Choosing a European fund domicile: The views of global asset managers

A survey conducted by the Economist Intelligence Unit on behalf of Matheson
## Contents

**Introduction**

1 About this survey 6

2 Overview of the survey results 9

   Which European domiciles would fund managers now choose if starting over? 11

   **Regional focus:** US, UK, Asia-Pacific and Latin-American views 12

   How do asset managers expect their organisation to respond to the application of the AIFMD? 14

   What are the most important decision-making factors for fund managers when choosing a European fund domicile? 14

   What are asset managers’ views on expected growth of funds domiciled in Europe? 14

3 Key charts and graphs from the survey 15

   The views of global asset managers on leading European fund domiciles 16

      Best overall 17
      Best regulatory conditions 17
      Best legal and tax framework 17
      Best business conditions 17
      Regional focus 18

   The key decision-making factors for asset managers when choosing a European fund domicile 28

      Legal and regulatory factors 29
      Financial and business factors 29
      Market and distribution factors 29
      How Ireland rates in the top decision-making factors 30

   Reaction of asset managers to AIFMD 31

   Expected growth levels of assets under management in UCITS and alternative investment funds domiciled in the EEA 33

4 Appendix: Full survey results 35

5 Glossary 44

About Matheson 45
Introduction

For global asset managers, choosing the right fund domicile is a key strategic decision. Whether seeking to establish UCITS or alternative investment funds or both, how do asset managers evaluate the best domicile for their needs among the various European financial centres available? And what are the key decision-making criteria that influence their preference?
In this survey of 200 global asset managers, which was conducted independently by the Economist Intelligence Unit on behalf of Matheson, respondents were asked for their views on the leading European investment fund domiciles, and the most important factors which guide a domicile decision. The survey also explored their reaction to the application of the AIFMD, and the scale of expected growth in UCITS and alternative investment funds in the coming years.

Significantly, the 200 managers surveyed by the Economist Intelligence Unit were asked which European domiciles they would now choose if starting afresh with their fund ranges. Asset managers had the opportunity to select which, in their view, are the best performing European fund domiciles in terms of the following criteria:

- regulatory conditions (such as regulatory sophistication, accessibility and responsiveness).
- the applicable legal and tax framework.
- non-regulatory and non-tax business conditions in those domiciles (such as ease of doing business, service culture, local expertise in complex products).

The asset managers surveyed were also asked to assess what are the most influential decision-making factors for them when selecting a European jurisdiction in which to domicile their funds. Specifically, the survey gave managers the opportunity to select and rank what are the most important legal and regulatory factors when choosing a domicile; the most important financial and business factors; and the most important market and distribution factors which influence a decision in selecting one domicile over another.

All survey respondents’ asset management firms manage the assets of EEA-domiciled collective investment funds, and all respondents are familiar with their firm’s reasons for selecting jurisdictions in which to establish funds.

With respect to views on growth of funds domiciled in Europe, the survey carried out by the Economist Intelligence Unit examined global asset managers’ estimates of expected growth levels of assets under management in both UCITS and European alternative investment funds up to 2016. Regarding the AIFMD, survey respondents were asked to identify how they expected their organisation to react to the application of the AIFMD.

This document publishes the survey findings. We at Matheson hope you enjoy reading and examining the survey results, and the trends which those results highlight.
1 About this survey

For the purposes of this survey, the Economist Intelligence Unit engaged with 200 senior asset management executives across the globe, seeking their views on selecting domiciles for investment funds (both UCITS and alternative investment funds) structured under EU laws. The asset management firms of the managers polled were headquartered in North America (38%), Western Europe (35%), Asia-Pacific (13%), Latin America (10%), and the Middle East and Africa (4%).
Of the 200 respondents, 94% of their firms already have investment funds domiciled in the EEA, and the remaining 6% plan to by 2016.

Respondents tended to represent large organisations, with more than half representing firms managing $1 billion to $50 billion globally. Some 40% of respondents’ firms have assets under management of more than $1 billion in UCITS, while on the alternative investment side, 67% with EEA-domiciled alternative investment fund ranges have less than $100 million under management, 17% of those managers’ firms have $100 million to $1 billion and 16% of those managers’ firms have over $1 billion assets under management in their EEA alternative investment funds.

In terms of their seniority, a third of respondents (34%) are at director/vice president level; 16% are CFOs; 14.5% are portfolio managers; 13% are chief investment officers; and 12% are principals/partners.

