

Lessons from Hedge Fund Registration Stephen Brown, William Goetzmann, Bing Liang, Christopher Schwarz

Motivation

- Operational Risk
- Not Market Risk
- SEC registration: file a Form ADV by February 1st, 2006.
- Filing requirement overturned on June 23rd, 2006.
- Now, some do, some don't.



Institutional Concern About Risk

- Fiduciary guidelines imply concern for risk
 Financial risk
 - Operational risk
- Institutional demand
 - Growing popularity of market neutral styles
 - Explosive growth of funds of funds
 - Demand for "market neutral" funds of funds



Operational Risk



Source: Tremont TASS (Europe) Limited



Financial Risk



Source: Elton and Gruber 1995. Risk is measured relative to the standard deviation of the average stock



Financial Risk



Size of portfolio

Yale School of Management



Research Questions

Anything interesting in ADVs?
Useful? To Whom?
Or Redundant and Costly?
Value of SEC Oversight?

Data



 management companies matched with ADV forms by both name and address from the "Company" TASS file..

Data (cont.)

- 893 of 1,697 (52.3%) TASS management companies identified.
- 2,272 of the 4,019 (56.5%) of TASS funds.
- Unmatched TASS Companies:
 - □ 22% had assets under \$25 million
 - □ 2% had lockup longer than 2 years
 - □ 73% were foreign based

Form ADV

- •35 pages long.
- General info.
- Questions on:
 - potential conflicts of interest
 - legal or regulatory issues [Item 11]
 - ownership structure (both direct and indirect)

Yale School of Management



Phil Goldstein

- ADV form asks everything from "your last small pox vaccination to every dirty joke you got on Email"
- Item 11
 - Felonies
 - Investment-related misdemeanors
 - Any SEC, CFTC or self-regulatory issues
 - Lawsuits

Tests and Results

- A "Problem" fund = a fund whose management company answered 'Yes' to ANY question on Item 11.
- Of 2,272 funds 358 (15.8%) are defined as "problem."

□ 128 of 893 (14.3%) management companies.

 Of the 10,295 total ADV registrations, 1,526 (14.8%) had a "problem."



"Problem" vs. "Non-Problem"

	"Problem Funds" "Non-		"Non-Problem"	n-Problem" funds		
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Diff	<i>p</i> -value
Avg. Return	0.89	0.80	0.98	0.84	-0.09	0.05**
Std. Dev.	2.60	1.79	2.74	2.08	-0.14	0.28
1 st Order AC	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.14	0.00	0.82
Sharpe Ratio	0.33	0.29	0.39	0.30	-0.06	0.01***
AUM (\$mm)	218.23	58.74	180.23	54.00	38.0	0.20
Age (Years)	5.65	4.50	4.99	3.92	0.66	0.01***
Min Invtmnt	0.98	0.50	1.30	0.50	-0.32	0.35
Management fee	1.37	1.25	1.38	1.50	-0.01	0.63
Incentive fee	15.23	20.00	17.52	20.00	-2.29	0.00***
HWM	0.69	1.00	0.82	1.00	-0.13	0.00***
Lockup	4.07	0.00	4.48	0.00	-0.41	0.24

Table 2B/C: Problem vs. Non-Problem

	Problem	Non problem		
Conflict of Interest	% Yes	% Yes	Diff	<i>p</i> -value
Broker/Dealer	73.8	24.8	49.0	***
Investment Comp	50.4	16.0	34.4	***
Investment Advisor	74.7	41.3	33.4	***
Bank	40.4	9.8	30.6	***
Sponsor of LLP	56.8	22.2	34.6	***
BuySellYourOwn	30.1	8.4	21.7	***
BuySellYourselfClients	85.2	69.6	15.6	***
RecSecYouOwn	74.9	50.8	24.1	***
AgencyCrossTrans	31.2	2.3	28.9	***
RecSalesInterest	22.6	15.7	6.9	***
RecBrokers	45.7	38.4	7.3	***
OtherResearch	81.3	69.9	11.4	***

Yale School of Management



	Problem Funds		Non-Problem funds			
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Diff	<i>p</i> -value
Direct Owners	7.85	7.00	6.44	5.00	1.41	0.00***
Controlling	8.47	7.00	6.46	5.00	2.01	0.00***
Percent 75%	0.73	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.23	0.00***
Domestic Entity	0.80	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.30	0.00***
Indirect Owners	2.26	1.00	1.30	0.00	0.88	0.00***
Levered?	0.51	1.00	0.58	1.00	-0.07	0.03**
Margin?	0.36	0.00	0.49	0.00	-0.13	0.00***
Person Capital (\$mm)	1.18	0.00	2.64	0.00	-1.46	0.02**



Probit Model

- Do ADV conflict and ownership variables distinguish problem funds?
- Control For type and style.
- Relationship variables for potential conflicts correlated.
 - Reduced to single variable.

