

## Asset Allocation and WRS



## Measures of Successful Asset Allocation (WRS Perspective)

- Stable Contribution Rates
- Affordable Contribution Rates
- Generate Dividends (earnings > 5\%)
- Avoid Dividend Takebacks
- Maintain fully funded retiree reserve


## Asset Allocation Spectrum

Probability of<br>Stable Contribution Rates<br>Affordable Contribution Rates<br>Generate Dividends<br>Dividend Takebacks<br>Maintain Fully Funded Retire Reserve

| Asset Allocation Characteristics |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| High Risk | Low Risk |
| High Reward | Low Reward |
| Low | High |
| Medium | Low |
| High | Low |
| Medium | Medium |
| Medium | High * |

- An ideal Asset Allocation would provide stable, affordable contribution rates, generate dividends sufficient to offset inflation with no takebacks, and would maintain the retiree reserve in a fully funded position.
- There probably is no such thing, but is there a "Sweet Spot" that provides an optimal combined outcome of all the measures taken together.
* But not in the very long term


## Objectives of this Presentation

- Provide an Overview of the WRS
- Relationship of Investment Return to Success Measures
- Effects of bad outcomes
- Evaluate several points along the Asset Allocation spectrum against the measures of success.
- Find the "Sweet Spot" if it exists.


## WRS Operation

- Benefits
- Plan Governance
- ETF Board Role
- SWIB Role
- WRS Accounts and Reserves
- Actuarial Valuation of WRS
- Sharing Asset Experience
- Dividend Reserve Depletion


## Key Changes from 2015 Study

- Combined SWIB returns for 2015 and 2016 slightly lower than assumed rate of $7.2 \%$ (-0.4\% return for 2015 and 8.29\% return for 2016)
- Mortality table update (slightly longer expected lifetimes)
- Slightly lower Standard Deviation than 2015 Study
- Updated census data as of December 31, 2016


## Covered Population at 12/31/2016

Financial Information

|  | Number |  | Total \$ Millions |  |  |  | Average |  | Type |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retirees | 197,647 | $\$$ | 4,887 | $\$$ | 24,725 |  |  |  |  | Annual Benefit

## WRS Investment Funds

## - Core Fund

- Diversified Portfolio
- 5 Year Smoothing through Market Recognition Account
- Variable Fund
- Equity Portfolio
- Marked to Market each year


## Market Recognition Account

Beginning of year
a. Funding value
b. Market value

End of year
c. Market value
d. Non-investment cash flow (contributions minus benefits)
e. Investment income
e1. Total investment income
e2. Assumed rat
e3. Amount for immediate recognition
e4. Amount for phased-in recognition: e1-e3
f. Phased-in recognition of investment income f1. Current year: 0.2 xe4 f2. First prior year f3. Second prior year
f4. Third prior year
f5. Fourth prior year
f6. Total MRA recognition
f7. Amount for MRA recognition
f8. Total recognized gain (loss)
g. Total recognized investment income: e3 + f8
h. Funding value end of year: $a+d+e 3+f 8$
i. Difference between market and funding values
j. Recognized rate of return
k. Market rate of return (net of fee)

## WRS Benefits

- Hybrid Plan
- Defined Benefit: 1.6\% x FAC x Service (Most participants)
- Not less than twice value of member account (A form of employer match)
- Adjustments are made to the above for members participating in Variable.


## WRS Contributions

- Three rate Groups: General/Executive, Protective with and without Social Security.
- Actuarial Valuation determines contributions by rate group.
- General and Executive are now combined participants split cost equally with employers.
- Protective participants pay the same rate as General participants and employers pay the difference.
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## WRS Accounts and Reserves

- Retired Reserve: Intended to hold exactly the right amount of money so that IF
- each person lives exactly the right number of years,
- and gets exactly the same benefit each year
- and the reserve earns exactly 5\% each year,
- Then the reserve will be exhausted the day the last person dies.


## Dividend Reserve

- Retirees share in investment gains, but also share in investment losses. Prior dividends can be reduced if less than $5 \%$ is credited to the Core Annuity Division.
- Only dividends can be reduced. The original core benefit is protected.
- The present value of the excess of total core benefits over original benefits is called the "Dividend Reserve", although there is no formal definition of such a reserve.


## Dividend Reserve

- A positive dividend reserve means that retirees are getting some inflation protection, but also provides a means by which the effect of investment losses on employer rates can be dampened.
- A \$0 dividend reserve means that retirees have lost all inflation protection and one of the shock absorbers on employer rates is gone.


## Dividend Remaining (as a Percentage of Total Benefit) by Year of Retirement



## Dividend Reserve Depletion

- The probability of such an event is low. Even 2008 did not produce depletion.
- In a low and volatile return market
environment, realizing a return low enough to deplete the dividend reserve is more likely.
- The following slides explore in general terms what a deficit in the retiree reserve means for the System.