Based on respondents’ naming of the top three European countries in which most of their funds (measured in terms of assets under management) are domiciled, 49% have funds domiciled in the UK, with Luxembourg as the next most common domicile with 43%, and Ireland third with 41%. France and Germany were fourth and fifth, with 39% and 28% respectively.
The survey compares their views of ten domiciles within the EEA. These domiciles were selected on both qualitative and quantitative grounds, either because of the scale of their investment fund businesses (the quantitative measure) or because they were deemed to be worthy of consideration by investment fund experts (the qualitative measure).

In the data analysis, these countries were ranked based on simple response numbers from the respondents, who were asked to name their three top country choices in each of three categories: regulatory conditions, legal and tax framework, and non-regulatory and non-tax business conditions. The responses were not volume-weighted, for example, by the value of assets under management held by each respondent’s firm.

Survey respondents were also asked to express their views on the most important factors, grouped into three categories (legal and regulatory conditions, financial and business factors, and market and distribution factors) when selecting a domicile. The same decision factors were used in asking respondents to assess how Ireland has performed as a fund domicile.

When this survey refers to a European domicile, it means a domicile within the EEA.

Disclaimer: This report is published by Matheson. The survey of 200 asset managers titled “Choosing a European Fund Domicile: The Views of Global Asset Managers”, which is the subject of this publication, was carried out independently by the Economist Intelligence Unit on behalf of Matheson during June and July 2013. The Economist Intelligence Unit takes full responsibility for the accuracy of the survey results quoted in this publication.
The following findings arise from the survey of 200 global asset managers conducted by the Economist Intelligence Unit.

2 Overview of the survey results
Overall
The three jurisdictions which performed best overall in the survey were Ireland, Germany and Luxembourg. Ireland received the combined overall highest number of preferences across each of the categories surveyed with 71% of global asset managers indicating that, if starting over, they would choose Ireland as one of their top-3 European fund domiciles. Germany and Luxembourg came in joint second place with 45% of managers selecting them as a top-3 domicile. The United Kingdom came in third place, receiving votes from 33% of managers, while the Netherlands came in fourth place, receiving a top-3 preference from 27% of managers. France came in fifth place, with 23% of managers giving it a top-3 preference.

Legal and tax framework
As a European fund domicile, 73% of managers ranked Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction in terms of its legal and tax framework for investment funds. Second in this category was Luxembourg, with 47% of managers giving it a top-3 preference. Germany was third with 43% of managers naming it as a top-3 domicile. The United Kingdom came in fourth place with 33% of managers giving it a top-3 preference, while the Netherlands came in fifth with 25% giving it a top-3 preference.

Ease of doing business, service culture, local expertise in complex products
72% of managers ranked Ireland as a top-3 domicile as regards business conditions for domiciling funds. The business conditions considered included non-regulatory and non-tax factors such as ease of doing business, service culture and local expertise in complex products. The domicile which came second in this category was Germany, earning top-3 preferences from 45% of managers. Luxembourg was third with 43% of managers giving it a top-3 preference. The United Kingdom came fourth with 32% of managers surveyed giving it a top-3 preference, while the Netherlands came fifth with 29% of managers giving it a top-3 preference.

Regulatory conditions
67% of respondents ranked Ireland as a top-3 domicile as regards regulatory conditions. This included regulatory sophistication, accessibility and responsiveness. Second in this category was Germany which received top-3 preferences from 48% of managers, while Luxembourg was third, receiving preferences from 45% of managers surveyed. The United Kingdom came in fourth place receiving top-3 preferences from 34% of global managers, while the Netherlands came in fifth with 27% of managers’ preferences.
US-based asset managers' preferences

The jurisdiction which received the highest number of top-3 preferences from US-based managers was Ireland. If starting over:

- 76% of US managers rank Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction in terms of the best regulatory conditions for domiciling investment funds in Europe. In second place, Germany received preferences from 52% of US managers while the United Kingdom was third for US managers with 44% of them giving it a top-3 preference. Luxembourg came in fourth place with 43% of managers giving it a top-3 preference, while the Netherlands came in fifth with 30%.

- 75% of US managers rate Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction in terms of legal and tax framework. In second place for legal and tax framework, 52% of US managers gave Luxembourg a top-3 preference. The United Kingdom placed third for US managers with 44% of them giving it a top-3 preference. Germany came in fourth place, with 37% of managers giving it a top-3 preference. The Netherlands came in fifth place, with 33%.

