



Australian Government
Productivity Commission

Funds surveys

Superannuation: Assessing
Efficiency and Competitiveness,
Inquiry Report no. 91
Technical Supplement 2

December 2018

© Commonwealth of Australia 2018



Except for the Commonwealth Coat of Arms and content supplied by third parties, this copyright work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Australia licence. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au>. In essence, you are free to copy, communicate and adapt the work, as long as you attribute the work to the Productivity Commission (but not in any way that suggests the Commission endorses you or your use) and abide by the other licence terms.

Use of the Commonwealth Coat of Arms

Terms of use for the Coat of Arms are available from the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet's website: <https://www.pmc.gov.au/government/commonwealth-coat-arms>

Third party copyright

Wherever a third party holds copyright in this material, the copyright remains with that party. Their permission may be required to use the material, please contact them directly.

Attribution

This work should be attributed as follows, *Source: Productivity Commission, Funds survey, Technical Supplement 2.*

If you have adapted, modified or transformed this work in anyway, please use the following, *Source: based on Productivity Commission data, Funds survey, Technical Supplement 2.*

An appropriate reference for this publication is:

Productivity Commission 2018, 'Funds survey', Technical Supplement 2 to the Inquiry Report *Superannuation: Assessing Efficiency and Competitiveness*, Canberra, December.

Publications enquiries

Media, Publications and Web, phone: (03) 9653 2244 or email: mpw@pc.gov.au

The Productivity Commission

The Productivity Commission is the Australian Government's independent research and advisory body on a range of economic, social and environmental issues affecting the welfare of Australians. Its role, expressed most simply, is to help governments make better policies, in the long term interest of the Australian community.

The Commission's independence is underpinned by an Act of Parliament. Its processes and outputs are open to public scrutiny and are driven by concern for the wellbeing of the community as a whole.

Further information on the Productivity Commission can be obtained from the Commission's website (www.pc.gov.au).

2 Technical supplement: funds surveys

This technical supplement provides selected results from the Commission’s initial and supplementary surveys of institutional superannuation funds that are regulated by the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority (APRA).

Funds were surveyed in order to address gaps in the available information about fund inputs, operations and behaviour, including member engagement, governance, insurance, product development, regulation, and expenses. The surveys also sought to remedy the absence of data about the net returns received and investment management fees paid by funds in different classes of assets. Details on the conduct of the two surveys are provided in appendix C.

Why survey funds twice?

Prior to the release of the draft report, the Commission conducted an initial survey of super funds in 2017 to gather the data necessary to inform its assessment of the efficiency and competitiveness of the super system. Some of the data provided by funds was of poor quality, which necessitated a second, supplementary survey of funds (after the release of the draft report in May 2018). The supplementary survey focused on key evidence gaps relating to fund expenses, net returns and investment management fees, and thus covered only a subset of the questions asked in the initial survey.

Questions in the supplementary survey related to fund assets and returns by asset class; investment management fees by asset class; and fund expenses by expense category and source (outsourced to related parties, outsourced to non-associated providers, or provided in-house). The questions on total assets and net returns by asset class, and fund expenses were essentially the same as in the initial survey.

The supplementary survey also simplified questions about investment management fees by asset class, which received very poor responses in the initial survey. The initial survey asked for investment management costs by asset class grouped into those incurred in-house, with associate providers or with non-associated providers. The supplementary survey asked for total investment management costs by asset class, not seeking to split costs by source. Information about the survey design and process for each of these surveys is included in appendix C.

There are two sections to this supplement. Section 2.1 presents selected descriptive statistics and response rates separately for the initial and supplementary surveys. Section 2.2 provides

relevant tables and figures from both of these surveys that support the text in various chapters throughout the inquiry report. The survey source is indicated in each table.

2.1 Selected descriptive and response statistics

Initial funds survey

There were 208 registrable superannuation entities (RSEs) invited to participate in the initial survey, and 114 responses were received (table 2.1). Over 80 per cent of industry funds responded, while the response rate for other fund types was around or below 50 per cent. Overall, responding funds accounted for around 88 per cent of all accounts, and 90 per cent of assets, although the quality of responses was highly varied.

Table 2.2.1 Initial funds survey response rates and coverage
By fund type

<i>Fund type</i>	<i>Survey responses (no.)</i>	<i>Response rate by fund type (%)</i>	<i>Assets share by fund type^a (%)</i>	<i>Accounts share by fund type^a (%)</i>
Retail	57	48	88	91
Industry	34	83	96	94
Corporate	11	48	90	92
Public sector	9	50	78	70
Eligible rollover fund (ERF) ^b	3	38	60	74
Total	114	55	90	88

^a Asset and accounts shares are calculated using 2017 APRA data. They indicate the percentage of total assets and accounts held by funds that provided survey responses, respectively. ^b As there are only three eligible rollover funds (ERFs), they are grouped with other retail funds unless otherwise specified.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.2 Composition of initial survey data
Responses, assets and accounts across the system^{a,b}

Type	Survey responses		Total assets		Total accounts	
	No.	% of responding funds	\$m	% of responding funds	'000	% of responding funds
Retail	57	50	415 102	38	7 871	34
Industry	34	30	450 006	42	10 496	46
Corporate	11	10	43 471	4	279	1
Public sector	9	8	172 912	16	1 837	8
Eligible rollover fund (ERF)	3	3	2 801	–	2 313	10
Total	114	100	1 084 292	100	22 797	100

^a Asset and accounts information is based on 2017 APRA data. ^b Columns may not sum exactly to totals due to rounding.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.3 Cell completions by survey topic^a
Percentage of cells completed, by fund type

Section	Retail ^a	Industry	Corporate	Public sector	Total
Fund activity	55.5	64.7	68.1	43.5	58.5
General	77.0	89.9	86.4	80.2	82.0
Governance	100.0	99.5	100.0	95.8	99.5
Insurance	67.5	75.5	81.7	59.1	70.6
Market contestability	67.0	73.8	78.2	71.6	70.6
Member engagement	84.3	88.6	89.1	82.2	85.9
Net returns and fees	10.2	28.3	20.6	17.5	17.3
Total	36.4	49.9	46.0	38.8	41.7
Number of funds	60	34	11	9	114

^a ERFs are grouped with other retail funds unless otherwise specified.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Supplementary funds survey

Fewer funds were asked to respond to the supplementary fund survey compared with the initial survey. Of the 208 funds invited to participate in the initial funds survey, 22 funds were screened out because they had either wound up or had commenced that process, meaning that invitations to participate in the survey were sent to 186 funds. The Commission received responses from 137 funds, representing over 90 per cent of accounts and assets in APRA-regulated funds (a slight improvement compared with the initial survey). The response rate was similar for retail and not-for-profit funds.

The composition of the not-for-profit funds (that is, the split between industry, public sector and corporate funds) that responded to the survey was similar to the composition of all not-for-profit funds in the APRA-regulated system. Industry funds make up 54 per cent of responding not-for-profit funds, and account for around 80 per cent of not-for-profit accounts and 55 per cent of assets.

