key takeways

Summary I

- A part of active investing is now packaged as factor investing
- Factor investing = systematic management that captures the common risk factors ($\neq$ passive management)
- Active investing and factor investing are generally opposed. In practice, they aren't!

Figure: The landscape of asset management

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
Shadow asset management
Systematic management & network risk
Seeking active managers

Defining systematic management

1980-2008

- Option hedging
- Portfolio insurance (CPPI, OBPI)
- Index funds
- Quant funds (L/S, statistical arbitrage, etc.)

2009-2018

- Indexation (CW, ETF, AW, etc.)
- Equity factor investing
- Trend-following strategies
- Risk parity portfolios
- Volatility/overlay management (vol control, vol target, vol cap, etc.)
- Volatility investing (short volatility, etc.)
- (Bank) proprietary (strategy) indices
- Robo-advisory

What is the issue?

They may use similar portfolio construction and rule-based mechanisms, and same data, rebalancing frequencies and assets.

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
Shadow asset management
Systematic management & network risk
Seeking active managers

The shadow asset management industry

> *Banks embrace 'the age of asset management'*
> *(Financial Times, November 30, 2015)*
>
> *How FinTech is shaping asset and wealth management*
> *(PWC, 2016)*

- Investment banking vs asset management
  - Investment bankers sell financial products and asset managers buy them to manage for their clients (`www.investopedia.com`)
  - Sell-side / buy-side, own-account / third-party, etc.
- According to FSB (2015), asset management is part of the shadow banking industry
- There is also a shadow asset management industry: investment banks, index sponsors, fintech, robo-advisors, etc.

$\Rightarrow$ A significant part of shadow asset management is driven by rule-based and systematic strategies

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
Shadow asset management
Systematic management & network risk
Seeking active managers

The risk of systematic management

Asset picking $\Rightarrow$ Portfolio allocation
(Securities)   (Asset Classes, group of securities)

- Few quantitative models
- Crowding/spillover effects
- High-frequency strategies (intra-day, daily) vs low-frequency strategies (monthly, quarterly, semi-annually)
- Backward-looking ($\neq$ forward-looking)

$\Rightarrow$ **Is systematic asset management a source of systemic risk?**

See e.g. Black Monday (October 1987), LOR[4] and the Brady report.

---

[4]Company founded by Hayne Leland, John O'Brien and Mark Rubinstein. Leland was named Businessmen of the Year by Fortune in 1987.

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
Shadow asset management
Systematic management & network risk
Seeking active managers

Illustration of systemic risk
Financial crises are not necessarily systemic crises

The dot-com crisis (2000-2003)

If we consider the S&P 500 index, we obtain:

- 55% of stocks post a negative performance

$$\approx 75\% \text{ of MC}$$

- 45% of stocks post a positive performance

Maximum drawdown = 49 %

Small caps stocks ↗
Value stocks ↗

The GFC crisis (2008)

If we consider the S&P 500 index, we obtain:

- 95% of stocks post a negative performance

$$\approx 97\% \text{ of MC}$$

- 5% of stocks post a positive performance

Maximum drawdown = 56 %

Small caps stocks ↘
Value stocks ↘

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
Shadow asset management
Systematic management & network risk
Seeking active managers

Illustration of systemic risk
The specific status of the stock market

The interconnectedness nature of illiquid assets and liquid assets: the example of the Global Financial Crisis

- Subprime crisis ⇔ banks (credit risk)
- Banks ⇔ asset management, e.g. hedge funds (funding & leverage risk)
- Asset management ⇔ equity market (liquidity risk)
- Equity market ⇔ banks (asset-price & collateral risk)

The equity market is the ultimate liquidity provider:
GFC ≫ internet bubble

Remark

$1/3$ *of losses in the stock market might be explained by the liquidity supply*

Stocks ≠ bonds (safe asset, low perceived risk)

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
Shadow asset management
**Systematic management & network risk**
Seeking active managers

Examples of network risk

In most models, the origin of a systemic risk is a stress, but...