- 78% of US managers rank Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction for business conditions, such as ease of doing business, service culture and local expertise. Germany received top-3 preferences from 44% of US managers, putting it in second place. Luxembourg was third for US managers with 43% of them giving it a top-3 preference. The United Kingdom came in fourth place with 38% of managers giving it a top-3 preference, while the Netherlands came in fifth with 37%.

- Combining the results overall across all three categories, 76% of US-based managers would now choose Ireland as a top-3 funds domicile if starting over. The next best jurisdiction was Luxembourg, which received top-3 preferences from 46% of US managers. Germany came third for US managers with 44% of them giving it a top-3 preference overall, across the three categories surveyed. The United Kingdom came in fourth place, receiving top-3 preferences from 42% of managers, while the Netherlands came in fifth with 33%.

UK-based asset managers' preferences

The jurisdiction which received the highest number of top-3 preferences from UK-based managers was Ireland. If starting over:

- 79% of UK managers rank Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction in terms of the best regulatory conditions for domiciling investment funds in Europe. In second place, Germany received top-3 preferences from 53% of UK managers. The United Kingdom itself was third for UK managers with top-3 preferences from 37% of managers. Luxembourg came in fourth place with 32% of UK managers giving it a top-3 preference, while Sweden came fifth with 26% of preferences.

- 84% of UK managers rank Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction in terms of the best legal and tax framework for domiciling investment funds in Europe. In second place, Germany received top-3 preferences from 42% of UK managers. France and the Netherlands were jointly in third place for UK managers, each receiving top-3 preferences from 32% of managers. Luxembourg and the United Kingdom came jointly in fourth place, with top-3 preferences from 26% of managers, while Spain came in fifth place with 21%.

- 58% of UK managers rank Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction for business conditions, such as ease of doing business, service culture and local expertise. In second place, 47% of UK managers voted the Netherlands a top-3 domicile. Germany and the United Kingdom were jointly in third place for UK managers each receiving top-3 preferences from 42% of managers. France and Spain came jointly in fourth place, with 26% of managers giving each top-3 preference, while Luxembourg and Sweden came in joint fifth place, with 21% each.

- Combining the results overall across all three categories, 74% of UK-based managers would now choose Ireland as a top-3 funds domicile if starting over. The next best jurisdiction for UK managers was Germany, which garnered top-3 preferences from 46% of UK managers. The United Kingdom was third for UK managers with top-3 preferences from 35% of managers overall, across the three categories surveyed. The Netherlands came in fourth place with 33% of managers giving it a top-3 preference, while Luxembourg and France came joint fifth, with 26% each.
Asia-Pacific asset managers' preferences

The jurisdiction which received the highest number of top-3 preferences from Asia-Pacific-based managers was Ireland. If starting over:

- 62% of Asia-Pacific managers rank Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction in terms of offering the best regulatory conditions for domiciling investment funds in Europe. Luxembourg and the United Kingdom came jointly in second place, each receiving top-3 preferences from 46% of Asia-Pacific managers. Germany came in third place, with 42% of Asia-Pacific managers giving it a top-3 preference. France and the Netherlands came jointly in fourth place with top-3 preferences from 31% of managers, while Sweden came fifth with 27%.

- 77% of Asia-Pacific managers rank Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction in terms of having the best legal and tax framework for domiciling investment funds in Europe. 54% of Asia-Pacific managers gave Germany a top-3 preference, putting it in second place. Luxembourg was in third place for Asia-Pacific managers, receiving top-3 preferences from 39% of managers. With top-3 preferences from 35% of managers each, France and the United Kingdom came jointly in fourth place, while Sweden placed fifth with 31%.

- 69% of Asia-Pacific managers rank Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction for business conditions, such as ease of doing business, service culture and local expertise. In second place, the United Kingdom received preferences from 46% of Asia-Pacific managers. Germany came third with 42% of Asia-Pacific managers giving it a top-3 preference. Luxembourg came fourth with top-3 preferences from 39% of managers, while France came fifth with 35%.