Variations in the quality of data

As with the initial survey, responses to specific questions varied in quality — for example, 13 of the 137 funds provided no information about expenses. Because the data were collected on an in-confidence basis, survey results for individual funds are not published. With the exception of the descriptive and response statistics below, data from the supplementary survey are grouped into not-for-profit (comprising industry, corporate and public sector funds) and retail market segments. Where there are three or less funds contributing to a cell within a table, information has not been published. This allows the presentation of more detailed tables than would otherwise have been possible.

A number of large retail funds indicated that they were unable to complete the supplementary survey due to a lack of available data in the form requested by the Commission (particularly prior to 2013-14). The Commission met with a number of large retail funds that were unable to provide the data requested, and agreed that for 13 retail funds where fund-level data were not available, those funds could provide product- or option-level data that were broadly representative of within-asset-class performance at the fund level.

All data reported from the initial and supplementary funds survey should be interpreted cautiously because:

- some funds have made simplifying assumptions to provide data in the form requested by the Commission (for example, some funds indicated that for years prior to 2013-14 they did not have data on assets or returns that exactly matched to APRA's asset-class classification)
- there are relatively few observations for some questions, particularly for earlier years and related party expenses
- some funds may have interpreted survey questions differently.

Table 2.4 Supplementary funds survey response rates and coverage
By fund type

<i>Fund type</i>	<i>Survey responses (no.)</i>	<i>Response rate, by fund type (%)</i>	<i>Assets share, by fund type^a (%)</i>	<i>Accounts share, by fund type^a (%)</i>
Retail	70	68	91	94
Industry	33	87	97	97
Corporate	13	65	95	96
Public sector	15	88	90	93
Eligible rollover funds	6	75	97	98
Total	137	74	93	96

^a Asset and accounts shares are calculated using 2017 APRA data. They indicate the percentage of total assets and accounts held by funds that provided survey responses, respectively.

Source: Supplementary funds survey.

Table 2.5 Composition of supplementary survey data^a
Responses, assets and accounts across the system^{a,b}

<i>Type</i>	<i>Responses</i>		<i>Total assets</i>		<i>Total accounts</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>% of responding funds</i>	<i>\$m</i>	<i>% of responding funds</i>	<i>'000</i>	<i>% of responding funds</i>
Retail	70	51	531 175	36	8 888	36
Industry	33	24	521 920	35	10 596	43
Corporate	13	9	49 787	3	284	1
Public sector	15	11	380 786	26	2 470	10
Eligible rollover funds	6	4	4 237	–	2 688	11
Total	137	100	1 487 905	100	24 926	100

^a Asset and accounts information is based on 2017 APRA data. ^b Columns may not sum exactly to totals due to rounding.

Sources: Supplementary funds survey; PC analysis of unpublished APRA data.

Table 2.6 Provision of fund expenses data

Per cent of funds providing 2016-17 expenses information, by fund type

Type	Administrati on (% of fund type)	Custody (% of fund type)	Investment manageme nt (% of fund type)	Other administrati on services (% of fund type)	Other investme nt services (% of fund type)	No. of funds a
Retail	84	33	32	59	16	69
Industry	94	88	88	91	82	33
Corporate	85	46	69	92	69	13
Public sector	87	87	93	100	87	15
Eligible rollover funds	83	33	33	67	17	6
Total	87	54	56	75	45	136

^a One fund provided implausible expense values and was excluded from this table.

Source: Supplementary funds survey.

Table 2.7 Net returns and fees cell completions

Per cent of cells completed, by fund type

Section	Retail (% of fund type)	Industry (% of fund type)	Corporate (% of fund type)	Public sector (% of fund type)	Total (% of fund type)
Total assets	60	75	77	74	67
Net returns	35	64	45	67	46
Investment management fees	21	55	39	46	34
Total	38	65	53	63	49
Number of funds	76	33	13	15	137

Source: Supplementary funds survey.

2.2 Supporting results

Member engagement

Table 2.8 **Annual expenditure on member education and engagement^a**
By fund type, 2016-17

<i>Type</i>	<i>Intra fund advice (\$m)</i>	<i>General and super advice (\$m)</i>	<i>Tools to assist planning (\$m)</i>	<i>Assets^b (\$m)</i>	<i>No. of funds^c</i>
Retail	0.8	34.5	1.0	217 857.2	21
Industry	16.6	22.8	2.0	318 162.7	23
Corporate	6.1	5.5	0.7	39 858.3	6
Public sector	23.4	38.9	1.4	159 489.3	6
Total	46.9	101.7	5.0	735 367.5	56

^a Results are derived from survey question 8. ^b Asset information is based on 2017 APRA data. ^c 29 of the 114 responding funds reported that expenditures on member engagement and education are not relevant as they do not engage directly with members.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.9 Availability of information from various sources^a

Per cent, by fund type

<i>Information</i>	<i>Retail (% of fund type)</i>	<i>Industry (% of fund type)</i>	<i>Corporate (% of fund type)</i>	<i>Public sector (% of fund type)</i>	<i>Total (% of all funds)</i>
<i>Call centre</i>					
Fees paid	84.2	100.0	90.9	100.0	91
Insurance amount	75.4	100.0	90.9	100.0	86.5
Insurance premiums	73.7	100.0	90.9	100.0	85.6
Net investment returns	80.7	97.1	72.7	88.9	85.6
Risk	84.2	100.0	72.7	100.0	89.2
<i>Mobile app</i>					
Fees paid	47.4	91.2	63.6	77.8	64.9
Insurance amount	42.1	91.2	72.7	77.8	63.1
Insurance premiums	42.1	91.2	72.7	77.8	63.1
Net investment returns	43.9	88.2	72.7	77.8	63.1
Risk	47.4	88.2	54.5	77.8	63.1
<i>Statement</i>					
Fees paid	86	100.0	90.9	100.0	91.9
Insurance amount	80.7	100.0	90.9	100.0	89.2
Insurance premiums	77.2	100.0	90.9	100.0	87.4
Net investment returns	82.5	97.1	100.0	100.0	90.1
Risk	77.2	94.1	72.7	88.9	82.9
<i>Website</i>					
Fees paid	78.9	100.0	90.9	100.0	88.3
Insurance amount	73.7	100.0	90.9	100.0	85.6
Insurance premiums	73.7	100.0	90.9	100.0	85.6
Net investment returns	77.2	97.1	90.9	100.0	86.5
Risk	80.7	100.0	81.8	100.0	88.3
<i>Number of responding funds</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>111</i>

^a Results are derived from survey question 9, which asks funds if they believe member with average financial and superannuation literacy can easily obtain different types of information from different sources.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.10 How satisfied are your members with different aspects of fund services?^a