Probit Results

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Log Assets	0.012	-0.023	-0.005
HWM	-0.193**	-0.111	-0.140
Mean Return	-0.039***		0.063
Incentive Fee		-0.039***	-0.038***
Relationship		0.790***	0.682***
AgencyCrossTrans			1.418***
RecSecYouOwn		0.313***	0.333***
BuySellYourOwn		0.679***	
Other Research		0.321***	0.256**
PercentOwner75			0.554***
Direct Domestic			0.128***
Pseudo R-squared	3.97%	16.62%	25.73%
Number of Observations	1971	1971	1954

Leverage and Problem

Can lenders tell the difference?
TASS leverage variables

Average leverage
Maximum leverage

Style controls

Leverage and Problem

- First, cross-section.
- Second, time-series.
 - a z-score created from TASS data to proxy for operational risk (described later)
 - From 2001-2005, we regress average leverage against the z-score and control for style.

Leverage and Problem Funds

	Problem	Non problem	Diff	p-value
All funds				
Leverage	0.51	0.58	-0.07	0.03**
Avg. Leverage	53.53	85.49	-31.96	0.01***
Max Leverage	98.21	141.02	-42.81	0.00***
No FOF				
Leverage	0.61	0.61	-0.01	0.88
Avg. Leverage	64.81	95.65	-30.84	0.02**
Max Leverage	119.59	159.18	-39.59	0.05**
5% Winsorized				
Avg. Leverage	44.54	65.31	-20.77	0.00***
Max Leverage	82.45	108.63	-26.18	0.00***

Yale School of Management



Leverage By Style

Category	Matched	Problem	Problem Avg	Non-Problem Avg
Convertible Arb	4.27%	7.24%	118.04	170.24
Dedicated Short	0.70%	0.00%	n/a	72.22
Emerging Markets	4.23%	3.06%	0.00	18.60
Equity Neutral	6.34%	5.85%	185.31	61.18
Event Driven	12.02%	13.65%	52.49	51.06
Fixed Arb	6.07%	3.34%	287.50	419.81
FOF	20.77%	25.63%	6.72	36.33
Global Macro	3.57%	0.84%	140.00	136.34
Long-Short	34.95%	32.31%	24.86	44.93
Managed Futures	3.43%	4.18%	19.34	94.38
Multi-Strat	3.65%	3.90%	40.00	118.46

Returns

- Do conflicts and capital structure matter to returns?
 - Control for size, risk (std. dev.), onshore/offshore, and style.
- Issues
 - Survived funds (mean and std. effects)
 - Different life-spans (1998 effects)

Return Regression Results

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Log Assets	0.093***	0.095***	0.095***
Stdev	0.167***	0.167***	0.166***
Onshore	0.079***	0.069**	0.077***
Lockup Period		0.003	
Incentive Fee		0.004	
HWM		0.054	0.074**
Relationship		-0.080***	-0.057*
Direct Domestic			-0.074***
PercentOwner75			-0.103***
Pseudo R-squared	35.40%	35.83%	36.71%
Number of Observations	1958	1958	1954

Efficiency vs. Risk

Separate Problem and Non-Problem funds.Control for Style

Return Regression Results

	Problem	Non-problem	Combined
Log Assets	0.107***	0.103***	0.105***
Fund Age	-0.027***	-0.018***	-0.020***
Stdev	0.160***	0.178***	0.176***
Onshore	0.057	0.110***	0.103***
Incentive Fee	-0.005	0.007*	0.004
HWM	-0.033	-0.008	-0.009
Relationship	-0.668***	-0.023	-0.064**
Internal Conflict	-0.049	0.105***	0.053
Direct Domestic	0.010	-0.082***	-0.073***
PercentOwner75	-0.146	-0.090***	-0.100***
Chow test	< 0.01		
Adj. R-squared	38.12%	38.76%	37.40%
Number of Observations	321	1618	1939

Observable Proxy

- No ADVs before 2006
- We use observable TASS characteristics
- Canonical correlation
- Z-scores
- Allows use of history

Observable Proxy (cont.)

