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Since the adoption of the European Union Green Deal ‘Fit for 55’ legal & regulatory package, and, less than four months later, the passage of the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, known as the Biden Infrastructure Bill, in the United States, the notion of infrastructure as an asset class has moved centre stage: from Blackrock to the Bank of England, the “case for institutional investment in infrastructure” is being made more forcefully than ever. Perhaps this means that after a relatively slow start (2005 – 2020), the notion of pension investment in infrastructure will finally be moving into the mainstream, as we shall argue here. This change in thinking is happening against a particular geo-economic backdrop: the progressive realization by policy makers in Beijing, Brussels, London, and Washington DC that “pension powers” can play an essential role in building the ESG-driven world economy. 1 The severe Covid lockdowns and ensuing supply chain disruptions and social unrest (notably in 2020 – 2021 in the United States) have emboldened pension board members (representing civil society) and labor organisations, whose newfound vigour gave rise to the ESG-driven “build back better” policy agenda, both domestically, in the United States and other industrialised nations, and abroad, in the emerging markets of Asia, Africa and Latin America. 2

ESG and Employee-Capitalism as Mutually Reinforcing Trends

The co-authors of the article, are amongst the original coiners of terms such as “infrastructure as an asset class” and “pension superpowers.” 3 They also predicted, at the onset of the Covid Crisis, that a “historic realignment on the asset allocation front is happening precisely at the moment when ESG is moving centre stage: even in once staunchly neoliberal jurisdictions like Texas, Alaska or Switzerland, the smart money is betting on renewable energy, greentech, social bonds, women’s empowerment, employee shareholding and board diversity: this is an irreversible trend towards [what we call] the Age of Fiduciary Capitalism.” 4 This primer reflects their personal interpretation of the “crossroads where ESG, infrastructure investment and pension superpowers intersect”, and why they believe this will constitute a key feature of the “Fifth Industrial Revolution”.

Pension board members (trustees), many of whom are employee representatives and union leaders, are flexing their fiduciary muscles like never before. In many ways, they now represent the interplay between civil society and financial markets. And, as we move into 2022, the rise of private market assets (diversification, quest for yields, and inflation protection) and the mainstreaming of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) amongst policy makers and pension board members (cultural-ideological change transforming legal-corporate norms) will form mutually reinforcing trends, converging ultimately to redefine the terms of free market economics5. Or, as Larry Fink put it in his recently published 2022 Letter to Shareholders: “Workers demanding more from their employers is an essential feature of effective capitalism […] “We are committed to a future where every investor - even individual investors - can have the option to participate in the proxy voting process if they choose.” 6 In the UK, similar ideas were championed by Baroness Altmann, House of Lords, and Janice Turner, Co-Chair, Association of Member Nominated Trustees (AMNT).
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Pioneers like Claude Lamoureux, inaugural president and chief executive officer of the Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan (OTPP), Christina Currier of the Texas Department of Transportation and Michael Nobrega, former President and CEO of the Ontario Municipal Employees' Pension System (OMERS), one of Canada’s largest pension funds, started to use the term “infrastructure as an asset class” in the first decade of the century. The Hon. Nick Sherry led similar efforts in Canberra in his various parliamentary and ministerial roles – notably Minister for Superannuation & Corporate Law in the Labor Government of Kevin Rudd, and so did M. Nicolas Firzli in Paris and Brussels – AXA, French Society of Financial Analysts, World Pensions Forum.

A look at the policy planks and economic programmes of practically all G20 nations for the next four to eight years, including the EU 2030 Climate & Energy Framework, Korea’s New Deal 2.0, Saudi Arabia Vision 2030, indicates that many governments intend to draw on increased private investment in “green and modern infrastructure” to leverage government funds at federal, state (provincial) and municipal level: inviting foreign asset owners to ‘Choose France’ (Emmanuel Macron), relying on the perceived economic patriotism of national pension and insurance giants (Boris Johnson), or a combination of both strategies (Justin Trudeau and Scott Morrison). How reasonable are these policy expectations? Can we expect pension investors to increase substantially their allocation to infrastructure assets?

We believe institutional asset owners will step up to the plate in the coming quarters, especially large funds from six key pension superpowers, whose combined assets represent more than 75% of the world’s total: the United States, Canada, Australia, Japan, Holland and the United Kingdom. The ‘Canadian model’ favours straight investment in infrastructure assets/projects (direct ownership), whereas the ‘Australian model’ relied, until recently, on the indirect route, favouring limited partnership (LP) arrangements with specialized asset managers (investing in funds). The recent wave of mega-mergers across the Australian superannuation ecosystem means that, increasingly, Australian pension funds have the suitable size and scale to follow both routes if they so wish, depending on sub-asset typology and geography: “the wall of capital pointed at Australia is just enormous, it’s seen [by both foreign and domestic pension investors] as a mainstay, a very safe jurisdiction for infrastructure investing”. Here, we can also learn from Canada and Australia’s brand of ESG pragmatism: avoiding rigid one-size-fits-all ‘exclusion lists’, and understanding that the path to net zero
may, perhaps, require continued investments in nickel, uranium and rare metals extraction, as well as natural gas and LNG infrastructure as we transition to greener ways and means.  