- Combining the results overall across all three categories, 69% of Asia-Pacific managers would now choose Ireland as a top-3 funds domicile if starting over. The next best jurisdiction for Asia-Pacific managers was Germany, which received top-3 preferences from 46% of managers. The United Kingdom came third for Asia-Pacific managers with top-3 preferences from 42% of managers, averaged across the three categories surveyed. Luxembourg came fourth, receiving top-3 preferences from 41% of managers while France came fifth with 33%.

Latin-American asset managers' preferences

The jurisdiction which received the highest number of top-3 preferences from Latin-American-based managers was Ireland. If starting over:

- 65% of Latin-American managers rank Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction in terms of the best regulatory conditions for domiciling investment funds in Europe. In second place, Luxembourg received top-3 preferences from 50% of Latin-American managers. The Netherlands was third for Latin-American managers, with 35% of managers giving it a top-3 preference. Germany came fourth, receiving top-3 preferences from 30% of managers, while Sweden came fifth with 25%.

- 70% of Latin-American managers rank Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction in terms of the best legal and tax framework for domiciling investment funds in Europe. In second place, Luxembourg received top-3 preferences from 55% of Latin-American managers, while Germany and Sweden were jointly in third place, garnering top-3 preferences from 30% of managers each. The Netherlands came in fourth place, receiving top-3 preferences from 25% of managers, while Italy placed fifth, with 15%.

- 75% of Latin-American managers rank Ireland as a top-3 jurisdiction for business conditions, such as ease of doing business, service culture and local expertise. In second place, 50% of Latin-American managers gave Luxembourg a top-3 preference, while Germany placed third for Latin-American managers receiving top-3 preferences from 30% of managers. The Netherlands and Sweden came jointly in fourth place, with 25% of top-3 preferences while France and Italy both received 15%, putting them jointly in fifth place.

- Combining the results overall across all three categories, 70% of Latin-American managers would now choose Ireland as a top-3 funds domicile if starting over. The next best jurisdiction for Latin-American managers was Luxembourg, which received top-3 preferences from 52% of Latin-American managers. Germany was third with top-3 preferences from 30% of Latin-American managers overall across the three categories surveyed. The Netherlands came fourth, receiving top-3 preferences from 28% of managers, while Sweden came fifth with top-3 preferences from 27% of managers.
What are the most important decision-making factors for fund managers when choosing a European fund domicile?

- Amongst legal and regulatory factors, managers ranked the approach to implementing the AIFMD as most important. This was followed by the sophistication of the national regulator and the approach to implementing the UCITS Directive.

- As regards financial and business factors, managers ranked the cost of doing business as of greatest importance, followed by tax treatment of fund vehicles and presence and range of double tax treaties. Having existing fund ranges or business relationships in a jurisdiction was the least important factor.

- In terms of market and distribution factors, managers ranked as most important speed to market, followed by investors’ perceptions of a specific jurisdiction and third was reputation and longevity as a funds centre.

What are asset managers’ views on expected growth of funds domiciled in Europe?

- Fund managers say the value of their funds located in Europe will grow significantly over the next three years in terms of both UCITS and alternative investment funds.

- 56% of managers predict that by 2016 their firm will have over $1 billion in UCITS (by assets under management) – up from 41% in 2013.

- 29% of managers predict that by 2016 their firm will have over $1 billion in European alternative investment funds (by assets under management) – up from 16% in 2013.

How do asset managers expect their organisation to respond to the application of the AIFMD?

- When asked what way did they expect their organisation to react to the application of the AIFMD, 62.5% of asset managers surveyed stated that they expected their firm to wait and see how investors respond first.

- 18.5% indicated that they expected their firm to restructure existing alternative investment funds into UCITS-compliant funds where possible.

- 10.5% indicated that they expected their organisation to take the earliest opportunity to avail of the new AIFMD passport.

- 4.5% of managers stated that they expected their firm to re-domicile their offshore alternative investment funds to Europe to avail of the AIFMD passport.

- 3.5% of managers responded that they expected their organisation to distribute offshore alternative investment funds via European private placement regimes for as long as this remains possible for non-EU managers.

- Only one respondent of 200 stated that they expected their firm to cease marketing in Europe and to re-domicile their alternative investment funds out of the EEA.
3 Key charts and graphs from the survey
The views of global asset managers on leading European fund domiciles
Which European domiciles would fund managers now choose if starting over?

