



PBI Actuarial Consultants Ltd.

Suite 1070, One Bentall Centre, 505 Burrard Street, Box 42, Vancouver, BC V7X 1M5
pbi@pbiactuarial.ca T. 604-687-8056 F. 604-687-8074

April 27, 2021

To: Fred Hahn, President CUPE Ontario
CUPE Ontario

From: Bradley Hough

Subject: **OMERS Performance Review**

Scope of review

CUPE has asked PBI to review "CUPE Ontario Concerns With OMERS Investment Returns". PBI has reviewed the performance data, methods, and comparisons of OMERS with peer pension plans and funds in CUPE's report.

The intention of our review is to determine:

- a) if comparisons made between the pension plans and funds and their respective benchmarks are reasonable; and
- b) if the analysis completed by CUPE supports the conclusions of their report.

We have reviewed the performance comparisons in CUPE's report by reviewing public information provided by the plans and funds referenced. Statements of investment policies and procedures, actuarial valuation reports, annual reports and other governance documents were reviewed to add as much context around plan performance as possible with the public information available.

Summary

We conclude that the comparisons made by CUPE are reasonable and show that there is a significant gap in performance between OMERS and other comparable public pension plans and funds. In our opinion, public information is unable to fully explain the performance gap. More information is required to truly understand why performance is so different between OMERS and comparable public pension plans and funds.

In our opinion, the comparisons and analysis in the report support CUPE's request for further review of performance.

Review

Is the choice of peer universe reasonable?

CUPE has chosen a universe of large public sector defined benefit plans ("plans"), or public sector investment managers managing assets ("funds") including, but not exclusively, defined benefit pension plans. Scale gives public plans and funds a different opportunity set versus smaller private sector plans as a result of the size of assets and also investment opportunities. We therefore believe that CUPE's approach of focusing on a limited universe of public sector peers rather than a broader pension plan universe is reasonable and fair.

Of the universe supplied, HOOPP, OTPP, BCMPP and LAPP are easier to directly compare given they are pension plans rather than funds; however, the public sector investment managers referenced by CUPE are still useful



points of reference when looking at comparable performance. Performance of funds such as PSP, CDPQ, BCI and AIMCO suggests that client defined benefit plans are likely to have higher absolute returns than OMERS for 2020.

LAPP and AIMCO have not published full performance information for 2020.

Would conclusions change if the universe of plans was expanded?

Defined benefit plans have different benefits, contributions, funding policies, and member demographics. Making comparisons across universes of defined benefit plans requires caution and it is difficult to draw firm conclusions. However, it is worth noting that OMERS performance is significantly below not only public peers, but wider universes of defined benefit plans.

RBC’s universe of pension plans shows a median return of 9.2% for 2020¹. PBI has access to the Northern Trust universe of Canadian defined benefit pension plans² and note that the median return is similar to RBC (full year 2020 median return is 9.9%). The lowest return in the Northern Trust Universe is 5% for 2020. We are not aware of an absolute return for PBI clients below 5%.

Could ‘context’ such as different asset mixes driven by Plan demographics or situation explain OMERS performance?

a. Asset Mix

We compared asset mixes with HOOPP, BCMPP and OTPP. HOOPP has a liability driven investment strategy and has a higher fixed income allocation. BCMPP and OTPP are return focused like OMERS. OMERS has a higher proportion in real assets and credit than these plans and lower fixed income assets. OTPP has a specific inflation management strategy. However, at a high level, asset allocations between OMERS, BCMPP and OTPP make use of similar asset classes and are comparable.

Asset Class	OMERS	BCMPP	OTPP	HOOPP
Public Equity	31%	33%	19%	23%
Fixed Income	6%	21%	16%	86%
Private Equity	14%	10%	19%	13%
Real Assets	34%	27%	21%	15%
Credit/Mortgages	17%	6%	8%	0%
Inflation Sensitive	0%	0%	17%	0%
Innovation	0%	0%	2%	0%
Absolute Return Strategies	0%	0%	6%	0%
Money Market	-2%	2%	-8%	-37%

Source: annual reports as of December 31, 2020, except for BCMPP, which is as of December 31, 2019.