Per cent

<i>Fund service</i>	<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Somewhat satisfied</i>	<i>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</i>	<i>Somewhat dissatisfied</i>	<i>Very dissatisfied</i>	<i>Information not available</i>
Availability of information on fees and charges	23.8	34.3	10.5	1.0	–	30.5
Availability of information on risks related to investments	19.4	35.9	12.6	–	1.0	31.1
Availability of information on the features of the fund	25.7	37.6	4.0	1.0	–	31.7
Ease of contacting the fund	50.9	16.0	3.8	–	–	29.2
Ease of making changes to the insurance options	8.6	37.6	15.1	3.2	–	35.5
Ease of making changes to the investment options	29.0	28.0	9.7	–	–	33.3
Ease of understanding the fund statement	30.5	30.5	4.8	1.9	1.9	30.5
Information that members receive on how money is being invested	18.4	42.7	7.8	1.9	1.0	28.2
Level of administration fees	18.6	33.3	16.7	2.9	–	28.4
Level of investment fees	16.2	34.3	15.2	3.0	–	31.3
Level of member support and advice services	37.5	27.9	8.7	1.9	–	24.0

^a Results are derived from survey question 10, which asks funds how satisfied they feel members are with different aspects the services provided by the fund. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.11 Sources of information about member satisfaction^a

Per cent

<i>Type</i>	<i>Member survey (% of fund type)</i>	<i>Focus group (% of fund type)</i>	<i>Member feedback (% of fund type)</i>	<i>No. of responding funds^b</i>
Retail	71.0	32.3	90.3	31
Industry	100.0	43.8	84.4	32
Corporate	70.0	30.0	90.0	10
Public sector	100.0	57.1	85.7	7
Total	85.0	38.8	87.5	80

^a Results are derived from survey question 11, which asks funds if they use different sources of information to form a view about customer satisfaction. ^b 34 funds did not answer this question.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.12 Information collected by funds^a

Per cent

<i>Type of information</i>	<i>Collected directly</i>	<i>Collected indirectly</i>	<i>Not collected</i>
Age	73.2	11.6	15.2
Education	3.6	90.2	6.2
Household income	7.1	79.5	13.4
Household wealth	7.1	86.6	6.2
Marital status	15.2	75.9	8.9
Number of dependents	14.3	79.5	6.2
Personal income	24.1	58.9	17.0
Personal wealth	9.8	74.1	16.1
Profession	26.8	58.0	15.2
Smoking status	21.4	75.9	2.7

^a Results are derived from survey question 13, which asks if the responding fund collects different types of information. 112 funds answered this question.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.13 If collected, what information is used in pricing different products?^a

Per cent, by product type

Type of information	Product types				No. of funds
	Default/MySuper (% of product type)	Choice (% of product type)	Retirement (% of product type)	Insurance (% of product type)	
Age	53.5	55.6	60.6	75.8	99
Education	18.2	27.3	18.2	54.5	11
Household income	17.4	34.8	43.5	52.2	23
Household wealth	26.7	26.7	46.7	40.0	15
Marital status	22.2	18.5	33.3	44.4	27
Number of dependents	21.7	21.7	21.7	43.5	23
Personal income	41.3	52.2	47.8	73.9	46
Personal wealth	34.5	48.3	69.0	58.6	29
Profession	38.3	46.8	34.0	87.2	47
Smoker	–	14.8	–	77.8	27

^a Results are derived from survey question 15, which asks if funds use information that is collected in the pricing of various products. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.14 Member activities^a

Percentage of members undertaking different activities in 2016-17, by fund type

Type	Made a voluntary contribution (% of fund type)	Sought intra-fund advice (% of fund type)	Received fee-for-service advice (% of fund type)	Changed investment options (% of fund type)	Changed insurance options (% of fund type)
Retail	8.3	0.4	2.9	18.8	11.7
Industry	11.3	0.9	0.2	2.8	1.7
Corporate	15.1	1.5	1.4	9.1	5.3
Public sector	15.0	1.9	1.2	3.7	6.2
Total	10.7	1.0	0.7	6.3	4.9

^a Results are derived from survey question 20, which asks funds to estimate the percentage of their members who undertook various activities within a given year. Fund-level percentages are weighted by the number of members in order to produce aggregate estimates.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.15 Obstacles faced by members in switching funds^a

Average ranking of main obstacles, by fund type

<i>Type</i>	<i>Administration costs</i>	<i>Availability of information</i>	<i>Time to understand and evaluate options</i>	<i>No. of responding funds</i>
Retail	2.77	2.08	2.77	60
Industry	2.84	2.00	2.84	31
Corporate	2.73	2.00	2.73	11
Public sector	2.71	1.71	2.71	7
Total	2.78	2.03	2.78	109

^a Results are from survey question 21, which asks funds to rank obstacles from 1 to 3, with a '1' representing the biggest obstacle and a '3' the smallest obstacle.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.16 Minimum number of 'clicks' required to access key terms, conditions, fees and performance of MySuper products^a

By fund type

<i>Type</i>	<i>Clicks</i>
Retail	1.81
Industry	2.39
Corporate	3.36
Public sector	2.50
Total	2.19

^a Results are from survey question 22, which asks respondents what the minimum number of clicks required for a member to access key product terms, conditions, fees and performance of MySuper products from the fund' homepage. 109 funds answered this question. Of the 57 retail funds that answered this question, 10 funds indicated that it would require 0 clicks to access this information.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.17 Options for members to switch to and from funds^a

Per cent of funds providing options, by fund type

<i>Type</i>	<i>Call centre (% of fund type)</i>	<i>Fax (% of fund type)</i>	<i>Email (% of fund type)</i>	<i>Online (% of fund type)</i>	<i>Post (% of fund type)</i>	<i>MyGov website (% of fund type)</i>	<i>No. of funds</i>
<i>Option is available</i>							
Retail	45.0	70.0	50.0	41.7	56.7	61.7	60
Industry	94.1	91.2	85.3	97.1	94.1	88.2	34
Corporate	72.7	81.8	81.8	63.6	81.8	72.7	11
Public sector	66.7	77.8	77.8	77.8	77.8	77.8	9
Total	64.0	78.1	65.8	63.2	71.9	71.9	114
<i>Action can be fully completed</i>							
Retail	15.0	56.7	38.3	33.3	48.3	55.0	60
Industry	67.6	70.6	44.1	94.1	82.4	79.4	34
Corporate	27.3	54.5	36.4	54.5	45.5	54.5	11
Public sector	11.1	55.6	11.1	55.6	55.6	66.7	9
Total	31.6	60.5	37.7	55.3	58.8	63.2	114

^a Results are from survey question 23, which asks responding funds how prospective members who wish to move their accumulated balance to that fund may do so.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Governance

