Why Governance Quality Determines Outcomes

A Cross-Asset Institutional Framework

Chung Hei Sing

Working Paper

January 2024

Why Governance Quality Determines Outcomes

A Cross-Asset Institutional Framework

Abstract

Institutional investment outcomes are typically explained through asset allocation, strategy selection, and market conditions. Yet across public markets, private markets, and real assets, institutions pursuing similar strategies under comparable conditions routinely experience sharply divergent results. Asset-based explanations account for some of this variation. They do not account for its persistence.

This paper argues that governance quality — not asset class exposure — is the more consistent determinant of institutional investment outcomes. Governance is examined here not as compliance, disclosure, or ESG integration, but as institutional infrastructure: the system through which authority is allocated, incentives are structured, decisions are reviewed, and accountability is enforced over time. Governance quality functions as a fiduciary multiplier — amplifying the effectiveness of sound judgment and compounding the cost of poor institutional design.

Drawing on cross-asset institutional experience, the paper introduces a four-pillar governance framework: authority allocation, incentive architecture, information traceability, and accountability with adaptation. The framework is applied across asset classes including public markets, private equity, private credit, real assets, direct investing, quantitative strategies, and emerging digital structures, showing that while governance failures differ in form across contexts, they converge structurally around the same design weaknesses.

By reframing governance as primary institutional infrastructure, the paper provides a system-level lens for understanding why similar investment strategies produce divergent outcomes — and how institutions can improve durability under complexity without prescribing specific organizational forms.

Keywords: governance quality; corporate governance; institutional investing; fiduciary duty; capital allocation; investment governance; asset owners; decision-making systems; risk oversight; organizational design

How to cite this paper: Sing, C. H. (2024). Why governance quality determines outcomes: A cross-asset institutional framework. Working paper.

1. Introduction

Institutional investment outcomes are most often explained through asset class selection, strategy choice, and market timing. These dimensions dominate portfolio construction, benchmarking, and performance attribution across public markets, private markets, and real assets. Yet decades of institutional experience reveal a persistent and underexplained pattern: materially similar assets, managed under comparable market conditions, routinely produce sharply divergent outcomes.

This paper argues that governance quality — not asset class exposure — is the more consistent explanatory variable behind these divergences. Across strategies and market cycles, the design of governance systems — how authority is allocated, incentives are structured, decisions are reviewed, and accountability is enforced — shapes capital outcomes more reliably than the financial characteristics of the assets themselves.

Governance is treated here not as compliance, disclosure, or environmental and social scoring, but as the institutional infrastructure through which capital is allocated and controlled. Weak governance allows poor decisions to persist undetected or uncorrected. Strong governance does not guarantee success, but it increases the probability that institutions learn, adapt, and preserve capital under uncertainty.

The contribution of this paper is threefold. First, it reframes governance as a system-level determinant of institutional outcomes rather than a secondary control function. Second, it introduces a portable four-pillar framework — authority allocation, incentive architecture, information traceability, and accountability with adaptation — that applies across asset classes including public markets, private markets, real assets, direct investing, and emerging digital structures. Third, it situates governance quality as the mechanism through which fiduciary duty is actually carried out in complex investment organizations — a fiduciary multiplier that amplifies sound judgment and compounds structural weakness.

This paper does not propose a governance checklist, rank governance models, or advocate specific regulatory reform. It offers a unifying framework to explain why similar investment strategies produce divergent results — and why governance quality, rather than financial sophistication, functions as the most consistent differentiator across asset classes and market cycles.

2. The Governance Blind Spot in Asset-Centric Thinking

Institutional investing is built around asset classes, benchmarks, and strategy labels — categories that make portfolios understandable, reportable, and comparable. These categories serve a genuine organizational function. They also create a systematic blind spot. Because governance quality — how decisions are authorized, monitored, and corrected — is difficult to observe and harder to standardize, it is routinely underweighted in performance analysis relative to factors that are easy to measure. This section examines how asset-centric thinking creates that blind spot

and why outcome dispersion within asset classes points toward governance as the missing variable.