**Best overall**

If you were to consider starting afresh with your fund ranges, which of the following European domiciles do you think offers the **best regulatory conditions, legal and tax framework and business conditions**? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the composite are averages of responses to questions below. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

**Best regulatory conditions**

If you were to consider starting afresh with your fund ranges, which of the following European domiciles do you think offers the **best regulatory conditions** (eg, regulatory sophistication, accessibility and responsiveness)? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages calculated based on total respondents; 100% = 200 respondents. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

**Best legal and tax framework**

Which of the following European domiciles offers the **best legal and tax framework**? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages calculated based on total respondents; 100% = 200 respondents. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

**Best business conditions**

Which of the following European domiciles offers the **best non-regulatory and non-tax business conditions** (eg, ease of doing business, service culture, local expertise in complex products)? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages calculated based on total respondents; 100% = 200 respondents. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.
Regional focus: The US View
European domicile preferences of US asset managers

Best overall
If you were to consider starting afresh with your fund ranges, which of the following European domiciles do you think offers the best regulatory conditions, legal and tax framework and business conditions? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the composite are averages of responses to questions below.
Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Best regulatory conditions
If you were to consider starting afresh with your fund ranges, which of the following European domiciles do you think offers the best regulatory conditions (eg, regulatory sophistication, accessibility and responsiveness)? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the charts for individual questions are based on number of respondents in region; 100% = 63 US-based respondents.
Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Best legal and tax framework
Which of the following European domiciles offers the best legal and tax framework? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the charts for individual questions are based on number of respondents in region; 100% = 63 US-based respondents.
Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Best business conditions
Which of the following European domiciles offers the best non-regulatory and non-tax business conditions (eg, ease of doing business, service culture, local expertise in complex products)? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the charts for individual questions are based on number of respondents in region; 100% = 63 US-based respondents.
Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.
Regional focus: The UK View
European domicile preferences of UK asset managers

Best overall
If you were to consider starting afresh with your fund ranges, which of the following European domiciles do you think offers the best regulatory conditions, legal and tax framework and business conditions? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the composite are averages of responses to questions below. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Best regulatory conditions
If you were to consider starting afresh with your fund ranges, which of the following European domiciles do you think offers the best regulatory conditions (eg, regulatory sophistication, accessibility and responsiveness)? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the charts for individual questions are based on number of respondents in region; 100% = 19 UK-based respondents. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Best legal and tax framework
Which of the following European domiciles offers the best legal and tax framework? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the charts for individual questions are based on number of respondents in region; 100% = 19 UK-based respondents. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Best business conditions
Which of the following European domiciles offers the best non-regulatory and non-tax business conditions (eg, ease of doing business, service culture, local expertise in complex products)? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the charts for individual questions are based on number of respondents in region; 100% = 19 UK-based respondents. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.
Regional focus:
The Asia-Pacific View
European domicile preferences of Asia-Pacific asset managers

Best overall
If you were to consider starting afresh with your fund ranges, which of the following European domiciles do you think offers the best regulatory conditions, legal and tax framework and business conditions? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the composite are averages of responses to questions below. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Best regulatory conditions
If you were to consider starting afresh with your fund ranges, which of the following European domiciles do you think offers the best regulatory conditions (eg, regulatory sophistication, accessibility and responsiveness)? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the charts for individual questions are based on number of respondents in region; 100% = 26 Asia-Pacific-based respondents. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Best legal and tax framework
Which of the following European domiciles offers the best legal and tax framework? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the charts for individual questions are based on number of respondents in region; 100% = 26 Asia-Pacific-based respondents. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Best business conditions
Which of the following European domiciles offers the best non-regulatory and non-tax business conditions (eg, ease of doing business, service culture, local expertise in complex products)? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the charts for individual questions are based on number of respondents in region; 100% = 26 Asia-Pacific-based respondents. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.
Regional focus: The Latin-American View
## European domicile preferences of Latin-American asset managers

### Best overall

If you were to consider starting afresh with your fund ranges, which of the following European domiciles do you think offers the **best regulatory conditions, legal and tax framework and business conditions**? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the composite are averages of responses to questions below. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

### Best regulatory conditions

If you were to consider starting afresh with your fund ranges, which of the following European domiciles do you think offers the **best regulatory conditions** (eg, regulatory sophistication, accessibility and responsiveness)? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the charts for individual questions are based on number of respondents in region; 100% = 20 Latin-American-based respondents. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

### Best legal and tax framework

Which of the following European domiciles offers the **best legal and tax framework**? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the charts for individual questions are based on number of respondents in region; 100% = 20 Latin-American-based respondents. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

### Best business conditions

Which of the following European domiciles offers the **best non-regulatory and non-tax business conditions** (eg, ease of doing business, service culture, local expertise in complex products)? Please select the top three.