- Using this "z-score", we can retrospectively examine the performance of high problem-score funds.
- We use 9 different TASS datasets to update the z-score for each fund yearly.
- Regressions are controlled for style differences using both the TASS style dummies and Brown and Goetzmann (1997) cluster styles.

Univariate measure of problem

TASS		ADV	
Previous Returns	-0.27***	AgencyCrossTrans	0.06**
Previous Std. Dev.	-0.36***	RelBrokerDealer	0.24***
Fund Age	-0.10***	RelInvestComp	0.25***
Log of Assets	0.09***	RelInvAdvisor	0.24***
Reports Assets	0.07***	RelPartSponser	0.27***
Incentive Fee	-0.89***	BuySellYouOwn	0.06**
Margin	-0.29***	BuySellYourClient	-0.12***
Audited	-0.21***	RecSecYouOwn	0.32***
Personal Capital	-0.26***	RecUnderwriter	0.24***
Onshor	-0.11***	RecSalesInterest	0.28***
OpenToInv	0.04	RecBrokers	-0.35***
Accepts Mgd. Accts.	-0.13***	PercentOwner75	0.17***
Corr ADV & TASS	0.41***	DirectDomestic	0.28***

Does the operational risk measure predict returns?

	TASS Style DummiesB		B-G Style Dummies	
	Coeff	<i>t</i> -value	Coeff	<i>t</i> -value
2005	-1.09%	-2.97***	-0.14%	-2.20**
2004	-2.18%	-6.47***	-0.31%	-1.27
2003	-6.74%	-6.06***	-3.32%	-4.05***
1996	-1.82%	-2.35**	-0.80%	-1.27
1995	-1.06%	-1.16	-0.86%	-1.11
1994	-2.52%	-3.21***	-1.60%	-2.48**
Average	-2.03%	-2.50**	-1.25%	-3.39**
Avg. Adj. R-sq.	9.34%		36.77%	
Avg. Obs	1,338		1,338	

Does the operational risk measure predict leverage?

	TASS Style Dummies		B-G Style Du	ummies
	Coeff	<i>t</i> -value	Coeff	<i>t</i> -value
2005	-18.04	-4.04***	-6.39	-6.80***
2004	-28.87	-5.85***	-35.16	-8.25***
2003	-24.76	-4.76***	-33.38	-7.19***
2002	-17.36	-3.28***	-26.96	-5.68***
2001	-21.75	-3.96***	-27.21	-5.30***
Average	-22.16	-10.33***	-25.82	-5.04***
Avg. Adj. R-sq.	13.74%		2.61%	
Avg. Obs	2279		2279	

Investor Flows and Problem Funds

- So far, redundancy support for equity and debt investors.
- Customers?
- Use z-score and flow-performance analysis to test.

Flow Analysis

- Explain Yearly Flow to Top Performers.
- Problem Funds Different?
- Piecewise Performance
- Controls for Category Flows etc.
- Z-score and Interaction
- Interaction Significant?
- 1994 to2005
- Coefficients and *t*-values a la Fama and MacBeth (1973).

Table 4 – Panel B

	Coeff	<i>t</i> -value	Coeff	<i>t</i> -value
Low Rank	0.603	5.23***	0.639	6.28***
Mid Rank	0.978	6.01***	0.982	6.31***
High Rank	0.911	6.13***	0.894	4.75***
Std. Dev.	-0.022	-5.43***	-0.023	-6.17***
Category Flows	0.687	8.49***	0.688	8.35***
Log Assets	-0.118	-6.66***	-0.118	-6.75***
Mgmt. Fees.	-0.045	-3.71***	-0.044	-3.52***
Z-score	-0.006	-0.85	0.027	1.06
Low Rank/Z			-0.015	-0.12
Mid Rank/Z			-0.194	-1.80*
High Rank/Z			0.085	0.70
Avg. Adj. R-sq.	14.00%		14.16%	
Avg. Obs	966		966	

Conclusion

- Problems Correlate to Conflict.
- Return Differential
- Leverage Differential
- Ownership Differential
- No Flow/Performance Differential
- Would Customers Use ADV Information?