- August 24, 2015: US ETF Flash Crash
- October 15, 2014: US Treasury Flash Rally
  "*While no single cause is apparent in the data, the analysis thus far does point to a number of findings which, in aggregate, help explain the conditions that likely contributed to the volatility.*"
- May 6, 2010: US Stock Market Flash Crash
- August 7-10, 2007: The "Quant Quake" (Andrew Lo)

Joint Staff Report:

THE U.S. TREASURY MARKET
ON OCTOBER 15, 2014

U.S. Department of the Treasury
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System
Federal Reserve Bank of New York
U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission

July 13, 2015

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
Shadow asset management
Systematic management & network risk
Seeking active managers

What happened to the VIX in February 6, 2018?

VIX Index (01/02/2018 - 09/02/2018)

XIV ETN

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
Shadow asset management
Systematic management & network risk
Seeking active managers

The crowding question*

- Not an easy question: how to measure crowding effects?
- Crowding of strategies, portfolios or trades?
  - Cross-correlation within a given strategy ($\Rightarrow$ implementation issue)
  - Cross-correlation between strategies ($\Rightarrow$ dependency issue)
  - Temporal correlation between trades ($\Rightarrow$ time-horizon issue)
- Crowding of trades is more problematic than crowding of positions
- Potential temporary synchronization of trades?
- We can think for instance that risk control is more an issue than factor investing for two reasons:
  - time-horizon implementation (daily versus quarterly)
  - the impact of active management

(*)This slide resumes the elements of discussion presented by Charles-Albert Lehalle during the seminar at the AMF.

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
Shadow asset management
Systematic management & network risk
Seeking active managers

How many active managers do we need?

Bhattacharya and Galpin (2011)[5]:

- If everyone is a passive investor, 100% of trading volume is explained by market capitalization

- The aggregate ratio trading volume/market capitalization is a measure of stock picking

$\Rightarrow$ They estimated that stock picking in the US accounted for 80% of trading volume in the 1960's, and for just 24% in 2000-2004

$\Rightarrow$ They also think that the stock market remains efficient if stock picking represents more than 10% of the trading volume

<p align="center"><strong style="color:red">How to measure active management?</p>

---

[5]Bhattacharya, U., and Galpin, N. (2011), The Global Rise of the Value-weighted Portfolio, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 46(3), pp. 737-756. Bhattacharya, U., and Galpin, N. (2005), Is Stock Picking Declining Around the World?, http://www.haas.berkeley.edu/groups/finance/StockPicking.pdf.

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
Shadow asset management
Systematic management & network risk
Seeking active managers

Key takeways

Summary II

- The frontier between asset management, hedge funds and investment banking is now much more blurred

- The risk of the rise of systematic management

  "How the Next Quant Fund Crisis Will Unfold"
  (Bloomberg, August 17, 2017)

- ~~Quant funds~~ $\Rightarrow$ systematic management

- Relationship between systemic risk and network risk: the example of money market funds in 2007 (too ~~big~~ small to fail)

- Volatility market = a potential source of systemic risk

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

Traditional approaches to measure active management

- Tracking-error volatility

- Beta

- Correlation

- Alpha (or tracking difference)

- Information ratio

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

Introducing the active share

> **Definition**
>
> Let $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ be the weights of the benchmark. Let $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be the weights of the portfolio. The active share[a] is defined as one half the sum of absolute deviations between the portfolio weights and the benchmark weights:
>
> $$\mathrm{AS}(x \mid b) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i - b_i|$$
>
> It also corresponds to the one-way turnover assuming that the active portfolio at the previous period is the benchmark index.
>
> ──────────────────
>
> [a]Cremers, M., and Petajisto, A. (2009), How Active is Your Fund Manager? A New Measure that Predicts Performance, *Review of Financial Studies*, 22(9), pp. 3329-3365.

$\Rightarrow$ For long-only portfolios, we have:

$$0 \leq \mathrm{AS}(x \mid b) \leq 1$$

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

Introducing the active share

Table: An example with a universe of 6 assets

Asset	Benchmark	Portfolio				
		#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
#1	40%	40%	25%	30%	10%	0%
#2	30%	30%	25%	20%	20%	0%
#3	20%	20%	25%	10%	30%	0%
#4	10%	10%	25%	0%	40%	0%
#5	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	50%
#6	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	50%
AS		0%	20%	40%	40%	100%

$\Rightarrow$ The active share is equal to zero when the portfolio is exactly equal to the benchmark

$\Rightarrow$ The active share is equal to 100% when the portfolio is invested outside the benchmark

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

How to use active share?