2.1 Asset-class-driven thinking in institutional practice

Modern institutional investing is organized around asset classes, strategy labels, and benchmarks. These categories simplify portfolio construction, facilitate reporting, and enable comparison across institutions. Over time, they have also shaped how performance is interpreted: success and failure are typically attributed to exposure choices, market cycles, or manager selection within predefined asset categories.

This asset-centric framing persists not because it is analytically complete, but because it is operationally convenient — and therefore institutionally reinforced. Asset classes are observable, benchmarkable, and auditable. Governance quality — how decisions are authorized, monitored, and corrected over time — is less visible and harder to standardize. As a result, institutional evaluation systems favor what is easiest to measure over what most directly shapes outcomes.

2.2 The dispersion puzzle

Across asset classes, outcome dispersion within categories consistently exceeds dispersion between categories. Private equity funds with similar mandates exhibit wide performance spreads; infrastructure platforms owning comparable assets deliver substantially different long-term results; hedge funds pursuing similar strategies diverge sharply over time (Kaplan & Schoar, 2005; Gompers et al., 2016). These patterns persist even after accounting for market conditions, leverage, and fee structures.

Asset-based explanations struggle to account for both the magnitude and the persistence of these divergences. Market timing and strategy selection explain some variation, but they do not explain why performance differences endure across cycles, organizations, and governance regimes — nor why institutions repeatedly experience similar failures despite rotating asset exposures.

2.3 Governance as a measurement blind spot

A central reason governance remains underweighted in performance analysis is that it sits outside traditional attribution frameworks. Attribution models decompose returns into exposures and factors, implicitly treating decision processes as neutral transmission mechanisms. When outcomes disappoint, explanations default to market conditions or strategy execution rather than institutional design.

This creates a systematic blind spot in institutional performance analysis. Governance failures are frequently misdiagnosed as investment mistakes when they are, in fact, structural failures in authority allocation, incentive design, oversight, or learning mechanisms. Institutions adjust portfolios while leaving underlying decision systems unchanged — allowing similar failures to recur under different asset labels.

Reframing governance as a primary analytical variable shifts attention from what institutions invest in to how investment decisions are authorized, reviewed, and revised over time.

3. What Governance Quality Actually Means

‘Governance quality' is used loosely in institutional settings — sometimes as a proxy for ESG ratings, sometimes as shorthand for board structure, sometimes as a description of regulatory compliance. None of these definitions captures what determines investment outcomes. This section establishes an operational definition of ‘governance quality’, distinguishes it from adjacent concepts, and explains why it must be understood as a system-level attribute rather than a set of individual practices.

3.1 An operational definition

Governance quality refers to the institutional design through which authority, incentives, information, and accountability interact to shape decision-making over time. It is not a single mechanism or policy, but a system that determines who can act, under what constraints, with what information, and subject to what review.

High-quality governance does not eliminate risk or prevent losses. It increases the likelihood that decisions are proportionate to risk, that deviations are detected early, and that institutions course-correct rather than compound mistakes (OECD, 2015).

3.2 What governance quality is not

Governance quality is not synonymous with disclosure volume, formal compliance, or structural features such as board independence. Institutions can exhibit extensive reporting, sophisticated policies, and formally well-structured boards while still suffering from weak governance. In such cases, governance exists on paper rather than in practice.

Governance quality is also analytically distinct from ESG integration, even where governance considerations overlap (Sing, 2020). ESG frameworks typically emphasize disclosure, metrics, and alignment with environmental or social objectives. Governance quality concerns the integrity of decision processes — how authority is exercised, how trade-offs are evaluated, and how accountability operates when outcomes diverge from expectations. An institution may score highly on ESG metrics while exhibiting weak governance if decision rights, incentives, or escalation mechanisms are poorly designed. Conversely, strong governance can exist even where ESG disclosure is limited.

