



Fair value pricing survey, eleventh edition

Finding the formula that fits

Cary Stier
Vice Chairman - Global Investment
Management Leader
Deloitte

Paul Kraft
Partner
Audit
Deloitte

Elizabeth Krentzman
U.S. Mutual Fund Leader
Audit & Enterprise
Deloitte

Tyson May
Partner
Audit
Deloitte

Rajan Chari
Partner
Audit
Deloitte

Alexey Surkov
Partner
Audit & Enterprise
Deloitte



It goes without saying that there is no precise formula for determining fair value and performing related oversight. Those charged with valuation responsibilities have to do what any scientist in a lab would do: pursue a course of action, measure the results, and then refine the approach, taking into account changes in internal and external factors.

Over the eleven years that we have conducted our annual Fair Value Pricing Survey, we have seen mutual fund firms continue to tweak their valuation efforts in search of the right formula. Along the way, we have catalogued both emerging practices and those that have matured into common industry processes.

Morgan Keegan settlement returns valuation oversight to the spotlight

The omnipresent threat of regulatory action has long hovered over the valuation process—a threat that became real this past year, when one board’s oversight formula was publicly challenged. In June, the former mutual fund directors of the Morgan Keegan Funds

settled administrative charges brought by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) regarding their oversight of pricing procedures¹.

The Morgan Keegan case, which came after a series of other SEC enforcement actions, was more than a warning shot—it was the strongest signal yet that the SEC has fund directors firmly in its sights, holding them responsible for fair valuation decisions.

Against the backdrop of the Morgan Keegan case, this year’s survey garnered the highest participation since we launched it in 2001: a record 96 mutual fund firms representing more than US\$10 trillion in assets under management completed the survey.

¹ <http://www.sec.gov/News/PressRelease/Detail/PressRelease/1365171574878#.Uih-k9Ksi-0>

A strong indication of how seriously fund boards are treating valuation issues after Morgan Keegan was that survey participants identified the SEC enforcement actions as the most talked about valuation topic among board members outside of regularly scheduled meetings. These discussions, as well as deliberations during regular board meetings, gave directors the opportunity to assess whether they needed to change elements such as the timing and frequency of their oversight, the type and extent of materials being reviewed and the level of delegation provided to others. These efforts have borne fruit, as this year's survey shows that changes have been made to valuation oversight practices:

- 78% of survey participants have modified their valuation policies and procedures over the last year
- 57% of survey participants have enhanced the level of detail in the valuation materials provided to the board
- 54% of survey participants have changed the types of valuation materials provided to the board

Finding the right balance of information can require experimentation. Providing too much detail may make it difficult for board members to identify salient points or important relationships that may be obscured by the volume of data. Providing too little detail, on the other hand, may result in board members being unable to identify the key questions they should be asking.

Whether fund boards decide to make changes to their oversight approach is, in the end, a matter of judgment. That judgment will likely be directly affected by the types of funds and the nature of investments they oversee, perceived valuation risks and external factors that impact fair value decisions.

Apart from SEC enforcement actions, 34% of survey respondents identified trading halts as the second most popular subject prompting discussion among directors outside of regular meetings. Trading disruptions can affect the availability of security prices and, as a consequence, may trigger the need for fair value determinations, particularly when trading halts continue beyond NAV calculation deadlines.

As technology glitches continue to plague securities exchanges, it appears likely that these issues will continue to demand attention from fund directors and management alike.

Trading disruptions can affect the availability of security prices and, as a consequence, may trigger the need for fair value determinations, particularly when trading halts continue beyond NAV calculation deadlines

Balancing risk with efficiency

The survey findings show that risk management remains an integral part of the valuation alchemy for many fund groups. More than half—51%—of survey participants indicated that they had identified valuation risks for one or more specific investment types as part of their annual compliance reviews under rule 38a-1 or a formal risk assessment process.

Almost six out of seven respondents (84%) reported that their fund's chief compliance officer (CCO) has a full-time presence at board meetings when valuation matters were discussed. CCOs were also more actively involved in identifying risks associated with the valuation of investment classes. In addition, 58% of adviser compliance personnel also saw their full-time participation at such meetings increase.

There is also an indication that some fund groups adjust the timing, nature and extent of their processes and internal controls based on the type of investment or macroeconomic data. For example, certain funds refine how they identify investment valuations requiring further scrutiny by customising their procedures based on the presence of market-related events, such as movements in an underlying benchmark or changes in credit quality. This approach can be an efficient way to increase effectiveness because it allows fund groups to focus on instances that may be more susceptible to valuation risk, rather than relying on standardised triggers that apply broadly across the asset class.