Note: Percentages in the charts for individual questions are based on number of respondents in region; 100% = 20 Latin-American-based respondents. Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.
European fund domicile preferences of asset managers by region

This chart represents a regional breakdown showing the composite result for managers’ selection of their top-three European fund domiciles under the categories of best regulatory conditions, best legal and tax framework and best business conditions.
The key decision-making factors for asset managers when choosing a European fund domicile
The key decision-making factors for asset managers when choosing a European fund domicile

In this part of the survey, asset managers were asked to rank from one to three the most influential decision-making factors when selecting a European jurisdiction to domicile their funds. The survey gave managers the opportunity to select and rank the most important legal and regulatory factors, financial and business factors and market and distribution factors when choosing a European fund domicile. For the calculation of the total score below, a factor chosen by a respondent as the most important received three points, the second most important received two points, and the third most important received one point.

Which of the following are the most important legal and regulatory factors when choosing a European domicile for your range of funds? Please rank-order the top three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Legal and regulatory factors</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>% of number one votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Approach to the AIFMD</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The sophistication of the national regulator</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approach to the UCITS Directive</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The ease of re-domiciling funds</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Accessibility and responsiveness of the national regulator</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The legal system and legal certainty</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Range of fund vehicles</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Presence of a stock exchange</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Which of the following are the most important financial and business factors when choosing a European domicile for your range of funds? Please rank-order the top three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Financial and business factors</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>% of number one votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cost of doing business</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tax treatment of fund vehicles</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Double tax treaties</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Professional services cluster</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Local expertise</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Having existing fund ranges/business relationships</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Which of the following are the most important market and distribution factors when choosing a European domicile for your range of funds? Please rank-order the top three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Market and distribution factors</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>% of number one votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speed to market</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Investors’ perceptions</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reputation and longevity as a funds centre</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Service culture</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pro-business Government</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Access to a large domestic (national) market</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Status as a global distribution hub</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.
How Ireland rates in the top decision-making factors

As an Irish-headquartered law firm, Matheson wanted to evaluate Ireland’s performance as a domicile according to the most important decision-making factors for managers when selecting a European fund domicile, as voted in the survey. In this regard, the bar charts below identify managers’ appraisals of Ireland in relation to the decision-making factors which were ranked number one in their respective categories of legal and regulatory, financial and business, market and distribution, ie the approach to implementation of the AIFMD, the cost of doing business and speed to market.

The approach to implementing the AIFMD

(% respondents; 100% ~ 200 respondents)

Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Cost of doing business

(% respondents; 100% ~ 200 respondents)

Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Speed to market

(% respondents; 100% ~ 200 respondents)

Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.
Reaction of asset managers to AIFMD
Reaction of asset managers to the AIFMD

How do you expect your organisation will react to the application of the AIFMD? Please select the answer that most closely fits your organisation.

- **62.5%** We will wait and see how investors respond first
- **18.5%** We intend to re-structure our alternative investment funds into a UCITS-compliant fund where possible
- **10.5%** We will avail of the AIFMD passport for our European alternative investment funds at the earliest opportunity
- **3.5%** We intend to distribute our offshore alternative investment funds via European private placement regimes for as long as this remains possible for non-EU
- **4.5%** We will re-domicile our offshore alternative investment funds to Europe to avail of the AIFMD passport
- **0.5%** We will cease all marketing in Europe and will re-domicile our alternative investment funds out of the EEA

Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.
Expected growth levels of assets under management in UCITS and alternative investment funds domiciled in the EEA
Expected growth levels of assets under management in UCITS and alternative investment funds domiciled in the EEA

**Expected growth in assets under management in UCITS, 2013-16**

What is the approximate size of your firm’s current assets under management in UCITS funds? (% respondents; 100% = 189 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over $1 billion</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 million to $1 billion</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to $100 million</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do you expect the size of your firm’s assets under management in UCITS-compliant funds to change over the next three years? (% respondents; 100% = 200 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over $1 billion</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 million to $1 billion</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to $100 million</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Survey respondents were asked to select the approximate size of their firm’s assets under management in UCITS/EEA alternative investment funds, and also were asked how they expect the size of their firm’s assets under management in UCITS/EEA alternative investment funds will change over the next three years.
Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