3.3 Governance as a system-level attribute

In practice, governance failures rarely arise from a single defective component. They emerge from misalignments across the governance system: authority without accountability, incentives

disconnected from long-term outcomes, information that obscures rather than clarifies risk, or review processes that lack corrective force (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; OECD, 2015).

Evaluating governance components in isolation — committee structures, reporting frequency, or incentive plans — can therefore obscure systemic failure. Governance quality must therefore be evaluated as a whole — as the coherence of the system that governs capital decisions — not by auditing each component in isolation.

This system-level perspective allows governance quality to be compared across asset classes. While investment instruments differ, the underlying governance questions — who decides, who bears consequences, how decisions are reviewed — remain consistent across contexts.

4. A Cross-Asset Governance Framework

Institutional governance failures often appear idiosyncratic: a flawed investment committee decision, a misaligned incentive plan, an information breakdown, or a delayed response to deteriorating performance. Viewed structurally, these failures exhibit a small number of recurring patterns across institutional contexts — patterns that persist regardless of asset class, organizational form, or investment strategy.

This section introduces a four-pillar framework for evaluating governance quality across asset classes and investment modes. The framework does not prescribe organizational form or best practices. It identifies structural features that determine how capital is authorized, deployed, monitored, and corrected over time. These pillars apply across public markets, private markets, real assets, direct investing, and emerging digital structures because they reflect core governance functions — not financial instruments.

Governance quality depends not on excellence in any single pillar, but on the coherence of the system formed by their interaction.

4.1 Authority allocation: Who decides, and under what constraints

Authority allocation defines where decision rights reside within an institution and how discretion is exercised. It governs who can initiate, approve, modify, escalate, or unwind investment decisions, and under what conditions those rights may be exercised.

Governance failures frequently originate in ambiguous or misaligned authority structures. Decision rights may be diffused across committees without clear responsibility, concentrated without proportional oversight, or formally assigned but informally overridden (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). In such environments, accountability weakens not because actors are negligent, but because authority is insufficiently specified.

Across asset classes, authority allocation failures recur in recognizable forms. In public markets, delegation chains can obscure responsibility as decision authority passes from boards to investment committees to external managers. In private markets, broad discretionary mandates

may grant managers effective control without clearly defined escalation thresholds. In direct investing, authority shifts inward, often faster than institutions can adjust internal oversight structures to match their expanded discretion (Sing, 2022).

Effective authority allocation does not require centralization. It requires clarity: explicit decision rights, defined boundaries, and credible escalation mechanisms. Institutions with strong governance ensure that authority expands and contracts in proportion to risk, complexity, and irreversibility.

4.2 Incentive architecture: How behavior is shaped over time

Incentive architecture governs how rewards, penalties, and career consequences shape behavior across time horizons and market conditions. While mandates articulate objectives, incentives determine how those objectives are pursued in practice (Holmstrom, 1979).

Misaligned incentives produce some of the most persistent governance failures. Short-term performance rewards can encourage excessive risk-taking in long-duration strategies. Asymmetric upside can promote growth at the expense of long-term resilience. Career incentives may discourage early recognition of problems, delaying corrective action until losses become unavoidable.

Incentive architecture extends well beyond compensation structures. It includes performance benchmarks, promotion criteria, reputational dynamics, and internal political considerations. In direct investing environments, incentives may shift toward internal profile-building or career preservation, altering risk behavior even when formal compensation remains unchanged.

High-quality governance aligns incentives with the full lifecycle of decisions, including downside scenarios and long-term consequences. It does not eliminate risk-taking, but it structures incentives so that the people making decisions bear the consequences of those decisions — preventing risks from being quietly transferred to future periods, other stakeholders, or other parts of the institution.

4.3 Information traceability: Enabling oversight without micromanagement

Governance depends on information not merely being available, but being traceable to decisions. Information traceability refers to the institution's ability to reconstruct why decisions were made, what assumptions were relied upon, and how risk was understood at the time.