Table 2.18 Performance attribution analysis^a
By fund type

		<i>Unit</i>	<i>Retail</i>	<i>Industry</i>	<i>Corporate</i>	<i>Public sector</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Does the fund undertake performance attribution analysis to understand the source of returns?</i>							
Yes	% of fund type	71.7	97.1	81.8	87.5	81.4	
No	% of fund type	28.3	2.9	18.2	12.5	18.6	
Total	No. of funds	60	34	11	8	113	
<i>How often is performance attribution analysis undertaken?^b</i>							
Monthly	% of fund type	30.2	15.6	55.6	57.1	29.7	
Quarterly	% of fund type	69.8	62.5	44.4	42.9	62.6	
Semi-annually	% of fund type	–	3.1	–	–	1.1	
Annually	% of fund type	–	18.8	–	–	6.6	
Total	No. of funds	43	32	9	7	91	
<i>Is performance attribution analysis undertaken separately by and within asset class?^b</i>							
Yes, by asset class only	% of fund type	67.4	18.2	22.2	14.3	41.3	
Yes, by asset class and within asset class	% of fund type	27.9	75.8	66.7	85.7	53.3	
No	% of fund type	4.7	6.1	11.1	–	5.4	
Total	No. of funds	43	33	9	7	92	
<i>Are any of the results of the performance attribution analysis made available to members?^b</i>							
Yes, results are published	% of fund type	2.3	3.0	11.1	–	3.3	
Yes, results are available to members on request	% of fund type	18.6	12.1	11.1	57.1	18.5	
No	% of fund type	79.1	84.8	77.8	42.9	78.3	
Total	No. of funds	43	33	9	7	92	

^a Results are from survey questions 28, 29, 30 and 31. ^b Funds are only asked these questions if they have indicated that they do undertake performance attribution analysis. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Insurance

Table 2.19 How difficult or easy is it for a 'reasonable member' to undertake various actions?^a

By fund type

Type	Very difficult (% of fund type)	Difficult (% of fund type)	Neither difficult nor easy (% of fund type)	Easy (% of fund type)	Very easy (% of fund type)	No. of responding funds
<i>Opt out of insurance</i>						
Retail	–	–	–	73.7	26.3	19
Industry	–	–	3.0	57.6	39.4	33
Corporate	–	–	–	33.3	66.7	9
Public sector	–	16.7	16.7	50.0	16.7	6
Total	–	1.5	3.0	58.2	37.3	67
<i>Amend their cover</i>						
Retail	–	–	21.1	73.7	5.3	19
Industry	–	–	9.1	72.7	18.2	33
Corporate	–	–	–	77.8	22.2	9
Public sector	–	–	33.3	33.3	33.3	6
Total	–	–	13.4	70.1	16.4	67
<i>Initiate a temporary or permanent disability claim^b</i>						
Retail	–	–	5.3	78.9	15.8	19
Industry	–	–	18.2	57.6	24.2	33
Corporate	–	–	–	66.7	33.3	9
Public sector	–	–	33.3	16.7	50.0	6
Total	–	–	13.4	61.2	25.4	67
<i>Initiate a life insurance claim^b</i>						
Retail	–	–	10.5	78.9	10.5	19
Industry	–	–	15.2	63.6	21.2	33
Corporate	–	–	–	66.7	33.3	9
Public sector	–	–	33.3	16.7	50.0	6
Total	–	–	13.4	64.2	22.4	67
<i>Initiate an income protection insurance claim^b</i>						
Retail	–	–	15.8	68.4	15.8	19
Industry	–	–	15.2	63.6	21.2	33
Corporate	–	–	–	77.8	22.2	9
Public sector	–	–	33.3	16.7	50.0	6
Total	–	–	14.9	62.7	22.4	67

^a Results are from survey question 32. A 'reasonable' member is someone considered to have an average level of financial and superannuation literacy. ^b 'Initiating an insurance claim' refers to all the steps a member must take to register a claim with the fund, irrespective of the nature or complexity of the claim or the eventual result of that claim. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.20 Insurance cover by account type^a

Per cent of accounts, 2016-17

<i>Account type</i>	<i>Default</i>	<i>Group policy</i>	<i>Individual</i>	<i>No cover (opted out)</i>	<i>No cover (no default)</i>	<i>Total</i>
Default/MySuper	63.8	9.1	4.2	22.9	–	100
Choice	15.5	2.4	7.4	15.7	58.9	100

^a Results are derived from survey question 34, which asks funds to indicate the number of MySuper and Choice member accounts had different levels of insurance cover. 75 funds responded to at least one of Choice and MySuper/Default sections for 2016-17 of this question in the funds survey, representing 59 per cent of balances and 51 per cent of accounts. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.21 Funds reviewing insurance arrangements^a

Percentages, by fund type and year

	<i>2012-13 (% of fund type)</i>	<i>2013-14 (% of fund type)</i>	<i>2014-15 (% of fund type)</i>	<i>2015-16 (% of fund type)</i>	<i>2016-17 (% of fund type)</i>	<i>No. of responding funds</i>
<i>Funds conducting an informal review for the selection of an insurance provider</i>						
Retail	38.6	43.9	42.1	49.1	47.4	57
Industry	21.9	27.3	31.2	34.4	48.5	33
Corporate	18.2	18.2	36.4	18.2	45.5	11
Public sector	28.6	42.9	14.3	42.9	71.4	7
Total	30.3	35.5	35.8	40.4	48.2	110
<i>Funds switching insurance providers</i>						
Retail	7.0	5.3	3.5	5.3	17.5	57
Industry	12.5	6.1	9.4	9.4	18.2	33
Corporate	18.2	–	–	18.2	–	11
Public sector	14.3	14.3	–	28.6	42.9	7
Total	10.1	5.5	4.6	9.2	17.3	110
<i>Conducting formal tender process for selection of insurance product</i>						
Retail	15.8	7.0	8.8	10.5	19.3	57
Industry	21.9	30.3	12.5	18.8	18.2	33
Corporate	18.2	27.3	–	18.2	9.1	11
Public sector	42.9	28.6	14.3	57.1	42.9	7
Total	19.3	17.3	9.2	16.5	19.1	110

^a Results are derived from survey question 40. 110 funds (including 33 industry and 57 retail) responded to this question in the funds survey, representing 88 per cent of balances and 84 per cent of accounts. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.22 Inactive accounts with and without insurance cover^a

By fund type, 2016-17

<i>Type</i>	<i>Inactive accounts (no.)</i>	<i>Inactive accounts paying insurance (no.)</i>	<i>Inactive accounts paying insurance (% of fund type)</i>	<i>Total accounts (no.)</i>	<i>No. of responding funds</i>
Retail	3 196 178	976 894	30.6	6 685 772	38
Industry	2 540 695	1 489 323	58.6	8 044 048	27
Corporate	78 042	55 891	71.6	275 384	10
Public sector	773 650	393 250	50.8	1 940 535	5
Total	6 588 565	2 915 358	44.2	16 945 739	80

^a Results are based on survey questions 6, 41 and 42. Question 6 asks funds about the number of accounts at 30 June 2017; while question 41 asks funds about the number of inactive accounts they have. Question 42 asks for the percentage of inactive accounts that are paying insurance.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.23 Funds reporting trailing commissions^a