Given the current business and regulatory environment, a thoughtful assessment of valuation risks allows fund groups to balance both effectiveness and efficiency. In this regard, 38% of survey participants indicated that they had conducted an analysis in the last year designed to identify ways to improve the efficiency of the valuation process and to reduce redundancies. More than 60% of these same survey participants increased automation in their valuation processes in the current year, suggesting there may indeed be a way to rethink the formula for processes and controls to generate better results overall.





Looking ahead

We asked our survey participants to identify what they believe will be the most pressing valuation challenges over the next one to two years. Not surprisingly, navigating the future actions, guidance and expectations of the SEC was at the top of the list for many survey participants. There was a wide range of responses, but the most common are grouped below into these five areas:

1. **Changes necessitated by SEC regulatory action**

Challenges in the regulatory arena include the uncertainties associated with the SEC's next action, including what it will say (e.g. how prescriptive its guidance or admonitions may be) and how it will say it (e.g. in an SEC speech, another enforcement action, or more formally through proposed industry-wide guidance). Given the complexities associated with valuations and the different practices followed within the industry, it will be important for the industry to continue to share its experiences and perspective in advance of any final SEC action.

2. **Pricing vendor oversight**

Pricing vendors continue to offer new asset class valuation products, as well as new tools to assist the industry in fulfilling its valuation responsibilities. This year, survey responses indicated an increased focus on transparency tools and how best to use them. These transparency tools can provide meaningful assistance to fund groups in determining whether to make price challenges and in aiding the overall understanding and assessment of a pricing vendor. With these potential benefits also come challenges, such as evaluating how frequently and formally to employ such tools and what steps funds to take in the valuation process when presented with evidence that contradicts the primary valuation.

3. **Managing the external audit process**

It can be difficult for fund groups to understand current external audit requirements and expectations for valuation testing. Gaining a full understanding of the external auditor's procedures as well as flexibility in handling new audit requests that arise because of changing requirements and expectations is important. Fund boards also need to ensure that they understand the benefits and limitations of the external audit in connection with their valuation responsibilities.

4. Derivative valuations

New asset classes have always created a degree of valuation risk. Derivatives are certainly no exception. Exchange-traded derivatives have historically been more straightforward from a valuation process, but the move to centrally cleared swaps has created a new dynamic for fund groups. Understanding trading volume levels will likely be a factor in determining whether exchange-traded prices are reflective of fair value.

Over-the-counter derivatives can be a concern for fund groups when the instruments involve underlying securities that themselves are difficult to price. Accordingly, it remains very important for fund groups to truly understand the terms of the contracts and the inputs that are likely to affect the valuation. Fund groups holding more complicated derivatives may want to assess the benefit of having the necessary modelling skills in-house to value these instruments should markets and the environment change.

5. Board reporting and oversight

Even though we've seen industry practices coalesce in certain areas over the years, the governance and oversight structure that will function best very much depends on the particular circumstances of the fund group, and even to some extent, individual board members. Arriving at the appropriate mix of information, degree of director involvement and overall delegation model can be driven largely by the size of the fund group and board, type and complexity of investments and external factors impacting valuation risks. Changes resulting in greater oversight may be called for from time to time and yield beneficial results. That said, boards and fund management should not shy away from discontinuing practices that are no longer effective. As with other areas, sustainability is a critical ingredient for success in the governance and oversight arena, even when the regulator's spotlight turns up the heat.

Finding the right formula to address these and other challenges will require further exploration in the years ahead. The key will be anticipating and planning for future challenges, including building infrastructure that is adaptable and flexible enough to address developments as they unfold.

Conclusion

This year's survey illustrates once more that valuation practices and processes are continually being refined in ways large and small. After all, valuation is an ongoing and iterative process—even when a fund finds the formula that fits its investment setting and other factors, conditions can and often do change. Over the years, we have seen our survey respondents adjust to these changes and we suspect that they will continue to do so, particularly as the SEC steps up its focus.

To the point:

- SEC enforcement actions have led to mutual funds stepping up their focus on fair value
- Mutual fund boards are being challenged to re-think their involvement in the valuation process at all levels and stages
- Mutual funds continue to make refinements as the range and complexity of investment types expand and new investment valuation tools expand