"We argue that Active Share is useful for two main reasons. First, it provides information about a fund's potential for beating its benchmark index – after all, an active manager can only add value relative to the index by deviating from it. Some positive level of Active Share is therefore a necessary (albeit not sufficient) condition for outperforming the benchmark.

Second, while Active Share is a convenient stand-alone measure of active management, it can also be used together with tracking error for a more comprehensive picture of active management, allowing us to distinguish between stock selection and factor timing [...] we can choose tracking error as a reasonable proxy for factor bets and Active Share for stock selection". (Cremers and Petajisto (2009), pages 3330-3331).

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

How to use active share?

Figure: Styles of fund management

Source: Cremers and Petajisto (2009).

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

Active share and performance

Table: Performance of US equity mutual funds (1990-2003)

Statistic	$Q_5 - Q_1$
Excess return wrt to the benchmark	2.55%
Carhart alpha	2.98%

Source: Cremers and Petajisto (2009).

The fund picking rule of Cremers and Petajisto (2009):

- High active share
- Small fund size
- High past year return

$\Rightarrow$ It has been adopted by some institutional clients (e.g. in Asia)

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

Active share and performance

Figure: Active share statistics by benchmark

- Active share figures highly depend on the benchmark!
- Dependency to the frequency distribution of market capitalization
- There is a positive relationship between the active share and the small cap characteristic of the benchmark

Source: Frazzini *et al.* (2016), Figure 1

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

Active share and performance

Figure: Active share correlation with benchmark type and benchmark alpha

- During the period 1990-2009, small-cap indices underperformed large cap indices

- Large cap indices had positive alpha

- Small cap indices had positive alpha

- The relationship active share/performance is index dependent

Source: Frazzini *et al.* (2016), Figure 2

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

Active share and performance

Figure: Cumulative abnormal net returns of active share quintile portfolios, 1990-2015

Jan/90 = $1

Source: Cremers (2017), Figure 2, page 69.

- $Q_5 - Q_1$ is positive from 1990 to 2000
- $Q_5 - Q_1$ is flat since 2001
- US related result?
- The results of Cremers and Petajisto (2009) are mainly explained by the dot.com bubble

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

TE / AS arbitrage

Figure: Frequency distribution of US equity mutual funds in 2009

- Active share and tracking error are related
- The arbitrage AS/TE is constrained

Source: Petajisto (2013), Table 1, page 76.

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

TE / AS arbitrage

Figure: Percentage of US equity retail mutual fund assets by active share

- Active share increases during crisis
- Active share (and tracking error) is time-dependent and regime-dependent
- Risk aversion ⇒ Liquidity issues

Source: Cremers (2017), Figure 1, page 67.

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

TE / AS bounds

Figure: Lower and upper bounds (Eurostoxx 50, 30/12/2016)

- Average correlation = 55%

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

TE / AS bounds

Figure: Lower and upper bounds (the case $\rho_{i,j} = 90\%$)

- The arbitrage AS/TE depends on the correlation regime
- With high correlations, the constraints are less binding
- With low correlations, the constraints are more binding

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

TE / AS arbitrage

Figure: The minimum TE portfolio (Eurostoxx 50, 30/12/2016)

- Herfindahl index $\mathscr{H}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2$
- Number of bets $\mathscr{N}(x) = \mathscr{H}(x)$
- $Q_5 =$ the 10 smallest stocks
- GAC = (normalized) geometric average capitalization
- The small cap bias of high AS portfolios
- **AS = Promoting small cap stocks?**

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

The closet indexing debate

"Closet indexing is an issue which has attracted the attention of investor protection groups and investors alike throughout the European Union and ESMA has played a key role in an EU-wide inquiry to get to the heart of the matter. [...] In partnership with national regulators we are taking a closer look into this issue."
(S. Maijoor, ESMA Chairman, 02/02/2016).