	<i>Accumulation products</i>	<i>Insurance products</i>
Number of funds paying commissions	35	32
Per cent of all respondents	31.3	28.6

^a Results are based on survey question 43 which asked if the fund has members that are paying trailing adviser commissions. 112 funds answered this question, and all funds paying trailing adviser commissions were retail funds. Funds that advised that they were paying trailing adviser commissions were also asked what proportion of their members were paying these commissions, but only 17 funds answered this question.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Fund activity and product development

Table 2.24 Coverage of expenses data from the supplementary fund survey
By fund type

	Total assets (2016-17)		Member accounts (2016-17)		Number of funds	
	\$m	%	'000	%	N	%
Administration expenses						
<i>Retail funds</i>						
Did not respond to the survey	216	37	4 003	43	42	41
Responded	365	63	5 410	57	61	59
Total	581	100	9 413	100	103	100
<i>Not-for-profit funds</i>						
Did not respond to the survey	67	7	1 236	7	20	24
Responded	953	93	15 437	93	63	76
Total	1 021	100	16 673	100	83	100
Investment expenses						
<i>Retail funds</i>						
Did not respond to the survey	385	66	6 157	65	68	66
Responded	196	34	3 255	35	35	34
Total	581	100	9 413	100	103	100
<i>Not-for-profit funds</i>						
Did not respond to the survey	68	7	1 654	10	23	28
Responded	952	93	15 018	90	60	72
Total	1 021	100	16 673	100	83	100

Sources: Supplementary funds survey; PC analysis of unpublished APRA data.

Table 2.25 Fund expenses compared with APRA data^a
Expenses by category and data source, 2016-17

Fund type	Administration services			Investment services			Number of funds
	Supplementary survey (\$m)	APRA (\$m) ^b	Difference (%) ^c	Supplementary survey (\$m)	APRA (\$m) ^b	Difference (%) ^c	
Retail	2 310	2 428	-5	546	665	-18	70
Industry	1 166	1 448	-19	1 830	1 698	8	33
Corporate	93	100	-7	196	183	7	13
Public sector	468	301	55	995	302	229	15
Total	4 036	4 277	-6	3 567	2 849	25	136

^a Expense categories are based on APRA's SRS 331.0. Administration services includes administration and other administration services, while investment services includes investment management services, custody expenses and other investment services expenses. ^b APRA totals are for the same funds providing data in the supplementary survey. ^c Difference is a percentage of the APRA expenses data.

Sources: Supplementary funds survey; PC analysis of unpublished APRA data.

Table 2.26 Administration and investment expenses as a per cent of total assets
By service source

<i>Service source</i>		<i>Not-for-profit</i>		<i>Retail</i>	
		<i>Expenses as a per cent of total assets</i>	<i>No. of funds</i>	<i>Expenses as a per cent of total assets</i>	<i>No. of funds</i>
Administration services					
2011-12	In-house services	0.14	27	0.61	22
	Associate providers	0.16	22	0.78	18
	Non-associate providers	0.18	57	0.3	32
2016-17	In-house services	0.08	28	0.48	25
	Associate providers	0.12	21	0.47	28
	Non-associate providers	0.11	59	0.17	40
Investment services					
2011-12	In-house services	0.03	17	0.64	2
	Associate providers	0.05	10	0.21	7
	Non-associate providers	0.37	50	0.12	21
2016-17	In-house services	0.05	16	0.15	5
	Associate providers	0.08	13	0.26	14
	Non-associate providers	0.27	54	0.08	26

^a Total assets are based on 2017 APRA data.

Sources: Supplementary funds survey; PC analysis of unpublished APRA data.

Table 2.27 Administration expenses by service source

Service source	Year	Not-for-profit funds			Retail funds ^a		
		Expenses (\$m)	Share of administration expenses (%)	No. of funds	Expenses (\$m)	Share of administration expenses (%)	No. of funds
In-house services	2011-12	269	23	27	637	44	22
	2016-17	439	27	28	887	39	25
Associate providers	2011-12	283	24	22	611	42	18
	2016-17	284	18	21	1 037	46	28
Non-associate providers	2011-12	628	53	57	211	14	32
	2016-17	890	55	59	336	15	40
Total	2011-12	1 180	100	59	1 460	100	52
	2016-17	1 613	100	61	2 260	100	61

^a Retail funds in this table represented only 63 per cent of total assets and 58 per cent of all member accounts in the retail market segment in 2016-17. In contrast, not-for-profit funds in the table account for 83 per cent of total assets and 88 per cent of accounts in the not-for-profit market segment.

Source: Supplementary funds survey.

Table 2.28 Investment expenses by service source ^a

Service source	Year	Not-for-profit funds			Retail funds ^a		
		Expenses (\$m)	Share of investment expenses (%)	No. of funds	Expenses (\$m)	Share of investment expenses (%)	No. of funds
In-house services	2011-12	63	5	17	14	8	2
	2016-17	194	7	16	14	3	5
Associate providers	2011-12	52	4	10	108	59	7
	2016-17	168	6	13	462	85	14
Non-associate providers	2011-12	1 276	92	50	62	34	21
	2016-17	2 247	86	54	66	12	26
Total	2011-12	1 391	100	54	184	100	26
	2016-17	2 609	100	58	541	100	35

^a Data in this table are not representative for retail funds. Retail funds in this table represented only 34 per cent of total assets and 35 per cent of all member accounts in the retail market segment in 2016-17. In contrast, not-for-profit funds in the table account for 83 per cent of total assets and 86 per cent of accounts in the not-for-profit market segment.

Source: Supplementary funds survey.

Table 2.29 How does a fund’s capacity to move wholesale services in-house influence competitive pressure on wholesale providers of those services?^a

Wholesale services, by fund size

	No influence at all (%)	Minimal influence (%)	Moderate influence (%)	High influence (%)	Very high influence (%)	Total (%)	No. of responding funds
<i>Smaller funds (with less than mean assets)</i>							
Administration of accounts	36.6	26.8	9.8	17.1	9.8	100.0	41
Custody	59.1	25.0	2.3	2.3	11.4	100.0	44
Investment management	34.1	19.5	14.6	26.8	4.9	100.0	41
Other administration services	15.9	27.3	27.3	18.2	11.4	100.0	44
Other investment services	28.2	15.4	35.9	17.9	2.6	100.0	39
<i>Larger funds (with more than mean assets)</i>							
Administration of accounts	13.0	13.0	17.4	43.5	13.0	100.0	23
Custody	66.7	11.1	11.1	7.4	3.7	100.0	27
Investment management	14.8	3.7	40.7	40.7	–	100.0	27
Other administration services	11.5	11.5	34.6	26.9	15.4	100.0	26
Other investment services	11.5	15.4	34.6	34.6	3.8	100.0	26
<i>All funds</i>							
Administration of accounts	28.1	21.9	12.5	26.6	10.9	100.0	64
Custody	62.0	19.7	5.6	4.2	8.5	100.0	71
Investment management	26.5	13.2	25.0	32.4	2.9	100.0	68
Other administration services	14.3	21.4	30.0	21.4	12.9	100.0	70
Other investment services	21.5	15.4	35.4	24.6	3.1	100.0	65

