

## A REVIEW OF INVESTMENT MANAGERS – 31 Mar 2009

By T H Friedrich – Managing Director, Retirement Fund Solutions Namibia (Pty) Ltd

The monthly review of portfolio performance, as set out in this issue, is also available on our website at [www.rfsol.com.na](http://www.rfsol.com.na)

### 1. Introduction


BENCHTEST is a unique technical analysis of popular Namibian retirement fund investment portfolios, produced on behalf of the Benchmark Retirement Fund by Namibian niche fund administrator, Retirement Fund Solutions Namibia (Pty) Ltd. It only reflects extracts from an extensive data base that is available to interested parties who have a need for detailed information to assist them in taking decisions concerning their fund's investments.

### 2. Review of Asset Class and Sector Performance

#### Quarter 1 of 2009


Graph 1 below reflects the returns of the various asset classes, which pension fund investment portfolios typically comprise of.

Graph 1




Graph 2 reflects the performance of companies classified by market capitalization, e.g. large companies (Top 40\*), medium sized (Mid Cap\*) and small listed companies (Small Caps\*) and classified by type of company, e.g. growth and value companies.

Graph 2



Graph 3 reflects the returns of the main economic sectors.


Graph 3



### 3. Analysis of Manager Portfolio Composition


Graph 4 provides an overview how the asset allocation of the average prudential balanced portfolio changed over the course of the 7 quarters.

Graph 4



Graph 5 reflects the asset allocation of the prudential balanced portfolios, also distinguishing between onshore and offshore assets.

Graph 5




Graph 6 provides an overview how the sector allocation of the average prudential balanced portfolio changed over the course of the 6 quarters.

## A REVIEW OF INVESTMENT MANAGERS – 31 Mar 2009

By T H Friedrich – Managing Director, Retirement Fund Solutions Namibia (Pty) Ltd


The monthly review of portfolio performance, as set out in this issue, is also available on our website at [www.rfsof.com.na](http://www.rfsof.com.na)

Graph 6



Graph 7 reflects the sector allocation within the equity allocation of the prudential balanced portfolios.


Graph 7



### 4. Analysis of Manager Performance

Graph 8 reflects the performance for quarter 1 of 2009 of the prudential balanced portfolios (blue shaded bars) in our survey, all others carrying special mandates:


Graph 8



Graph 9 reflects the results of projected performance based on equity sector and asset allocation of each portfolio, its actual performance and 'projection error' (difference between projected and actual performance) for quarter 1 of 2009. High projection errors should be caused by good or poor stock selection or

portfolio restructuring and should require further analysis.

Graph 9



Can one reconstruct manager's performance to see where they had actually gone wrong?

Table 1 below reflects the average exposure and the projected performance for the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2009 for the average prudential, managed portfolio in our analysis and is a good benchmark for measuring the performance of your manager/s:

Table 1

Asset Class	Expos %	Perf %	Weighted Perf %
Equity	52.3	- 5.9	- 3.1
Bonds	10.4	2.9	0.3
Cash	16.2	2.4	0.4
Property	2.8	- 2.1	- 0.1
Gold	0.3	11.3	0.0
Intern Equit.	12.8	- 11.8	- 1.5
Intern Other	5.2	- 4.8	- 0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>- 4.2</b>

The projected performance of the average portfolio for the quarter, of **minus 4.2%**, represents a projection error of 0.4% on the actual performance of **minus 4.6 %** for the average prudential manager per graph 8.

Table 2 drills down further into equities as the asset class with the biggest impact on performance by far. The average manager presents the benchmark for measuring your manager/s (average exposure):

## A REVIEW OF INVESTMENT MANAGERS – 31 Mar 2009

By T H Friedrich – Managing Director, Retirement Fund Solutions Namibia (Pty) Ltd

The monthly review of portfolio performance, as set out in this issue, is also available on our website at [www.rfsof.com.na](http://www.rfsof.com.na)

Table 2


Equity Sector	Exposure %	Perf %	Weighted Perf %
Oil & Gas	4.4	- 1.8	- 0.1
Basic Mat	20.4	0.7	0.1
Industrials	13.4	- 12.8	- 1.7
Cons Goods	9.1	- 13.1	- 1.2
H/care	1.2	12.3	0.1
Cons Serv	8.8	- 6.9	- 0.6
Telecoms	8.9	- 2.4	- 0.2
Financials	32.5	- 7.0	- 2.3
Technol	0.9	- 4.5	- 0.0
Other	0.4	- 4.2	- 0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>- 5.9</b>

Graph 8 above shows that top performing Stanlib outperformed the average manager by roughly 2.9% for the quarter, while bottom ranking Prudential under performed by 1.9%. Investec is ignored for this quarter as the March return provided by Investec was incorrect and rectified in April, only after the end of the quarter.