¹ The RBC pension plan universe is published by RBC Investor and Treasury Services. “All Plan Universe” currently tracks the performance and asset allocation of a cross-section of assets under management across Canadian defined benefit pension plans.

² The Northern Trust universe of defined benefit plans is provided to PBI by Northern Trust. It consists of 34 defined benefit plans ranging from \$16.4M to \$8.7B in size. Average plan assets are \$1.9B, median plan assets are \$627M as of December 31, 2020.



As the differences in performance are so large between OMERS and two plans with comparable asset mixes (albeit with some differences), more information on specific strategies within each asset class, such as style of equity manager, exposure to office, retail, and industrial real estate within real assets, use of leverage/overlay strategies and derivatives, currency hedging, and approach to liquidity management would be required to explain differences in performance.

We note that on page 43 of the OMERS 2020 Annual Report, losses were incurred on foreign currency hedging positions due to actions taken to protect liquidity. This contributed \$2.2B to the overall loss. Again, this indicates that a review, significantly beyond simple asset mix comparisons, is required to truly understand performance differentials.

Finally, understanding the role of the 'Total Portfolio Management' approach in determining asset allocations and strategies would be helpful to putting context around the asset mix choices and investment strategies.

b. Membership Demographics

We note that BCMPP and HOOPP have broadly similar membership demographics to OMERS. OTPP is more mature with a greater proportion of retirees. PBI does not believe plan demographics are different enough to render comparisons between the plans invalid.

Comments on CUPE's five principal findings:

- 1) **OMERS 10-year annualized performance was below peer group as of December 31, 2019.** PBI believes the comparisons made are reasonable and agree with the conclusion.
- 2) **OMERS performance in 2020 was significantly below peers.** PBI agrees with this conclusion and notes that expanding the peer group adds weight to this conclusion.
- 3) **OMERS does not report comparisons of its annualized long-term returns to its own benchmarks**
Page 143 of the 2020 report has a comparison of calendar year returns vs benchmarks to 2011. We could not find a comparison of annualized long term performance vs benchmarks for OMERS.

We understand benchmarks are set annually by OMERS and approved by the Administration Corporation Board. From the information made public by OMERS, we would need more detail on the methodology used to derive the absolute return benchmark to interpret performance.

- 4) **5 to 10-year returns versus 5 to 10-year benchmarks.**

PBI verified the calendar year returns shown by CUPE. We were unable independently to verify the 5 and 10-year performance versus the benchmark as this was provided verbally to CUPE by OMERS and is not published. The peer group of public plans and funds all take different approaches to benchmarking. Some use composites of public market indices/asset class benchmarks according to their target allocations. PSP uses a reference portfolio approach and HOOPP may use a liability focused benchmark. We note that comparisons of relative performance vs stated benchmarks across peer group plans are challenging because of the differences in methodology.

However, in our opinion the analysis is sufficient to show that OMERS is the only Plan underperforming their internal benchmark over a 10-year horizon. Understanding why requires a deeper understanding



of performance and benchmarking methodology beyond the information made public. In our opinion this adds weight to CUPE's request for a review of performance.

- 5) **OMERS 20-year return is not above its 20-year benchmark.** We were unable to independently verify this point as the performance versus the benchmark was provided verbally to CUPE by OMERS and is not publicly available.

Conclusions

The comparisons made by CUPE are high level and broad by the nature of information made public. However, we believe the comparisons are reasonable and that CUPE has chosen similar public plans and funds as practically possible. Overall, we believe the analysis is sufficient to conclude that OMERS investment performance in 2020 and longer term is significantly lower than other comparable plans.

PBI would require considerably more information than made public on OMERS' total portfolio management approach, investment strategies, third party managers, asset mix policies, liquidity management approach and derivative positions to interpret performance.

In our opinion, the comparisons made demonstrate that the longer-term performance gap between comparable peers is significant and supports CUPE's request for a further, more detailed review of performance beyond the information made public.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bradley Hough".

Bradley Hough, FIA, ACIA, CAIA

BH:jh

U:\T0001\0001\110\00\2021\D\C1.DOCX