Table: ESMA's results (2600 equity funds, 2012-2014)

Criteria	Potential closet indexing funds	Potential actively managed funds
$AS < 60\% + TE < 4\%$	15%	85%
$AS < 50\% + TE < 3\%$	7%	93%
$AS < 50\% + TE < 3\%$ $+R^2 > 95\%$	5%	95%

Source: ESMA (2016), Statement ESMA/2016/165.

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

Are smart beta portfolios closet indexing?

Figure: Eurostoxx 50 Index (2003-2018)

Tracking error (in %)

Sampling
EW
Risk Parity
Minvar

Active share (in %)

- Universe = Eurostoxx 50
- Sampling = TE minimization with 25 stocks and 5% max weight
- EW & risk parity
- Minvar = minimum variance portfolio with 30 stocks and 5% max weight
- Smart beta portfolios may be closet indexing!

⇒ **Confusion between concentration and active management**

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

The impact of the universe

Figure: MSCI Emu Index

**Active share
is not related
to
performance**

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

The impact of the number of stocks

Figure: The minimum variance (investable) portfolio

Active share is related to the number of CW components

… and the frequency distribution of CW weights

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

The impact of the style management

Figure: Active share of EW portfolios

- CW index = trend-following
- EW portfolio = mean-reverting/contrarian
- If the CW weight of Asset i increases (decreases), the EW portfolio will sell (buy) the asset at the end of the month
- EW = Anti-CW strategy

$\Rightarrow$ **According to AS, mean-reverting strategies are closet indexing!**

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

Active share helps to control the ex-post tracking error

Figure: Sampling portfolios (CAC 40 Index)

Source: Amundi Research (2018)

- CAC 40 Index
- 2007-2017
- Covariance matrix calculated with a one-factor CAPM model
- AS > 50%

- What about bond portfolios? ⇒ AS does not work since weights do not reflect the benchmark structure
- We must include duration or DTS in the AS definition

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Definition
The performance debate
TE / AS arbitrage
The closet indexing debate

Key takeaways

Summary III

- Active share is not a predictor of future performance

- The mathematics of active share are not so obvious, since active share depends on the benchmark and the investment universe

- The debate on closet indexing is an issue of management fees

- The question "Who is Closet Indexing?" is certainly ill-posed, because it is a tricky problem

- The question "Who is active?" is easier

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

# It is difficult to beat the market in the long-run

Figure: Cumulative distribution of the number of years where active managers outperform the market (fees $= 0$)

- p is the annual probability to outperform the market
- We consider a 9-year study period
- Market $=$ the sum of active managers
- Assumption $=$ no skills
- $p = 50\%$ is the theoretical value

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

It is difficult to beat the market in the long-run

Figure: Impact of management fees on the probability p

- We assume that the (equity) risk premium is 8% and the dispersion of active manager returns is 4%

- $p = 50\%$ if Fees $= 0\%$

- $p = 40.1\%$ if Fees $= 1\%$

- $p = 30.9\%$ if Fees $= 2\%$

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

It is difficult to beat the market in the long-run

Figure: Cumulative distribution of the number of years where active managers outperform the market

- The impact of fees is important

- The probability distribution is shifted to the left if we introduce manager skills

- Why is it shifted to the right in practice[a]?

---

[a]Because of attrition rate...

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

It is difficult to beat the market in the long-run

Figure: Probability to outperform during 5 years (in %)

- We note f the management fees and σ_D the performance dispersion

- We have:

$$p = \Phi\left(-\frac{f}{\sigma_D}\right)$$

- p is a decreasing function of f and an increasing function of σ_D

- The right quantity of interest is $\dfrac{f}{\sigma_D}$

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

Ranking vs benchmarking
SPIVA (S&P Indices Versus Active, us.spindices.com/spiva)

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

What about bond funds?