## Dividend Reserve Depletion: Liability Attributable to Dividends

| Valuation | Liability for Dividend Remaining (billions) | Liability for Dividend Adjustment (billions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12/31/2010 | \$7.2 | \$(0.3) |
| 12/31/2011 | 6.4 | (1.7) |
| 12/31/2012 | 4.5 | (1.3) |
| 12/31/2013 | 3.0 | 2.0 |
| 12/31/2014 | 4.6 | 1.3 |
| 12/31/2015 | 5.5 | 0.2 |
| 12/31/2016 | 5.4 | 1.0 |
| 12/31/2017 (est) | 6.0 |  |

- Liability for Dividend Remaining represents the value of all previously granted dividends
- If another market event similar to 2008 were to occur again, the complete depletion of the dividend would become a real possibility
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## WRS PROJECTIONS

## Monte Carlo Simulations

- Based on 10,000 random trials
- Valuation Assumptions held constant
- Assumes seven sets of expected return/standard deviations (provided by NEPC)

$\xrightarrow{ } \quad$|  | Expected Return |  | Standard |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Curent | Geometric | Arithmetic | Deviation |
|  | $5.0 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ |
| Scenario 1 |  |  |  |
| Scenario 2 | $6.0 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ |
| Scenario 3 | $7.0 \%$ | $7.9 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ |
| Scenario 4 | $7.2 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $16.0 \%$ |
| Scenario 5 | $8.0 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $19.4 \%$ |
| Scenario 6 | $9.0 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ | $24.1 \%$ |
| Scenario 7 | $10.0 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ |
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## ?

## Contribution as a \% of Payroll <br> Scenario 2 - 6.0\%ER,11.4\%SD



## Dividend Rates

Scenario 2 - 6.0\%ER,11.4\%SD


## Contribution as a \% of Payroll Scenario 3 - 7.0\%ER,15.2\%SD




 $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\text { 75th Percentile } & 14.2 \% & 13.9 \% & 13.7 \% & 13.7 \% & 13.5 \% & 13.2 \% & 12.9 \% & 12.7 \% & 12.7 \% & 12.7 \% & 12.6 \%\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { 95th Percentile } & 14.2 \% & 13.9 \% & 13.4 \% & 12.9 \% & 12.2 \% & 11.3 \% & 10.4 \% & 9.9 \% & 9.6 \% & 9.4 \% & 9.4 \%\end{array}$
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## Dividend Rates

## Scenario 3 - 7.0\%ER,15.2\%SD



## Contribution as a \% of Payroll Scenario 4 - 7.2\%ER,16.0\%SD


$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { 5th Percentile } & 14.2 \% & 13.9 \% & 14.5 \% & 15.2 \% & 15.9 \% & 16.6 \% & 17.3 \% & 17.6 \% & 17.8 \% & 17.9 \%\end{array} 17.9 \%$

Median 14.2\% 13.9\% 14.0\% 14.1\% 14.2\% 14.3\% 14.3\% 14.3\% 14.3\% 14.3\% 14.3\%
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## Dividend Rates

## Scenario 4 - 7.2\%ER,16.0\%SD



GRS
Consulting

## Discussion of Dividend

Probability That Dividend Reserve Will Be Depleted in Year

$\xrightarrow{*}$|  | Expected <br> ROR | Standard | Year |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 5 | 10 | 20 | 50 |  |
| 1 | $5.0 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ | $22.7 \%$ | $30.0 \%$ | $39.6 \%$ |
| 2 | $6.0 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ | $12.4 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ |
| 3 | $7.0 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ | $16.4 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| 4 | $7.2 \%$ | $16.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $18.7 \%$ | $16.4 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| 5 | $8.0 \%$ | $19.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $20.9 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| 6 | $9.0 \%$ | $24.1 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $23.2 \%$ | $18.0 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| 7 | $10.0 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $26.2 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |

## Discussion of Dividend

Probability of Negative Dividend in Year

$\xrightarrow{*}$|  | Expected <br> ROR | Standard | Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 50 |  |  |
| 1 | $5.0 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $23.2 \%$ | $52.7 \%$ | $55.8 \%$ | $54.4 \%$ | $52.5 \%$ |  |
| 2 | $6.0 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ | $26.6 \%$ | $42.0 \%$ | $33.1 \%$ | $28.8 \%$ | $28.1 \%$ |  |
| 3 | $7.0 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ | $37.1 \%$ | $23.2 \%$ | $18.5 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ |  |
| 4 | $7.2 \%$ | $16.0 \%$ | $29.9 \%$ | $36.5 \%$ | $22.0 \%$ | $17.3 \%$ | $17.8 \%$ |  |
| 5 | $8.0 \%$ | $19.4 \%$ | $31.7 \%$ | $34.8 \%$ | $19.2 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ | $14.9 \%$ |  |
| 6 | $9.0 \%$ | $24.1 \%$ | $33.5 \%$ | $34.3 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ | $12.7 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ |  |
| 7 | $10.0 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ | $34.9 \%$ | $35.0 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ |  |
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## Discussion of Dividend