**Expected growth in assets under management in EEA domiciled alternative investment funds, 2013-16**

What is the approximate size of your firm’s current assets under management in alternative investment funds domiciled in the EEA? (% respondents; 100% = 189 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over $1 billion</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 million to $1 billion</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to $100 million</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do you expect the size of your firm’s assets under management in alternative investment funds domiciled in the EEA to change over the next three years? (% respondents; 100% = 200 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over $1 billion</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 million to $1 billion</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to $100 million</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Survey respondents were asked to select the approximate size of their firm’s assets under management in UCITS/EEA alternative investment funds, and also were asked how they expect the size of their firm’s assets under management in UCITS/EEA alternative investment funds will change over the next three years.
Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.
4 Appendix:
Full survey results
In which region are you personally located?

(\% respondents; 100\% = 200 respondents)

In which region are your company’s global headquarters based?

(\% respondents; 100\% = 200 respondents)

In which country are you personally based?

(\% respondents; 100\% = 200 respondents)
### What is your firm’s home country?

(\% respondents; 100\% = 200 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What are your firm’s total global assets under management?

(\% respondents; 100\% = 200 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets under Management</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to $100m</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $100m and $1bn</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $1bn and $50bn</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $50bn and $500bn</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $500 billion</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>% Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman/President</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer/Managing Partner/Managing Director</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Partner</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Investment Officer</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Operating Officer</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Risk Officer/Director Risk Management</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Marketing Officer</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other C-suite</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Legal Services</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Compliance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Product Strategy/Product Development Director</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Manager</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Sales</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Vice President/Senior Vice President</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the approximate size of your firm’s current assets under management in alternative investment funds domiciled in the EEA?

(% respondents; 100% = 189 respondents)

- Up to $100 million: 66.7%
- $100 million to $1 billion: 17.5%
- Over $1 billion: 15.8%

How do you expect the size of your firm’s assets under management in alternative investment funds domiciled in the EEA to change over the next three years?

(% respondents; 100% = 200 respondents)

- Up to $100 million: 32.3%
- $100 million to $1 billion: 27%
- Over $1 billion: 40.7%

What is the approximate size of your firm’s current assets under management in UCITS funds?

(% respondents; 100% = 189 respondents)

- Up to $100 million: 17%
- $100 million to $1 billion: 27.5%
- Over $1 billion: 55.5%

How do you expect the size of your firm’s assets under management in UCITS-compliant funds to change over the next three years?

(% respondents; 100% = 200 respondents)

- Up to $100 million: 24%
- $100 million to $1 billion: 29%
- Over $1 billion: 47%

What is the approximate size of your firm’s current assets under management in alternative investment funds domiciled in the EEA?

(% respondents; 100% = 189 respondents)

- Up to $100 million: 66.7%
- $100 million to $1 billion: 17.5%
- Over $1 billion: 15.8%

How do you expect the size of your firm’s assets under management in alternative investment funds domiciled in the EEA to change over the next three years?

(% respondents; 100% = 200 respondents)

- Up to $100 million: 47%
- $100 million to $1 billion: 24%
- Over $1 billion: 29%
In which of the following countries do you domicile most of your funds (in terms of assets under management)? Please select the top three.

(％respondents; 100％ = 200 respondents)

If you were to consider starting afresh with your fund ranges, which of the following European domiciles do you think offers the best regulatory conditions (eg, regulatory sophistication, accessibility and responsiveness)? Please select the top three.

(％respondents; 100％ = 200 respondents)

Similarly, which of the following domiciles offers the best legal and tax framework? Please select the top three.

(％respondents; 100％ = 200 respondents)

And, which of the following offers the best non-regulatory and non-tax business conditions (eg, ease of doing business, service culture, local expertise in complex products)? Please select the top three.

(％respondents; 100％ = 200 respondents)
Which of the following are the most important market and distribution factors when choosing a European domicile for your range of funds? Please rank-order the top three.

Key decision making factors of asset managers when choosing a European domicile – market and distribution factors.

(Total score *)

Which of the following are the most important financial and business factors when choosing a European domicile for your range of funds? Please rank-order the top three.

Key decision making factors of asset managers when choosing a European domicile – financial and business factors.