^a Results are derived from survey question 57, which asks to what extent the fund’s capacity to move wholesale functions in-house influences the competitive pressure of wholesale providers of those services. Respondents were instructed that this question is only relevant where the fund outsources to a non-associate provider or provides the services in-house. Service categories are defined by SRS 331.0.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Table 2.30 Retirement income products offering longevity risk management^a

By fund type

	Offered in 2012-13	New products between 2013-14 and 2016-17
<i>Number of funds offering longevity risk management products</i>		
Retail	2	10
Industry	3	6
Corporate	–	–
Public sector	–	3
Total	5	19
<i>Number of products offered</i>		
Retail	28	36
Industry	4	7
Corporate	–	–
Public sector	–	4
Total	32	47

^a Results are derived from survey questions 58 and 59. Question 58 asks how many retirement income products with longevity risk management (such as an annuity or a group self-annuitisation product) in the year 2012-13. Question 59 asks the same question for the period between 2013-14 and 2016-17. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: Initial funds survey.

Regulation

Table 2.31 Key adverse effects of regulatory reporting^a

Type	Proportion of funds			Proportion of accounts ^b		
	Higher fees (% of fund type)	Impediments to produce or service innovation (% of fund type)	Lower investment returns (% of fund type)	Higher fees (% of fund type)	Impediments to produce or service innovation (% of fund type)	Lower investment returns (% of fund type)
Retail	46.7	51.7	1.7	33.1	57.9	9.1
Industry	75.8	24.2	–	44.3	55.7	–
Corporate	63.6	18.2	18.2	97	2.6	0.4
Public sector	42.9	57.1	–	35.3	64.7	–
Total	56.8	40.5	2.7	39.2	56.7	4.1

^a Results are based on survey question 67, which asks funds to select the key adverse effect of different sources of regulatory burdens. 111 funds answered this question. ^b Accounts information is based on 2017 APRA data. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Sources: Initial funds survey; PC analysis of unpublished APRA data.

Table 2.32 Key adverse effects of disclosure to members^a

Type	Proportion of funds			Proportion of accounts ^b		
	Higher fees (% of fund type)	Impediments to produce or service innovation (% of fund type)	Lower investment returns (% of fund type)	Higher fees (% of fund type)	Impediments to produce or service innovation (% of fund type)	Lower investment returns (% of fund type)
Retail	46.7	51.7	1.7	33.1	57.9	9.1
Industry	75.8	24.2	–	44.3	55.7	–
Corporate	63.6	18.2	18.2	97.0	2.6	0.4
Public sector	42.9	57.1	–	35.3	64.7	–
Total	56.8	40.5	2.7	39.2	56.7	4.1

^a Results are based on survey question 67, which asks funds to select the key adverse effect of different sources of regulatory burdens. 111 funds answered this question. ^b Accounts information is based on 2017 APRA data. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Sources: Initial funds survey; PC analysis of unpublished APRA data.

Table 2.33 Key adverse effect of tax treatment of particular products^a

Type	Proportion of funds			Proportion of accounts ^b		
	Higher fees (% of fund type)	Impediments to produce or service innovation (% of fund type)	Lower investment returns (% of fund type)	Higher fees (% of fund type)	Impediments to produce or service innovation (% of fund type)	Lower investment returns (% of fund type)
Retail	6.7	56.7	36.7	9.4	59.7	30.9
Industry	15.2	51.5	33.3	2.6	63.0	34.4
Corporate	18.2	45.5	36.4	27.4	20.0	52.6
Public sector	–	57.1	42.9	–	62.2	37.8
Total	9.9	54.1	36.0	5.8	60.9	33.3

^a Results are based on survey question 67, which asks funds to select the key adverse effect of different sources of regulatory burdens. 111 funds answered this question. ^b Accounts information is based on 2017 APRA data. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Sources: Initial funds survey; PC analysis of unpublished APRA data.

Table 2.34 Key adverse effect of regulatory uncertainty and frequent changes^a

Type	Proportion of funds			Proportion of accounts ^b		
	Higher fees (% of fund type)	Impediments to produce or service innovation (% of fund type)	Lower investment returns (% of fund type)	Higher fees (% of fund type)	Impediments to produce or service innovation (% of fund type)	Lower investment returns (% of fund type)
Retail	31.7	68.3	–	25.1	74.9	–
Industry	45.5	54.5	–	40.5	59.5	–
Corporate	45.5	45.5	–	54.6	45.4	–
Public sector	28.6	71.4	–	34.9	65.1	–
Total	36.9	62.2	–	33.3	66.7	–

^a Results are based on survey question 67, which asks funds to select the key adverse effect of different sources of regulatory burdens. 111 funds answered this question. ^b Accounts information is based on 2017 APRA data. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Sources: Initial funds survey; PC analysis of unpublished APRA data.

Assets, net rates of return and investment management fees by asset class

The tables below summarise information from the supplementary survey about total assets, net rates of return and investment management fees, by asset class. For each asset class, funds were asked to provide asset values in dollars, and net returns and investment management fees as a percentage of those assets. Note that:

- In order to aggregate net returns and investment management fees for use in the report, it was necessary to convert percentages provided by funds to dollar values.
- There were 13 funds that were unable to provide fund-level data, and submitted ‘representative’ option-level information that has been rescaled to allow fund-level totals. More information on the methodology for the supplementary fund survey is provided in appendix C.

Table 2.35 Total assets by asset class, not-for-profit funds

Assets (\$m) and number of funds (N) contributing data^a

Asset class	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N
Cash	15 491	49	22 088	51	23 239	51	25 474	51	35 446	54	47 821	55	61 108	58	72 844	58	66 367	58	83 829	57
Fixed income (Australia)	10 871	45	10 663	47	18 879	48	24 211	48	35 697	51	31 355	52	50 413	56	53 985	56	70 013	56	80 779	55
Fixed income (International)	10 051	47	8 094	50	10 492	50	12 077	50	16 234	52	21 136	53	31 435	57	38 256	57	43 300	57	48 761	56
Listed equity (Australia)	49 491	48	43 032	50	60 398	51	72 443	51	89 517	54	105 676	55	135 195	58	141 748	58	150 445	58	171 286	57
Listed equity (International)	39 271	49	32 253	51	46 451	52	56 452	52	66 493	54	90 859	55	128 089	58	154 712	58	157 200	58	187 552	57
Property (Listed)	1 441	41	930	41	1 234	41	765	41	1 810	45	2 586	46	5 693	49	6 785	49	10 016	49	9 212	47
Property (Unlisted)	22 331	44	20 007	45	20 246	45	22 457	45	27 481	49	30 355	50	38 637	54	44 674	54	49 520	54	53 949	52
Property (Total) ^b	26 451	49	23 328	51	24 218	51	26 407	51	32 453	54	36 209	55	47 788	58	55 317	58	64 229	58	68 203	56
Infrastructure (Listed)	211	42	122	43	147	43	210	43	1 598	44	1 777	45	4 121	47	6 331	47	9 531	47	9 562	46
Infrastructure (Unlisted)	10 241	41	11 468	42	12 745	42	15 309	42	18 078	44	23 290	48	29 216	52	35 448	52	40 810	52	50 494	51
Infrastructure (Total) ^b	12 991	46	13 916	47	15 182	47	17 690	47	21 738	49	27 339	53	35 843	57	44 400	57	53 785	57	63 182	55
Private equity	9 831	53	10 825	55	12 836	55	12 614	55	14 132	56	17 551	56	23 496	58	24 624	58	27 691	57	28 739	57
Other	31 691	48	28 963	50	15 236	50	16 220	50	17 676	52	28 128	54	38 237	57	45 513	57	49 707	57	170 589	56
Total	241 531	52	226 388	54	266 843	54	309 588	54	378 459	57	466 131	58	551 595	58	631 417	58	681 386	58	902 927	57