Large institutional asset owners could double their allocation to private market assets in the next four years, shifting hundreds of billions of dollars annually towards infrastructure assets domestically, accelerating the investment flows coming into the United States, the United Kingdom, and the European Union, and also into emerging markets, including Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) member states. Many of these investment flows will come from cash-rich pension and sovereign wealth investors in Canada, Singapore, the Arabian Gulf/CCAS and Australia. We believe private market assets under management (PM-AuM) should grow by up to 20% per annum in the coming years (2022 – 2026), more than double the current rate.

The investment potential of large institutional asset owners, such as public pensions and sovereign wealth funds, can be visualised through the Infrastructure & Private Markets Investment Matrix, an original strategic assessment tool developed by Nicolas Firzli, G7 Pensions Forum & ESG Summit, and Dr. Joshua Franzel,
MissionSquare Research Institute (MSRI), International City/County Management Association (see chart). The yellow arrows show the likely asset allocation evolution for the next four years, with a marked increase in the allocation to infrastructure (Y axis) and, also, private assets across the board: infra, private equity, venture capital, private debt, real estate, and natural capital like forestry and farmlands (X axis), moving towards the “Australian allocation” (5% to 12% of overall assets in infrastructure), exemplified by AustralianSuper, or, for the largest players, the “Canadian model” (8% to 20% in infra, often in direct ownership, see graph).

Our chart shows notably the Ontario Municipal Employees' Retirement System (OMERS) and the Caisse de Dépôt et Placement du Québec, two archetypal Canadian pension investors: “by investing early on in non-listed assets (private equity, real estate, infrastructure, forestry, and commodities) both domestically and abroad, Canadian public pension and sovereign funds have attracted attention on both sides of the Atlantic: ‘They own assets all over the world, including property in New York City, utilities in Chile, international airports, and the high-speed railway in the United Kingdom [...] They have won the attention both of Wall Street firms, which consider them rivals, and institutional investors, which aspire to be like them’.”

Denmark’s PFA Pension (red circle) represents the “typical EU or US pension fund”, with 15% to 18% in private assets, including roughly 1.5% in non-listed infrastructure, a very common allocation across many OECD countries – it’s the allocation mix of CalPERS, the US’s biggest pension fund. The two northeast arrows indicate the direction likely to be followed by most pension investors in the next four years: raising their allocations to infrastructure and other private assets such as private equity and real estate in similar proportions. In Mainland Europe, sophisticated institutional investors such as Holland’s APG Asset Management, which manages investments on behalf of several Dutch pension funds, chief among them Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP, already have an ambitious asset allocation, with more than 3% in non-listed infrastructure and nearly 20% in private markets overall (see chart).

The Fifth Industrial Revolution Has Begun . . .

Australia and Canada are examples of global leadership in infrastructure investment. Both are middle ranking economic powers with stable legal-political systems (English common law, with the partial exception of Quebec), large pension industries – the world’s 4th and 5th largest by assets – and well managed funds with significant investment in private market assets, both domestically and internationally. They invest massively
in ports, airports, rail and urban transport networks, energy, and social infrastructure, including hospitals and student housing. Another shared feature is the growing governance role played by pension trustees, including employee representatives (“fiduciary capitalism”).

Not coincidentally, both countries are at the forefront of investment in renewable energy and cleantech, digital infrastructure, artificial intelligence, and biotechnology: the foundational sectors of the Fifth Industrial Revolution. Now, in other countries, some of these sectors and industries can still be perceived as excessively “illiquid” or “too risky” for pension investors: criticisms sometimes laid at the door of infrastructure and tech assets generally by conservative lawmakers and financial regulators. We understand their anxieties, but we believe those risks can be surmounted with five simple policy recipes:

1. Ensuring the sovereignty of (public) pension boards when it comes to allocation decisions. Investment committees must always remain at arm’s length from the government.

2. Guaranteeing the sanctity of property rights and contract law (safeguarding privatised assets and public private partnerships notwithstanding changes in government), with truly independent judiciary branches.

3. Adopting a pragmatic, centrist approach to energy transition and asset classification: recognising that “natural gas and nuclear energy could [in some cases] make a contribution in the difficult transition to climate neutrality” (European Union Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities).

4. Being willing to commit to truly long-term privatisation and concession programmes (e.g., ports and airports in the US, Latin America, and the EU, where governments need to secure a sufficient number of assets in their privatisation pipelines).

5. Perhaps more importantly, adjusting macro-prudential regulation to allow pension and insurance investors – and the investment banks that lend them money – to allocate substantially more to ‘illiquid’ assets without being handicapped by overzealous financial regulators. As we write these lines, the UK government and the Bank of England have indicated they will soon be reforming Solvency II rules adopted when the UK was in the EU, thus making it easier for large asset owners such as insurance companies to invest in infrastructure at home and abroad. The National Treasury (South Africa) also announced similar reforms.

As we move to a world of durably higher interest rates and greater focus on government debt, policymakers will need to rely more than ever on pension, SWF, and insurance capital. Hopefully, this will make the above policy measures more likely to be adopted.

© Sherry, Firzli & Khoo (2022). Some of the original material featured in this article also appeared in a shorter primer published earlier this year by the Global Infrastructure Hub (GIH), a G20 initiative.
The May 2022 issue of our Future of Finance Series will focus more specifically on US, EU, UK, and ASEAN insurance companies: understanding regulatory change and asset allocation dynamics etc.
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