(Total score *)

Which of the following are the most important legal and regulatory factors when choosing a European domicile for your range of funds? Please rank-order the top three.

Key decision making factors of asset managers when choosing a European domicile – legal and regulatory factors.

(Total score *)

* For the calculation of the total score below, a factor chosen by a respondent as the most important received three points, the second most important received two points, and the third most important received one point.
### Financial and Business Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very Attractive</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Uncompetitive</th>
<th>Not at all Attractive</th>
<th>I have no current view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The range of fund vehicles available to meet the needs of investors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The approach to implementing the UCITS Directive</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The approach to implementing the AIFMD</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sophistication of the national regulator in its approach to rules/policies for funds</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility and responsiveness of the national regulator</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ease of re-domiciling funds into Ireland</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nature of the legal system (i.e., common law) and legal certainty</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presence of an internationally recognised stock exchange for listing funds</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regulatory Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very Attractive</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Uncompetitive</th>
<th>Not at all Attractive</th>
<th>I have no current view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having existing fund ranges/business relationships in a jurisdiction</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local expertise and familiarity with complex products</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services cluster (including global custodians and administrators, law firms, audit firms)</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of doing business (e.g., regulatory fees, service provider fees)</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence and range of double tax treaties</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax treatment of fund vehicles</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a scale of 1-5, with 1 = “very attractive” and 5 = “not at all attractive”, how would you rate Ireland as a domicile country across the following financial and business factors? (200 respondents)

- 1 Very attractive
- 2 Competitive
- 3 Satisfactory
- 4 Uncompetitive
- 5 Not at all attractive
- I have no current view
Are you familiar with your firm’s reasons for selecting jurisdictions in which to establish an investment fund?

Yes

100%

(% respondents; 100% = 200 respondents)

Yes

94%

No, but plan to do so within 3 years

6%

(% respondents; 100% = 200 respondents)

On a scale of 1-5, with 1 = “very attractive” and 5 =”not at all attractive”, how would you rate Ireland as a domicile country across the following market and distribution factors?

(100% = 200 respondents)

1 Very attractive

2 Competitive

3 Satisfactory

4 Uncompetitive

5 Not at all attractive

I have no current view

Access to a large domestic (national) market

71% 9% 1.5

49% 26% 16.5% 1.5

6.5% 49% 26% 16.5% 1.5

10% 33% 44.5% 10.5% 0.5

We will avail of the AIFMD passport for our European alternative investment funds at the earliest opportunity

62.5%

We will re-domicile our offshore alternative investment funds to Europe to avail of the AIFMD passport

18.5%

We will re-structure our alternative funds into a UCITS-compliant fund where possible

10.5%

We intend to distribute our offshore alternative investment funds via European private placement regimes for as long as this remains possible for non-EU managers

4.5%

We will cease all marketing in Europe and will re-domicile our alternative investment funds out of the EEA

3.5%

We will wait and see how investors respond first

1.5%

How do you expect your organisation will react to the application of the Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive (AIFMD)? Please select the answer that most closely fits to your organisation.

(100% = 200 respondents)

1 Very attractive

2 Competitive

3 Satisfactory

4 Uncompetitive

5 Not at all attractive

I have no current view

Status as a global distribution hub

4.5% 14% 71% 9% 1.5

71% 9% 1.5

Access to a large domestic (national) market

6.5% 49% 26% 16.5% 1.5

Speed to market

10% 33% 44.5% 10.5% 0.5

Investors’ perceptions of this jurisdiction

8% 44.5% 38% 6% 1

Reputation and longevity as a funds centre

8% 39% 41.5% 10.5% 0.5

Service culture

5% 41% 49.5% 3.5% 0.5

Pro-business government

6% 36% 50.5% 7% 0.5

Does your firm manage the assets of Europe-domiciled collective investment funds?

Yes

100%

(% respondents; 100% = 200 respondents)

No, but plan to do so within 3 years

6%
5. Glossary

**AIF/alternative investment fund**
An alternative investment fund as defined in the AIFMD

**AIFMD**
Directive 2011/61/EU on Alternative Investment Fund Managers

**UCITS**
An undertaking for collective investment in transferable securities as defined in the UCITS Directive

**UCITS Directive**
Directive 2009/65/EC on Undertakings for Collective Investment in Transferable Securities

**EEA**
The European Economic Area which comprises the member states of the EU together with Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Norway

**EU**
The European Union
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