

On the Sustainability of the Canadian Model

Presented by Eduard van Gelderen

Online session of the 32nd colloquium on Pensions and Retirement
Research

December 3rd, 2024

Introduction

- Genesis of the model dates back to the restructuring of the Ontario pension plan in the '90s
- Sense of urgency: inadequate funding pension pay-outs of the baby-boomers during 2020-2040
- Main principles laid out by Peter Drucker*:
 - Government should not get involved in investment decisions
 - Pensions should be run as a business with professional Boards
 - Patient capital and active ownership

**Peter Drucker (1976) "The unseen revolution: how pension fund socialism came to America"*

Introduction (cont'd)

- Significant praise for the Canadian model
 - World Bank (2017): delivering retirement security
 - Lipschitz & Walter (2020): model for US pensions
 - Beath (2020): superior performance
 - Ambachtsheer (2021): superior performance
 - Betermier et al (2024): entrepreneurial mindset
- But some criticism too
 - C.D. Howe (2019): is the model sustainable in low-yielding world
 - IMF (2019): risk profile is changing without proper oversight
- Several issues: write-offs ABCP during GFC, liquidity issues during Covid, blown-up volatility trade, bribes in India...

Purpose of the Research

- The Canadian model has successfully managed the funding problem, based on the following pillars:
 - Governance around investment responsibilities, incl. professional Boards
 - Long-term investment focus
 - Large allocation to private markets
 - Internalization of investments
 - Competing compensation
- Is the Canadian model still relevant and future-proof given the changes in the internal and external environment?

Two Research Questions

1. Is the Maple-8 a homogenous group?

The Maple-8 is the group of larger Canadian institutions managing defined benefit public pension plans

2. Are fundamental changes to the five pillars needed?

The Maple-8 have grown significantly in size and find itself in surplus. Mission completed! But, what's next?

Research Methodology

1. Research question 1

- cross-sectional analysis
- Analysis of literature and documents

2. Research question 2

- Multi-case study by means of CEO interviews
- Discussions with subject matter experts
- Canadian media coverage

Research Results RQ1

- What the Maple-8 institutions have in common is that they have the government as a sponsor and that they manage defined benefit public pension plans
- The Maple-8 serve different plans: federal, provincial and occupational
- Broader governance is not alike. Composition of sponsors and Boards differ, delegation of responsibilities differ, mandates differ
- Some are single-client, others multi-client. Client base is defined by law, but could include pension plans, insurance companies and foundations
- The Maple-8 tend to follow the 5 pillars, but in varying degrees

Research Results RQ2

- All participants bring forward that the social license to operate is under pressure and fear the politicization of pensions
- Many claim that the best way to cope is to continue to generate solid performance
- The Maple-8 embraces the current governance and sees no use for more oversight
- Despite the aging of the plans and the realization that the first-mover advantage is gone, the Maple-8 continues to invest in private markets
- More emphasize is given to total fund management; a shift takes place from bottom-up deal origination to top-down asset management

Observations

- The discussion regarding the social license to operate should be taken seriously and provides an opportunity as Canada scores relatively low on the Mercer Global Pension Index.
- Given the life-cycle of most plans, the focus on investment return should at least be combined with a focus on long-term resilience.
- In general, if no formal oversight is put in place, the Maple-8 should boost their risk management activities.
- The Maple-8 should not ignore the impact of new technologies, including artificial intelligence, on their investment model.