Report 11: Percentage of Fixed Income Funds Outperformed by Benchmarks

FUND CATEGORY	COMPARISON INDEX	1-YEAR (%)	3-YEAR (%)	5-YEAR (%)	10-YEAR (%)	15-YEAR (%)
Government Long Funds	Barclays US Government Long	96.43	100.00	98.31	95.24	98.00
Government Intermediate Funds	Barclays US Government Intermediate	57.89	90.91	80.00	78.05	90.48
Government Short Funds	Barclays US Government (1-3 Year)	47.83	69.23	79.31	76.47	88.24
Investment-Grade Long Funds	Barclays US Government/Credit Long	96.74	94.68	95.45	95.40	97.73
Investment-Grade Intermediate Funds	Barclays US Government/Credit Intermediate	31.37	35.53	40.94	51.06	73.53
Investment-Grade Short Funds	Barclays US Government/Credit (1-3 Year)	22.22	41.67	43.33	57.81	68.89
High Yield Funds	Barclays US Corporate High Yield	80.95	90.87	93.81	98.37	98.23
Mortgage-Backed Securities Funds	Barclays US Aggregate Securitized - MBS	67.92	73.08	79.31	81.40	93.88
Global Income Funds	Barclays Global Aggregate	64.86	60.55	52.59	58.33	69.44
Emerging Markets Debt Funds	Barclays Emerging Markets	22.58	70.69	85.71	73.68	66.67
General Municipal Debt Funds	S&P National AMT-Free Municipal Bond	42.86	58.75	47.50	63.29	82.88
California Municipal Debt Funds	S&P California AMT-Free Municipal Bond	25.71	30.56	37.14	66.67	84.44
New York Municipal Debt Funds	S&P New York AMT-Free Municipal Bond	33.33	57.14	73.33	85.29	89.47
Loan Participation Funds	S&P/LSTA U.S. Leveraged Loan 100	52.08	56.25	52.78	100.00	-

Source: S&P Dow Jones Indices LLC. Data as of Dec. 29, 2017. Returns shown are annualized. Past performance is no guarantee of future results. Table is provided for illustrative purposes.

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

What about multi-asset funds?

- The multi-asset market capitalization portfolio is the true CAPM portfolio (Roll's critique)

- Consolidation of stock & bond index providers?

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

The issue of performance is biased

- Previous analysis = all other things being equal

- The battle between active management and passive management is endogenous, because the market portfolio is the aggregation of active management

- The issue of survivorship
    - For academics, survivorship bias is viewed as a positive effect for the active management industry:
        - It implies that performance is underestimated
    - For active managers, survivorship bias is viewed as a negative effect for the active management industry:
        - Only the best active managers survive
        - Talented managers capture new assets

$\Rightarrow$ Active managers don't only compete with other active managers, but they also compete with themselves
$\Rightarrow$ Endogenous selection increases the probability to underperform in the future

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

Why will active managers still have a role to play?

Figure: Option-like manager compensation

Source: Baker and Haugen (2012)

Figure: Performance dispersion

For illustrative purposes only

What do we need for a market to function properly?

- Backward-looking or forward-looking?
- Low return dispersion or high return dispersion?
- Crowding behavior or contrarian behavior?
- Stop-loss or start-again?

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

Key takeaways

Summary IV

- Performance evaluation: ranking or benchmarking?

- What is the right benchmark of active management?

- More and more benchmarks (cap-weighted, minimum variance, risk factors)

- Benchmarking $\Rightarrow$ crowning glory of tracking error and relative performance[a] (e.g. the mid-2000s break in equity mutual funds, the investment puzzle of institutions, etc.)

---

[a]Nobel Prize Richard Thaler: What does the theory become if utility maximization includes the performance of other economic agents?

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

Conclusion

- Passive/systematic/active management

- The question of systemic risk

- What is the room for active managers?

  - Systematic managers = rule-based active managers?
  - Discretionary active managers = only alpha/specific risk strategies?

- The active management debate is more an issue of dispersion and fees, and less a problem of performance (endogenous problem)

- How to assess the active nature of fund managers?

- The central place of contrarian investors in financial markets

  - Systematic managers: short-term contrarian, long-term trend following?
  - Active managers: short-term trend-following, long-term contrarian?
  - Bull market regime vs bear market regime

Backward-looking vs forward-looking investors

Only forward-looking investors may be contrarian (e.g. March 2009)

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

Epilogue

- Only active managers participate to capital allocation

- Is it possible to define a benchmark for active management?