Based on the portfolio structure of the managers, **graph 10** shows where the manager has added/subtracted value through asset allocation relative to the projected performance of the average manager in our survey, while **graph 11** shows a similar result with regard to sector allocation. This plus the projection error as also overlaid per graph 9, produces the actual performance of the manager for the quarter.

Adding value through asset and sector allocation is a function of correctly predicting cycles and represents a different skill from adding value through stock picking, latter being a function of superior analytical skills. The former is usually the result of the ‘top – down’ approach to portfolio structuring while latter is the result of a ‘bottom – up’ approach. Some managers proclaim to have a two directional approach while others proclaim to be ‘bottom – up’ managers only.

Graph 10



Graph 11



### How predictable is the managers' performance?

**Table 3** shows our ‘projection error’ over the past 3 quarters and should give some food for thought for when a board of trustees reviews its current managers or intends to employ other manager/s. High projection errors would require a more detailed analysis:

Table 3

Manager	Q 3 2008	Q 4 2008	Q 1 2009
Investec	(1.80)	(2.17)	<b>(4.79)</b>
Stanlib	(2.21)	(2.25)	<b>0.21</b>
Allan G	1.93	<b>4.35</b>	0.60
Metrop	<b>(4.90)</b>	(1.75)	0.93
<b>Average</b>	<b>(1.02)</b>	<b>(0.46)</b>	<b>(0.45)</b>
Sanl	(2.14)	(1.96)	0.76
Prud	(0.90)	1.01	(0.60)
OM Bal	(1.68)	0.93	(0.82)
RMB	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.18</b>	0.36

**Graph 12** below reflects the actual out- and under performance of the managers against the average manager, built up by value added/subtracted through asset allocation and sector allocation and projection error. Projection errors as revealed below can result from the use of derivatives, stock picking, and also from significant portfolio restructuring through the course of a quarter by the manager, or even from


## A REVIEW OF INVESTMENT MANAGERS – 31 Mar 2009

By T H Friedrich – Managing Director, Retirement Fund Solutions Namibia (Pty) Ltd

The monthly review of portfolio performance, as set out in this issue, is also available on our website at [www.rfso.com.na](http://www.rfso.com.na)

valuation problems and should in any event be subject to further enquiry.

Graph 12



### What shares do our managers actually invest in?

**Table 4** reflects the shares our 8 portfolios being surveyed, most frequently invest in, in order of frequency ('Count'). The '**Ø Exp**' column reflects the average percentage exposure of its total onshore equity exposure, of those 8 portfolios that have invested in this share. The first subtotal line '**% in Top 10**' reflects the average exposure to the common top 10 shares of our 8 managers. The next line '**# in Top 10**' reflects the average number of shares of our 8 portfolios in the common top 10, and the average percentage exposure of the 8 portfolios to their top 10 equity holdings is reflected in '**Total %**'. Finally the table reflects the average number of shares our 8 portfolios invest in, in '**# of shares**'.

Table 4


Counter	Ø Exp	Count
MTN	7.6	8
Standard B	6.9	7
Sasol	5.1	7
BHP Billiton	5.2	6
Anglo Am	6.0	5
SAB	6.3	4
First Rand	3.4	4
FNB Nam	6.1	3
Naspers	3.3	3
Anglo Gold	6.9	2
<b>Subtotal - Top 10</b>	<b>35.7</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Number in Top 10</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Total %</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>8</b>
<b># of shares</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>8</b>

## 5. One Year Performance Analysis


### The year to 31 March 2009

Graphs 13, 14 and 15 below reflect the performance of the asset classes, of companies by size and type and of the equity sectors. Take note that the heavy weight equity sectors that will have an impact on returns are 'Basic Materials\*', 'Consumer Services\*', 'Consumer Goods\*', 'Industrials\*' and 'Financials\*'. \*


Graph 13



Graph 14



Graph 15




**Graph 16** reflects projected performance, actual performance and the resulting projection error for the prudential balanced portfolios over the past year. The projection error is generally higher over a 12 month period, as our projections assume a smooth change in asset and sector allocation over the year which is likely not to be accurate.

## A REVIEW OF INVESTMENT MANAGERS – 31 Mar 2009

By T H Friedrich – Managing Director, Retirement Fund Solutions Namibia (Pty) Ltd


The monthly review of portfolio performance, as set out in this issue, is also available on our website at [www.rfsof.com.na](http://www.rfsof.com.na)

Graph 16



Graph 17 allows tracking the development of the various sectors since the start of the year for a more detailed analysis of your manager's performance vs. these indices. Please refer to graphs 28 to 31 for an analysis of our prudential balanced portfolio's monthly performance.

