

Investment

Are Hedge Funds Worth Higher Fees? The Straight Story: Hedge Funds

By: Sam Wiseman

While hedge funds are capturing more and more attention from the investment community, Wiseman, of Wise Capital, is not certain the industry has the resources to adequately assess hedge fund industry.

In an unregulated environment, with so many entering this area, hedge funds have attracted of:

- Pension plan sponsors who need to juice returns as a result of low expectations of returns or assets
- Individual investors who are attracted by the occasional astonishing return and are increasing minimum investment qualifications
- The investment community, in general, which needs and wants to understand what is going on
- Consultants who are overwhelmed by the vast number and complexity of this booming industry
- Regulators, seeing high profile funds disappearing, who want to protect the public

However, the lack of regulation and little transparency is also attracting the attention of numerous unscrupulous entrants.

Are hedge funds worth the awesome high fees? Can they repeatedly deliver on high performance? Are they so hard to analyze?

Let us look at new research that is just beginning to give us answers to these questions.

Lack Of Transparency

By their nature, hedge funds lack transparency. That is the critical factor that signals to experienced knowledgeable participants to beware. The lack of transparency manifests itself when one attempts to standardize performance, risk measurement, or due diligence.

From their point of view, hedge fund managers want to protect their proprietary investment performance. They are not obliged to reveal holdings or even meet with the typical client.

The holdings are audited annually but turn over many times in the year, commissions are fixed, and, hence, it is impossible for an outsider to measure the risk. Hedge funds, in their business interest to appear to be wizards hiding behind the curtain.

This lack of transparency is an advantage in attracting some skilful managers to the industry. They want consultants looking over their shoulders, telling them that they are changing their style or taking risk against the benchmark.

The high fee structure is very attractive to managers and salesmen. A recent study shows that traditional long-only investment management, hedge funds have 10 times the fees at one-fifth the incentive bonuses do result in gaining of performance. And that's why studies reveal that a short-term year of performance is followed by three years of very plain performance.

Different Game

To the mainstream investment industry, which is extremely conservative, the challenge of finding tracking hedge fund managers is proving too great. The quantitative tools available are inadequate to manage the risks of hedge funds. The interviewing skills and due diligence cannot, before the fact detect failing strategies or unscrupulous individuals. Efficient frontiers, assumptions of normality, they don't work for a simple reason, these managers are selling short! Traditional investment tools break down just as you cannot use a hockey stick in a baseball game – it's a completely different sport!

The quick answer of Value at Risk (VAR) doesn't cut it either. VAR assumes log normality, underestimates the true risk of hedge funds when there is short selling.

When the manager shorts, there is an unlimited downside. When the manager gets his short position increases. He is fighting the natural upward trend of the market. Shorts have a small margin and need constant replenishment, and many stocks cannot be practically shorted. Also, there are rules to follow and you are fighting management when you sell their stock short.

Few track records go back 10 years. Back tests are particularly unrelated to actual performance. Low correlations shown against conventional benchmarks.

New research shows returns have a 2.43 per cent annual survivorship bias. In long-only equity that's the difference between the median manager and the best long-term managers. Total fees and performance fees take another 5 percent (Ennis and Sebastian, Journal of Portfolio Management). So over a longer term timeframe, the average hedge fund has at most a 2 percent a year annualized return.

The standard deviation of the hedge fund manager universe is nearly as high as equities. It is reduced by having a group of managers? Research shows five to 10 managers gives you a 75 per cent diversification. However, adding managers often increases risk by adding different market exposures not hedging in a multi-manager program. When the sponsor is investing in long funds, adding additional managers normally covers more of the market and reduces risk.

Furthermore, there is a herd effect by hedge funds making similar bets. For example, recently have been following long gold and oil. Because they are enigmatic, they are often misclassified by many potential investors. Hedge fund managers still swim in the same waters as other investment managers, not diversifying so much as they are merely applying different and large bets in selected investments. Because of the immense probability of negative surprises, the Sharpe ratio does not measure the skill of hedge funds.

Another principle of finance that cannot be readily applied is that of time as a diversifier. Over a long period, a disciplined long-only manager will normally achieve his performance objective as risks are diversified. Research shows this is not the situation for hedge funds, largely because of insolvency risk.

Losing all of your money is certainly risky. That's not simply having a short-term volatility in returns. And 10 to 20 per cent of the hedge fund universe goes bust in any given year. Some high profile benchmarks

Long Term Capital Management, Manhattan Capital Management, Maricopa Investment Corporation, and Convertible Arbitrage. At an AIMR conference earlier in 2003, a well-respected senior portfolio manager predicted that 80 per cent of current hedge funds will disappear within a few years. Funds break down from failure due to misrepresentation of investments, unauthorized trading, and insufficient funding.

Lack Of Due Diligence

To make a difference in traditional risk/return tradeoff analysis, investors need to allocate 20% of their money to hedge funds, studies show. This requires awesome support of consultant knowledge available. Perhaps a couple of the very biggest consultants can follow some hedge funds, but, for most consultants simply cannot afford the infrastructure to do a proper job to educate themselves on the strategies and track the 4,000 managers in any prudent depth.

One bad manager easily wipes out all the benefits of a hedge fund allocation. So several managers are required in a program. The search must be diligent as it is an unregulated industry, where few managers are known by a reliable analyst. An on-site check, the smell test of sophisticated institutional investors is a waste of time in hedge funds because the inspector rarely has the knowledge.

The investor must pick several different types of managers, not based on track record. The hedge fund strategies alone can fill a long list. It can even include strategies that rarely short sell. Most fund-of-funds limit managers to \$200 million in any strategy as an optimal size to be nimble and scale the amount to \$20 million.

Institutions are more often dealing with the opportunity to invest in hedge funds by delegating due diligence to fund of funds. But these managers of managers, despite adding an additional layer of astronomical high fees, are not usually doing significant due diligence. If there are great risks in the industry, they are compounded by having fund-of-funds.

Long/short

The first hedge fund model was long/short equity hedge funds. About half of the hedge funds can be identified by this description. They tend to invest in equities, both on the long and the short side and generally have a small net long exposure. This alone still is more risky than long-only.

They are genuinely opportunistic strategies capitalizing on stock picking skill. A subset of the 'neutral hedge funds' that seek to neutralize certain market risks by taking offsetting long and short instruments with actual or theoretical relationships. These are essentially long/short equity hedge funds that maintain long and short portfolios of the same size and/or risk. It is nearly impossible to be 100% neutral in every period. There is no toolkit or model available to offset all risks, so that it is a long/short but it is only a question of degree of the magnitude of the long direction.

In brief, the industry is handicapped by few resources to cover the 4,000-something hedge funds.

*Sam Wiseman is chief investment officer at Wise Capital Management.
(sjwiseman@wisecapitalmanagement.com)*