Many governance failures occur not in information-poor settings, but in information-rich environments where institutions generate extensive reports while lacking clarity on which signals matter for oversight (BCBS, 2015). Without traceability, reviewers cannot distinguish between adverse outcomes caused by bad luck and those caused by flawed judgment or process.

Traceability enables effective oversight without requiring constant intervention. It allows boards, investment committees, and fiduciaries to evaluate decision quality ex post, assess whether risks

were taken knowingly, and determine whether deviations reflect acceptable uncertainty or governance breakdown.

Across asset classes, traceability supports proportional oversight. In algorithmic strategies, it enables model governance without interfering in execution. In private markets, it allows oversight of how discretion is exercised without operational micromanagement. In long-duration assets, it preserves institutional memory across investment horizons that often exceed individual tenures.

4.4 Accountability and adaptation: Learning as a governance function

Accountability mechanisms determine whether governance systems can correct course. They define how decisions are reviewed, how responsibility is assigned, and whether institutions adapt in response to new information or persistent underperformance (OECD, 2015).

Weak accountability systems emphasize justification over learning. Losses are explained rather than examined; processes are defended rather than updated. Over time, this converts governance into a retrospective exercise that legitimizes past decisions rather than improves future ones.

High-quality governance incorporates structured review processes with real consequences. These processes distinguish between acceptable risk-taking and errors that could reasonably have been avoided, and they enable institutions to update mandates, authority structures, and incentives in response to experience.

Adaptation is particularly critical in complex and evolving environments. Asset classes change, strategies evolve, and external conditions shift. Governance systems that cannot adapt risk becoming fragile under stress, even if they were once well designed (Reason, 1990).

4.5 Governance quality as system-level coherence

The four pillars do not operate independently. Strong authority allocation can be undermined by poor incentives; robust information systems can fail without accountability; adaptive processes can be neutralized by unclear decision rights. Governance quality ultimately emerges from system coherence, not pillar-by-pillar optimization.

This coherence explains why governance failures recur across asset classes despite differing financial structures, and why superficially similar governance reforms produce divergent results across institutions. Without alignment across all four pillars, governance improvements remain partial and fragile.

The framework provides a common language for evaluating governance quality across investment contexts. It shifts analysis from asset-specific features to institutional design, allowing governance to be assessed as a primary determinant of outcomes rather than a secondary control.

5. Governance Failure Modes Across Asset Classes

Governance failures manifest differently across asset classes, reflecting variation in liquidity, control rights, time horizons, and the nature of interactions with regulators, counterparties, and stakeholders. Beneath these surface differences, however, failures converge around the same structural weaknesses identified by the four-pillar framework: misallocated authority, misaligned incentives, weak decision traceability, and ineffective accountability.

This section applies the framework not to catalogue asset-specific risks, but to illustrate how governance quality — or its absence — shapes institutional outcomes across investment contexts. The goal is pattern recognition, not asset-class catalogue.

5.1 Public markets: Delegation and responsibility diffusion

In public equity and fixed income markets, governance is primarily indirect. Asset owners exercise oversight through delegation to internal teams or external managers, retaining limited direct control over underlying investment decisions beyond mandate design, voting, and engagement.

A recurring failure mode in public markets is responsibility diffusion. In practice, decision-making authority is distributed across boards, investment committees, and external managers, while benchmark targets implicitly constrain the range of decisions that feel permissible — complicating accountability when outcomes disappoint. Benchmark-relative evaluation can weaken governance further by substituting relative success for absolute assessment of downside risk, capital preservation, and institutional risk tolerance (ICGN, 2021).

Governance failures in this environment rarely appear as obvious misconduct. They emerge as delayed responses to structural change, persistent exposure to crowded trades, and systematic underreaction to tail risk. Governance quality depends less on control rights than on how delegation structures, incentive design, and review mechanisms preserve judgment rather than outsource it.