Worst Case Scenario of Cumulative Dividend Percent (\% of Floor Benefit That Is Funded)


Worst Case Scenario based on $1^{\text {st }}$ Percentile (i.e., $1 \%$ probability)

## Dividend Observations

- The low risk scenarios are actually risky in the sense that, for example, $5 \%$ expected return has much higher chance of dividend depletion in later years than higher risk scenarios
- Must balance short and long term volatility
- Consider probability of dividend depletion
- Consider level of worst case scenario that is acceptable
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## Projected Net External Cash Flow* Valuation Assumptions

| Year | \$ (Millions) | \% of <br> Assets | \% of <br> Payroll |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | $\$(2,853)$ | $(3.2) \%$ | $(21.2) \%$ |
| 2027 | $(4,822)$ | $(4.0) \%$ | $(25.5) \%$ |
| 2037 | $(6,857)$ | $(4.3) \%$ | $(26.0) \%$ |
| 2047 | $(8,034)$ | $(3.8) \%$ | $(21.8) \%$ |
| 2057 | $(10,633)$ | $(3.6) \%$ | $(21.1) \%$ |
| 2067 | $(15,144)$ | $(3.6) \%$ | $(21.9) \%$ |

[^0]
## Combination of All Scenarios

|  | ROR |  | StdDev | 2027 Results by \%-tile of Investment Return Outcomes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Contribution Rates | Dividend Rates |  |  | Retiree FS |
|  |  |  | 95th | 50th | 5th | 95th | 50th | 5th | 5th Percentile |
| $\xrightarrow{\text { Current }}$ | 1 | 5.0\% |  | 8.2\% | 13.6\% | 15.8\% | 17.5\% | 1.7\% | -0.2\% | -2.2\% | 76\% in year 50 |
|  | 2 | 6.0\% |  | 11.4\% | 11.8\% | 15.1\% | 17.6\% | 3.5\% | 0.8\% | -2.0\% | 88\% in year 10 |
|  | 2A | 6.15\% | 12.0\% | 11.4\% | 15.0\% | 17.7\% | 3.8\% | 0.9\% | -2.0\% | 87\% in year 10 |
|  | 3 | 7.0\% | 15.2\% | 9.4\% | 14.4\% | 17.9\% | 5.3\% | 1.7\% | -2.0\% | 85\% in year 10 |
|  | 4 | 7.2\% | 16.0\% | 8.9\% | 14.3\% | 17.9\% | 5.7\% | 1.9\% | -2.0\% | 84\% in year 10 |
|  | 5 | 8.0\% | 19.4\% | 6.4\% | 13.7\% | 18.2\% | 7.3\% | 2.7\% | -2.1\% | 80\% in year 10 |
|  | 6 | 9.0\% | 24.1\% | 2.7\% | 13.0\% | 18.6\% | 9.4\% | 3.6\% | -2.4\% | 74\% in year 10 |
|  | 7 | 10.0\% | 29.5\% | 0.0\% | 12.3\% | 19.2\% | 11.6\% | 4.4\% | -2.9\% | 65\% in year 10 |

Lower assumed rates of return result in higher expected contributions and lower expected dividends
Higher assumed rates of return are associated higher standard deviation (i.e.
risk) and worst case scenario for retiree dividend pool falling below 50\% Scenarios 2, 2A, 3 and 4 represent potential 'Goldilocks Zone'

## 2017 Observations

- Changes from 2015 Study
- Combined returns for 2015 and 2016 slightly lower than assumed rate of $7.2 \%$ (-0.4\% return for 2015 and 8.29\% return for 2016)
- Mortality table update (slightly longer expected lifetimes)
- Slightly lower Standard Deviation than 2015 Study
- Overall results are similar to 2015 study
- Slightly higher probability of depleting dividend reserve due to lower than expected returns
- This may be offset by asset returns from 1/1/2017 through 12/31/2017
- Continue to target ‘Goldilocks zone' that provides for positive return with appropriate downside protection


## Appendix

## Contribution rate summary under alternate scenarios - median



## Dividend rate summary under alternate scenarios - median



## Present \& Future Actives <br> Year by Year results



## Present \& Future Actives




## Retiree Population - Present and Future Year by Year Results



# Retiree Population Present and Future 

Projected Retiree Population

-Current Retirees

- Future Retirees From Deferreds -Future Retirees From Actives

Ratio of Active Members to Retirees


## Projected Core Trust Fund Assets (\$Billions)




## Disclaimers

- This presentation shall not be construed to provide tax advice, legal advice or investment advice.
- Readers are cautioned to examine original source materials and to consult with subject matter experts before making decisions related to the subject matter of this presentation.
- This presentation expresses the views of the authors and does not necessarily express the views of Gabriel, Roeder, Smith \& Company.


[^0]:    *Contribution income minus benefit payout.