^a Some funds indicated that they held assets in a particular class, but were unable to provide asset values. They are not included in this table. ^b The sum of listed and unlisted assets will not necessarily equal the value of total assets for property and infrastructure assets, as some funds have only provided the total (and not the listed and unlisted values) for these classes. N – Number of funds providing asset values for a given class and year.

Source: Supplementary funds survey.

Table 2.36 Total assets by asset class, retail funds

Assets (\$m) and number of funds (N) contributing data^a

Asset class	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N
Cash	28 577	41	28 906	42	30 342	43	35 346	47	42 040	47	55 574	53	71 908	71	78 525	71	77 923	71	84 807	71
Fixed income (Australia)	33 208	40	29 225	41	33 028	42	37 304	44	41 427	44	68 905	51	88 517	71	91 534	71	92 785	71	94 292	71
Fixed income (International)	18 704	40	18 164	41	19 351	42	21 199	42	22 767	42	28 514	47	44 500	70	48 413	71	50 239	71	51 368	71
Listed equity (Australia)	75 140	41	69 830	42	79 770	43	88 994	46	87 330	46	126 013	52	169 403	71	177 313	71	175 590	71	198 757	71
Listed equity (International)	54 804	39	49 718	40	56 322	41	64 338	43	64 217	43	99 337	49	128 710	71	140 519	71	137 794	71	146 417	71
Property (Listed)	11 423	38	9 205	39	10 871	39	10 919	42	8 220	41	10 675	47	14 414	63	17 912	64	21 874	63	22 218	62
Property (Unlisted)	2 349	39	2 249	40	2 093	40	2 710	41	2 328	40	6 482	45	7 301	62	6 504	62	7 911	62	7 747	61
Property (Total) ^b	16 894	41	14 023	42	15 838	43	16 834	45	17 373	45	20 802	51	26 917	70	30 049	70	35 983	70	36 135	70
Infrastructure (Listed)	436	39	403	40	961	41	1 650	43	1 656	42	2 861	47	4 000	63	4 939	63	5 074	63	6 775	61
Infrastructure (Unlisted)	103	38	128	39	370	40	769	42	970	41	1 417	46	2 088	62	1 285	62	2 483	62	1 847	61
Infrastructure (Total) ^b	1 063	39	983	40	1 836	41	2 978	43	5 058	42	6 936	47	9 125	66	9 696	66	11 299	66	12 647	66
Private equity	1 724	39	1 477	40	1 881	40	4 424	43	4 325	43	5 387	48	8 552	62	9 808	62	9 264	62	8 392	63
Other	11 723	42	11 742	43	13 977	44	15 505	48	14 567	48	21 733	53	33 786	68	32 200	69	42 922	69	44 175	67
Total	259 401	52	239 802	53	269 249	54	305 428	57	321 079	58	457 136	64	583 689	72	621 347	72	636 714	72	678 427	72

^a Some funds indicated that they held assets in a particular class, but were unable to provide asset values. They are not included in this table. ^b The sum of listed and unlisted assets will not necessarily equal the value of total assets for property and infrastructure assets, as some funds have only provided the total (and not the listed and unlisted values) for these classes. N – Number of funds providing asset values for a given class and year.

Source: Supplementary funds survey.

Table 2.37 Net returns by asset class, not-for-profit funds

Net returns (\$m) and number of funds (N) contributing data^a

Asset class	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N
Cash	1 811	46	1 795	49	1 516	53	2 208	55	2 709	59	2 544	60	2 441	63	2 732	63	2 151	63	2 328	64
Fixed income (Australia)	1 065	36	1 850	44	2 600	47	2 557	49	9 078	52	1 699	53	4 445	55	4 323	55	9 269	55	-578	56
Fixed income (International)	1 185	38	934	41	3 134	42	1 885	44	3 100	44	2 190	44	3 887	49	3 064	49	3 404	49	2 782	50
Listed equity (Australia)	-12 959	46	-15 088	49	14 412	52	15 176	54	-10 444	58	38 193	59	37 367	63	12 721	63	5 978	63	34 770	64
Listed equity (International)	-12 302	46	-12 911	49	8 971	52	8 221	54	-1 872	58	42 287	59	36 544	63	49 193	63	-3 689	62	46 658	63
Property (Listed)	-1 657	16	-2 597	18	1 655	17	1 187	16	394	16	1 468	21	1 448	25	1 826	25	2 709	27	-229	26
Property (Unlisted)	2 200	27	-2 239	31	420	35	2 023	38	2 090	39	2 812	42	3 712	43	4 899	44	6 732	44	5 782	43
Property (Total) ^b	318	39	-5 544	43	2 630	47	4 042	50	2 792	53	4 888	55	6 010	59	7 842	58	10 562	58	7 276	57
Infrastructure (Listed)	np	1	np	1	np	3	126	6	22	6	117	6	282	10	135	12	353	14	1 030	14
Infrastructure (Unlisted)	858	14	-764	17	865	21	1 986	24	1 657	26	2 583	30	3 609	35	3 420	35	6 212	39	6 450	39
Infrastructure (Total) ^b	1 060	18	-1 269	20	979	25	2 067	29	2 195	32	3 325	36	4 836	45	5 065	46	8 553	49	8 637	49
Private equity	695	29	-2 120	31	1 474	34	1 566	34	1 443	36	2 065	38	4 335	41	5 867	42	2 792	43	4 105	45
Other	1 295	28	-2 689	31	1 603	32	2 918	31	588	34	1 858	36	5 055	41	2 013	41	182	42	15 996	41
Total	-20 436	43	-39 626	46	31 890	49	37 443	51	6 142	53	85 382	55	83 146	55	72 335	57	29 826	56	96 235	56

^a Some funds indicated that they held assets in a particular class, but were unable to provide net returns or asset values. ^b The sum of listed and unlisted returns will not necessarily equal the value of total returns for property and infrastructure assets, as some funds have only provided the total (and not the listed and unlisted values) for these classes. np – Not published as three or fewer funds provided data.