- Passive management is efficient only if active management is efficient
  $\Rightarrow$ Passive management needs active management

- Individual (or micro) Pareto optimality $\neq$ collective (or macro) Pareto optimality

- The volatility puzzle:
  - The growth of passive management decreases the long-term volatility
  - The decline of active management increases volatility shocks
  - The single-active manager puzzle: no volatility, only jumps, only crashes!

- The regulatory challenge for promoting market efficiency: fees or dispersion?

$$\Rightarrow \textbf{The answer is dispersion!}$$

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

References I

Acemoglu, D., Ozdaglar, A., and Tahbaz-Salehi, A. (2015)

Systemic Risk and Stability in Financial Networks, *American Economic Review*, 105(2), pp. 564-608.

Baker, N., and Haugen, R. (1992)

Low Risk Stocks Outperform within All Observable Markets of the World, *SSRN*, `www.ssrn.com/abstract=2055431`.

Barberis, N., and Thaler, R.H. (2003)

A Survey of Behavioral Finance, in Constantinides, G.M., Harris, M. and Stulz, R.M. (Eds), *Handbook of the Economics of Finance*, 1(B), Elsevier, pp. 1053-1128.

Bhattacharya, U., and Galpin, N. (2011)

The Global Rise of the Value-weighted Portfolio, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 46(3), pp. 737-756.

Carhart, M.M. (1997)

On Persistence in Mutual Fund Performance, *Journal of Finance*, 52(1), pp. 57-82.

Cremers, M. (2017)

Active Share and the Three Pillars of Active Management: Skill, Conviction, and Opportunity, *Financial Analysts Journal*, 73(2), pp. 1-19.

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

References II

Cremers, M., and Petajisto, A. (2009)

How Active is Your Fund Manager? A New Measure that Predicts Performance; *Review of Financial Studies*, 22(9), pp. 3329-3365.

ESMA (2016)

Supervisory Work on Potential Closet Index Tracking, *ESMA/2016/165*, February.

Frazzini, A., Friedman, J., and Pomorski, L. (2016)

Deactivating Active Share, *Financial Analysts Journal*, 72(2), pp. 14-21

Grinblatt, M., Titman, S., and Wermers, R. (1995)

Momentum Investment Strategies, Portfolio Performance, and Herding: A Study of Mutual Fund Behavior, *American Economic Review*, 85(5), pp. 1088-1105.

Hereil, P., Laplante, J., and Roncalli, T. (2013)

Multi-Asset Indices – An Idea Whose Time Has Come, *Journal of Indexes Europe*, 4, January 2013.

Jensen, M.C. (1968)

The Performance of Mutual Funds in the Period 1945-1964, *Journal of Finance*, 23(2), pp. 389-416.

From active investing to factor investing
The rise of systematic management
The active share debate
The performance debate

Active managers and the market performance
Benchmarking vs ranking
The competition issue

References III

Kacperczyk, M. and Schnabl, P. (2013)
How Safe are Money Market Funds?, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128(3), pp. 1073-1122.

Nikeghbali, A., and Roncalli, T. (2016)
Size, Interconnectedness and the Regulation of Systemic Risk, *ESMA/CEMA/GEA Meeting* (November 16, 2016).

Persaud, A.D. (2003).
Liquidity Black Holes: Understanding, Quantifying and Managing Financial Liquidity Risk, Risk Books.

Petajisto, A. (2013)
Active Share and Mutual Fund Performance, *Financial Analysts Journal*, 69(4), pp. 73-93.

Roncalli, T. (2017)
Alternative Risk Premia: What Do We Know?, in Jurczenko, E. (Ed.), *Factor Investing and Alternative Risk Premia*, ISTE Press – Elsevier.

Roncalli, T., and Weisang, G. (2015)
Asset Management and Systemic Risk, *SSRN*, www.ssrn.com/abstract=2610174.
Response to FSB-IOSCO Second Consultative Document, Assessment Methodologies for Identifying NBNI-G-SIFI,
www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/Thierry-Roncalli-and-Guillaume-Weisang.pdf.