

## Industry super at risk of hubris

“Industry super funds taking their current favoured position for granted risk performing like old-fashioned retail funds if they allow hubris to set in” warned Adelaide based financial strategist Theo Marinis.

“There is the risk of industry fund executives becoming self-congratulatory and complacent – and that in turn runs the risk of letting the rot which infected some of their competitors to creep into their practices,” he said.

As the outflow of funds from banks to Industry funds becomes a flood, we may also see a leaking of the same ‘executives’ (who earned their stripes at the big 4 banks) emerge in the Industry fund world. If this happens, it will not be long until the same old bad practices re-occur under a different guise.

And whilst the Hayne Royal Commission and the Productivity Commission appear to have anointed Industry super as the most efficient way for saving for retirement, there is an efficiency limit. For super balances of \$400,000 and over, there are far more cost and efficiency benefits to be gained by using a retail investment platform.

I view the ‘active’ management styles employed by most industry funds as gambling with members’ funds. A statistically far smarter bet is to buy index funds – and it’s a much more cost-effective solution.

Where the advantage falls to Industry funds (as the advertising campaign has made it clear) is that in many cases they are cheaper (but not necessarily better) than most retail (bank run) funds. I stress that this may be better – but not in all cases – as there are a number of retail funds which charge half the cost of the Industry fund equivalent.

My greater concern is the inability to make proper comparisons.

Consumers are often confused by the description of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ funds. Both industry and retail funds invest in the same asset classes, but the successful evaluation all comes down to what exposure they have to those asset classes, and how well diversified the underlying portfolios are within – and between them.

This lack comparability between funds fosters misrepresentation. For example, many funds labelled ‘balanced’ (traditionally a fund which has a 70/30 ratio to growth versus defensive assets) have an 80% to 90% – or higher growth assets exposure.

Funds with a higher exposure to growth assets will obviously perform better in good times than one which has, say, a 65% exposure. **When** the market corrects, however, as it always does, the fund with the highest growth assets exposure will be subject to the highest falls – leaving investors in that fund to wonder why their ‘balanced’ portfolio has been so adversely affected.

Bear in mind that there is nothing wrong with a higher to exposure growth assets if your investment risk profile and life stage warrants it! In my 40s my exposure to growth assets exposure was well into the 90% range. Now that I am in my mid-50s, this exposure is well below 80%.

Given that I have always advocated for cost effective funds, we recently ran a comparison with what our clients pay with the five 'best' industry funds (as identified by rating agency Canstar in February 2019).

This is not as easy as it sounds, as there are no strict rules governing how funds describe asset allocations and / or (often the lack of) strategies for diversifying investment risk.

A comparison of the total costs and performance of '**balanced funds**' over a seven-year period based on an investment of \$500,000 is tabled below:

Fund	Accumulated Value – 7 years (\$)	Return on investment (%)	Investment Management cost pa (%)	Growth Assets exposure (%)
Catholic Super	\$922,269	9.14%	1.17%	85%
Host Plus	\$998,799	10.39%	1.40%	93%
CBUS	\$979,952	10.09%	1.07%	85%
Australian Super	\$982,447	10.13%	0.88%	78%
Sun Super	\$956,518	9.71%	0.73%	81%
Non industry fund balanced portfolio *	\$969,408	9.92%	0.50%	65%
Non industry fund growth portfolio *	\$1,061,210	11.35%	0.50%	80%

***\*diversified portfolio constructed using MFG researched investment options, managed via an MFG approved investment platform.***

It makes interesting comparison and highlights the difficulty of comparing apples with oranges!

The Productivity Commission's proposed beauty parade of the top 10 performing funds is sadly doomed to fail because of the lack of transparency – and the impact could be enormous. If suddenly, 30% of the population 'piles in' to the top fund and it is overweight in growth assets, when the inevitable occurs they will see their retirement savings hopes dashed.

I believe that a better focus for the Productivity Commission and the Government in the post Hayne era would be to define the various asset classes, so we can compare apples with apples, and to focus more on the quality of advice provided.

Superannuation has become far too complex (and too opaque) for the average worker to navigate in order to find the best outcome possible. In a former life as a Centrelink FIS officer, I saw this every day.

The quality of the advice and the appropriateness of guidance tailored to the individual makes the biggest impact on the long-term wealth accumulation and the preservation of capital. It should not be limited just to the tools the adviser uses." Theo said.

For further information, please contact:

Theo Marinis  
(08) 8130 5130

-o0o-

For further information, please contact:



**Theo Marinis B.A., B.Ec., CPA., CFP®**  
Financial Strategies (SA) Pty Ltd  
Trading as **Marinis Financial Group**  
T 08 8130 5130  
F 08 8331 9161  
E [admin@marinigroup.com.au](mailto:admin@marinigroup.com.au)  
W [marinigroup.com.au](http://marinigroup.com.au)  
A 67 Kensington Road  
NORWOOD SA 5067