

Discussion: *Will Alternative UCITs Ever Be Loved  
Enough to Replace Hedge Funds?*  
Wallerstein, Tuchschnid, and Zanolin

Discussant: Dale W.R. Rosenthal<sup>1</sup>

UIC Finance  
Liataud Graduate School of Business

9 April 2011

---

<sup>1</sup>daler@uic.edu


- Paper studies new, growing EU vehicle like hedge funds:
  - Undertakings for Collective Ivestment in Transferable Securities<sup>2</sup>.
- UCITs give flexibility in compensation and investment, but:
  - reporting and governance/risk management requirements; and,
  - limits on borrowing/leverage and short selling.
- Findings of this paper:
  - Firm-level: UCITs  $\alpha$  is significant; hedge fund  $\alpha$  is not.
  - Firm-level: UCITs volatility, risk-adjusted returns lower.
  - Cross-section: hedge fund returns (raw, adjusted) are higher.

---

<sup>2</sup>In particular, the modification known as UCITs III.

- “UCITs cannot borrow” . . . but can short non-MMkt bonds.
- Is location driven solely by labor market or tax benefits also?
- UCITs require a risk management team; so . . .
  - How do they compare to hedge funds with risk management<sup>3</sup>?
- Did looming UCITs IV (201007) hasten UCITs III creation?
- Why more macro and fixed-income UCITs vs. hedge funds?
  - Are borrowing “limits” not much of a constraint? Or,
  - Do shorting limits prohibit running a L/S equity fund?
- Eurotop 100? EuroStoxx 50 = more liquid, Eurozone-only.

---

<sup>3</sup>Since Gavin showed those hedge funds perform better. 

- Difference of alpha results on firm-level versus cross-section:
  - Firm-level reverse survivorship bias? (*cf* Linnainmaa 2011 WP)
- UCITs, hedge fund return dist'ns  $\Rightarrow$  diff. opportunity sets?
  - Investments might differ due to reporting requirements.
  - Semi-annually: at least largest 20 purchases, sales<sup>4</sup>.
  - However, Stephen showed copycat trading happens, so...
  - Fear of crowded exits may alter UCITs investments.
- Correlation of excess UCITs returns with asset class indices:
  - Why use Kendall's  $\tau$ ? Why not typical Pearson's  $\rho$ ?

---

<sup>4</sup>From the Ireland UCITs regulations.

- Eliminating 3 UCITs which ceased in 200906–201005:
  - Could cause big survivorship bias; why not keep them in?
  - No info on fund failures pre-2009 is also a problem.
- Cannot conclude lower UCITs mortality until sector matures.
- How are UCITs splits/spinoffs handled?
  - If allowed, easy way to game system (inducing backfill bias).

- A great look into value of some hedge fund capabilities.
- Some conclusions premature, but others are enticing:
  - Returns are slightly lower — but close, and risk is lower.
  - UCITs will not be able to lie about returns<sup>5</sup>.
- Need a little more clarity in a few places to let study shine.
- I look forward to final product.

---

<sup>5</sup>As Petri showed yesterday that hedge funds do.