

# Existing and Proposed Policy Targets

## Adding additional asset classes - Hedge Funds and MAC Strategies

Asset Class	Policy Target	Optimal Mixes						
		Mix 1	Mix 2	Add 5% HF	Mix 3	Mix 3B	Mix 4	Mix 5
U.S. Large Cap Equity	25%	20%	24%	25%	28%	29%	32%	36%
U.S. Small Cap Equity	7%	5%	6%	7%	7%	7%	8%	9%
Non-U.S. Equity	24%	16%	20%	24%	23%	25%	27%	30%
U.S. Fixed Income	35%	47%	37%	30%	27%	25%	17%	7%
Real Estate	9%	7%	8%	9%	10%	9%	11%	13%
Hedge Funds	0%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>							
<b>Expected Return</b>	<b>6.07%</b>	<b>5.40%</b>	<b>5.84%</b>	<b>6.16%</b>	<b>6.26%</b>	<b>6.36%</b>	<b>6.64%</b>	<b>7.00%</b>
<b>Expected Real Return</b>	<b>3.82%</b>	<b>3.15%</b>	<b>3.59%</b>	<b>3.91%</b>	<b>4.01%</b>	<b>4.11%</b>	<b>4.39%</b>	<b>4.75%</b>
<b>Expected Standard Deviation</b>	<b>11.08%</b>	<b>8.46%</b>	<b>10.13%</b>	<b>11.44%</b>	<b>11.84%</b>	<b>12.31%</b>	<b>13.58%</b>	<b>15.34%</b>
<b>Total Return-Seeking (%)</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>88%</b>
<b>Total Fixed Income (%)</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>% Illiquid</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>13%</b>

- 5% hedge fund exposure funded pro rata from both equity and fixed income (Mixes 1-5)
  - Modest improvement in efficiency – return per unit of risk
- Mix 2B adds a 5% allocation to hedge funds to the current target, funded solely from fixed income, which goes from 35% to 30%
  - Increases both return and risk
- Mix 3B adds a 5% allocation to hedge funds, funded from fixed income, and shifts another 5% from fixed income to equity, reducing fixed income from 35% to 25%
  - Greater increase in both return and risk than Mix 2B
- In both Mix 2B and Mix 3B, we suggest the CMT Fund consider the addition of long-biased MAC strategies (5%) within the large cap US equity allocation, similar to those employed within the ATF, to provide diversification in the larger allocation to equity and potential for a differentiated source of alpha

# Summary

## Recommendations

- The appropriate asset allocation will attempt to balance the dual objectives of maintaining or increasing real spending while maintaining or growing the real (inflation-protected) value of the Trust over the projection period.
- In the absence of gas royalty inflows:
  - A 5% of MV spending level may be difficult to sustain in the long run - spending policy is effectively greater than the real investment return for even the most aggressive asset mixes.
- Under the current projection of gas royalty inflows:
  - Royalties are insufficient to offset the spending generated by the 5% of MV spending level even for the more aggressive asset mixes; the CMT will need to retain substantial exposure to growth assets to help offset a decline in the real value of the corpus.
  - Pursuit of return to meet the current spending policy will result in more variability of spending from year to year.
- In order for the CMT Fund to Maintain Real Market Value and Real Spending Objectives, we recommend:
  - Adopt a more aggressive asset allocation policy - reducing fixed income exposure by up to 10%
  - Consider further diversifying the asset mix by adding **Absolute Return/Hedge Fund and MAC** strategies to mitigate market risk stemming from equity exposure, and to enhance return relative to fixed income.
  - Consider moving to either Mix 2B or Mix 3B which will have a greater probability of generating purchasing power protection while balancing against the worsening of the worse case. Our preference is for the CMT to move to Mix 3B.
  - Consider reducing the current spending policy by 50 basis points from 5% to 4.5% to increase the probability of maintaining the corpus.