Graph 17



Graph 18 below, reflects the performances of all managers in our survey for the twelve months to 31 March 2009.

Graph 18




Table 5 below, reflects the projected performance of the average prudential, managed portfolio for the 12 month period. The actual performance of the average prudential balanced portfolio of minus 14.5% represents a 'projection error' of 1.5% on the projected performance of the average prudential balanced portfolio for the year, of minus 13.0%.

Table 5

Asset Class	Exposure %	Perform %	Weighted Perform %
Equity	54.8	-23.9	-13.1
Bonds	9.9	16.5	1.6
Cash	15.6	10.8	1.7
Property	2.4	-7.9	-0.2
Intern Eq	12.0	-31.5	-3.8
Intern Other	5.1	15.3	0.8
Gold	0.2	15.7	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>-13.0</b>

Table 6 below, reflects the projected equity performance of the average prudential, managed portfolio for the 12 month period.

Table 6

Equity Sector	Exposure %	Perf %	Weighted Perf %
Oil & Gas	5.0	-26.3	-1.4
Basic Mat	20.7	-40.7	-9.0
Industrials	14.7	-30.0	-4.5
Cons Goods	9.4	-13.4	-1.3
H/care	1.1	16.1	0.2
Cons Serv	8.5	-2.1	-0.2
Telecoms	8.7	-12.9	-1.1
Financials	30.5	-21.3	-6.2
Technol	0.9	-31.5	-0.3
Other	0.5	-28.5	-0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>-23.9</b>


Based on the portfolio structure of the managers, graph 19 shows where the manager has added/subtracted value through asset allocation relative to the projected performance of the average manager in our survey, while graph 20 shows a similar result with regard to sector allocation, over the past 12 month. This plus the projection error as also overlaid per graph 16, produces the actual performance of the manager for the 12 months.

## A REVIEW OF INVESTMENT MANAGERS – 31 Mar 2009


By T H Friedrich – Managing Director, Retirement Fund Solutions Namibia (Pty) Ltd

The monthly review of portfolio performance, as set out in this issue, is also available on our website at [www.rfsof.com.na](http://www.rfsof.com.na)

Graph 19




Graph 20



### 6. Analysis of Currency Sensitivity


**Graph 21** provides an indication of the currency risk to which the portfolios are exposed. Currency risk here is measured as a function of effective offshore and 'Basic Materials\*' exposure.

Graph 21



**Graph 22** below depicts the position of the Rand versus the US\$, both adjusted by the change in its domestic CPI. Evidently the long-term trend line seems to indicate that the Rand was noticeably above this trend line, indicating an under valuation by this measure.

Graph 22



### 7. Analysis of Special Mandate Portfolio Performance


#### Special mandate portfolios as an alternative for the conservative investor?

The Benchmark Retirement Fund offers a number of special mandate portfolios and for this reason we also keep an eye on a number of such portfolios.

**Graphs 23 and 24** depict rolling one year returns, and the one year monthly returns of the special mandate portfolios, compared to that of the average prudential, managed portfolio. Evidently, most special mandate portfolios typically reflect lower volatility, at the cost of lower returns over the longer term. Also refer to graphs 31 to 34 for a more vivid view of monthly performances over the past 12 months.

Any conservative investor who wants to minimize negative returns should seriously consider these as an alternative to the more volatile prudential, managed portfolios.

Graph 23








## A REVIEW OF INVESTMENT MANAGERS – 31 Mar 2009


By T H Friedrich – Managing Director, Retirement Fund Solutions Namibia (Pty) Ltd

The monthly review of portfolio performance, as set out in this issue, is also available on our website at [www.rfsol.com.na](http://www.rfsol.com.na)


Graph 31




Graph 32



Graph 33



Graph 34



## 9. Conclusion

### Preview for 2009

For our view on what is to be expected over the next 6 to 12 months, the reader is invited to consult our monthly Benchtest Performance Review, the latest issue being for April 2009, which is available on our website at [www.rfsol.com.na](http://www.rfsol.com.na).

### Who to Contact

For further information, analyses or interpretations please contact Marthinuz Fabianus, Tilman Friedrich, Mark Gustafsson, Günter Pfeifer or Hannes van Tonder at Retirement Fund Solutions tel 061-231590.

### Important notice and disclaimer

Whilst we have taken all reasonable measures to ensure that the results reflected herein are correct, Benchmark Retirement Fund and Retirement Fund Solutions Namibia (Pty) Ltd do not accept any liability for the accuracy of the information and no decision should be taken on the basis of the information contained herein before having confirmed the detail with the relevant portfolio manager and without consulting an expert.

### Errors and omissions excluded