Source: Supplementary funds survey.

Table 2.38 Net returns by asset class, retail funds

Net returns (\$m) and number of funds (N) contributing data^a

Asset class	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N
Cash	576	8	607	8	505	9	721	10	851	10	749	12	963	30	1 003	37	690	37	1 106	38
Fixed income (Australia)	334	11	612	11	773	11	531	11	1 039	11	335	13	1 406	29	1 217	35	1 182	35	545	37
Fixed income (International)	122	5	114	5	437	5	345	5	384	5	313	7	763	18	689	27	541	29	624	30
Listed equity (Australia)	-3 102	9	-2 520	9	2 416	9	2 075	10	-1 479	10	5 522	12	6 009	30	2 543	36	322	36	5 949	37
Listed equity (International)	-1 667	8	-1 459	8	1 108	8	680	8	-727	8	3 892	10	4 016	27	4 901	36	-305	36	4 801	36
Property (Listed)	-1 202	7	-1 000	7	726	8	422	7	283	7	732	9	601	20	826	27	967	27	-82	27
Property (Unlisted)	np	2	np	2	np	2	np	2	np	2	25	5	65	11	123	15	148	13	147	14
Property (Total) ^b	-1 200	7	-1 041	7	712	7	465	7	289	7	762	9	682	25	998	32	1 181	32	103	33
Infrastructure (Listed)	np	2	np	2	60	4	204	5	57	5	302	6	500	12	245	16	308	18	431	18
Infrastructure (Unlisted)	np	1	np	2	np	2	np	2	np	2	np	2	55	6	71	9	55	9	43	8
Infrastructure (Total) ^b	np	2	np	3	60	5	206	6	66	7	332	8	594	14	326	18	396	20	498	21
Private equity	np	1	np	1	na	-	np	1	na	-	na	-	na	-	np	2	np	1	np	2
Other	np	3	np	3	np	3	38	5	79	5	38	6	80	18	1 387	22	792	22	-287	21
Total	-10 154	20	-3 363	20	6 284	21	4 923	26	1 591	27	14 214	29	13 223	34	11 241	38	4 778	38	13 632	39

^a Some funds indicated that they held assets in a particular class, but were unable to provide net returns or asset values. ^b The sum of listed and unlisted returns will not necessarily equal the value of total returns for property and infrastructure assets, as some funds have only provided the total (and not the listed and unlisted values) for these classes. np – Not published as three or fewer funds provided data.

Source: Supplementary funds survey.

Table 2.39 Investment management fees by asset class, not-for-profit funds

Investment management fees (\$m) and number of funds (N) contributing data^a

Asset class	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N
Cash	36	32	38	32	36	34	40	37	54	42	59	43	78	47	83	49	85	50	95	51
Fixed income (Australia)	43	26	37	30	43	31	49	35	85	40	96	42	107	47	109	48	110	49	122	51
Fixed income (International)	37	27	30	29	37	29	51	33	64	35	93	38	127	44	159	45	189	46	206	47
Listed equity (Australia)	225	32	218	33	218	35	267	39	360	44	497	46	590	51	655	53	670	54	721	56
Listed equity (International)	190	31	208	33	202	35	280	39	338	43	585	45	707	50	766	52	796	53	997	55
Property (Listed)	15	14	14	13	15	12	17	13	20	15	24	16	34	20	42	23	54	23	52	22
Property (Unlisted)	106	23	85	24	90	24	104	29	145	33	158	34	249	39	289	40	336	40	453	39
Property (Total) ^b	141	32	109	33	123	34	142	38	175	42	205	44	313	48	344	50	419	50	588	50
Infrastructure (Listed)	np	1	np	1	np	2	3	4	2	5	4	6	4	8	3	9	22	13	34	12
Infrastructure (Unlisted)	69	14	60	16	71	16	96	19	125	23	163	27	217	33	318	34	384	36	463	37
Infrastructure (Total) ^b	86	17	74	19	83	18	119	23	129	25	175	30	231	38	347	40	425	43	513	43
Private equity	220	22	227	22	245	23	236	26	275	31	435	33	638	36	642	38	830	40	875	42
Other	103	26	79	26	86	27	157	29	199	33	234	36	456	41	588	44	494	46	3 042	48
Total	1 452	39	1 449	40	1 544	42	1 877	45	2 149	47	2 948	49	3 622	52	4 102	53	4 508	54	6 185	56

^a Some funds indicated that they held assets in a particular class, but were unable to provide investment management fees or asset values. ^b The sum of listed and unlisted fees will not necessarily equal the value of total fees for property and infrastructure assets, as some funds have only provided the total (and not the listed and unlisted values) for these classes. np – Not published as three or fewer funds provided data.

Source: Supplementary funds survey.

Table 2.40 Investment management fees by asset class, retail funds
Investment management fees (\$m) and number of funds (N) contributing data^a

Asset class	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N	\$m	N
Cash	27	7	40	7	53	7	43	7	34	7	37	8	50	19	52	22	53	24	120	25
Fixed income (Australia)	30	9	22	9	23	9	23	9	20	9	23	10	58	20	52	23	50	25	89	26
Fixed income (International)	18	4	15	4	16	4	25	4	27	4	37	5	55	15	62	18	70	20	96	20
Listed equity (Australia)	257	7	201	7	186	7	218	7	220	7	196	8	293	19	333	22	331	24	380	26
Listed equity (International)	95	6	86	6	86	6	93	6	90	6	84	7	154	18	198	21	233	23	281	24
Property (Listed)	56	7	33	7	19	7	23	7	22	7	24	8	37	13	41	16	46	18	55	20
Property (Unlisted)	np	1	np	1	np	1	np	2	np	2	np	2	1	6	3	9	4	9	13	11
Property (Total) ^b	55	5	32	5	19	5	23	5	22	5	24	6	37	14	46	17	51	19	69	21
Infrastructure (Listed)	np	1	np	1	np	3	np	3	np	3	np	3	9	8	17	11	22	15	28	16
Infrastructure (Unlisted)	np	1	np	1	np	2	np	2	np	2	np	2	2	6	2	6	3	6	3	7
Infrastructure (Total) ^b	np	2	np	2	1	4	2	4	4	5	4	5	14	10	19	13	25	15	32	18
Private equity	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	np	2
Other	np	2	np	2	np	2	np	3	np	3	np	3	14	7	14	10	17	12	29	14
Total	622	15	549	15	528	15	566	17	565	18	583	19	841	28	927	31	976	34	1 256	36

^a Some funds indicated that they held assets in a particular class, but were unable to provide investment management fees or asset values. ^b The sum of listed and unlisted fees will not necessarily equal the value of total fees for property and infrastructure assets, as some funds have only provided the total (and not the listed and unlisted values) for these classes. np – Not published as three or fewer funds provided data.

Source: Supplementary funds survey.