5.2 Private markets: Discretion without proportional oversight

Private equity and venture capital operate in governance environments characterized by high discretion and direct influence. Investors often hold board seats, shape strategic direction, and influence capital structure. In theory, such control should enable superior governance. In practice, it frequently exposes its absence (Gompers et al., 2016).

The dominant failure mode in private markets is excess discretion without proportional oversight. Broad mandates, flexible investment theses, and performance-based compensation concentrate authority while weakening accountability. Oversight mechanisms — investment committees, LP advisory boards, and reporting structures — may exist formally but often lack the authority or information required to challenge decisions effectively.

Venture capital introduces additional complexity. Board influence varies widely with ownership concentration, syndicate dynamics, and stage. Governance failures often arise not from absence of control but from unclear boundaries between guidance, influence, and accountability — a distinction that becomes consequential under stress.

These dynamics reinforce a central insight of the framework: control rights alone do not ensure governance quality. Without aligned incentives, decision traceability, and adaptive accountability, discretion amplifies rather than mitigates institutional risk.

5.3 Real assets and infrastructure: Irreversibility and external interface risk

Real assets and infrastructure combine long-duration capital commitments with operational, regulatory, and political interactions. Governance failures in this domain are often slow-moving but highly consequential — precisely because the window for correction narrows once capital is deployed (World Bank Group, 2017).

A key failure mode arises from the practical irreversibility of capital commitment. Once deployed into physical assets, strategic flexibility narrows. Weak authority allocation or delayed escalation allows value erosion to persist long before corrective action becomes feasible.

Interface risk compounds this problem. Infrastructure assets interact with regulators, communities, counterparties, and governments across long time horizons. Governance systems that do not clearly allocate responsibility for managing these external relationships struggle to respond when conditions shift — which, over infrastructure investment horizons, they invariably do.

High-quality governance in real assets requires not only robust initial decision-making, but sustained oversight mechanisms capable of adapting mandates, reallocating authority, and revisiting assumptions across investment horizons that often exceed individual institutional tenures.

5.4 Direct investing: Governance as a stress test

Direct investing — whether in public securities, private companies, or co-investments — functions as a revealing governance stress test. By removing the intermediary manager, institutions internalize authority, accountability, and operational complexity simultaneously.

While direct investing promises fee savings and greater control, it exposes governance weaknesses that delegation previously obscured. Investment committees and internal teams must now perform functions once handled externally: sourcing, diligence, monitoring, reporting, and escalation. The governance requirements multiply; the external buffer disappears.

Common failure modes include authority concentration without proportional oversight, incentive distortion driven by internal politics or career risk, and information overload that undermines decision clarity. When investments underperform, accountability becomes internally diffused rather than contractually defined — and often more difficult to enforce.

Direct investing makes governance quality especially visible because it removes the intermediary buffer — there is no external manager to attribute decisions to. Where fund investing can obscure governance quality behind a manager relationship, direct investing forces the institution to confront its own governance capacity directly. Where governance systems are robust, direct investing can enhance outcomes. Where they are weak, it magnifies failure.

5.5 Credit, structured finance, and securitization: Contractual governance limits

Private credit, structured credit, and securitization rely heavily on contractual mechanisms — covenants, tranching, servicing arrangements — to govern risk. These structures can create the appearance of strong governance while masking underlying weaknesses in authority, incentives, and active oversight.

The recurring failure mode is overreliance on contractual form. Covenants may be poorly calibrated to underlying risk; enforcement rights may be politically or operationally constrained; servicer incentives may diverge from investor outcomes, prioritizing volume over long-term performance. When these misalignments accumulate, contractual protections that looked robust when the loan was structured prove fragile under stress.

In stressed environments, governance quality depends less on the presence of contractual protections than on the institution's capacity to interpret deteriorating signals, exercise discretion, and adapt structures in real time. When conditions shift — a macroeconomic downturn, a borrower-specific crisis, a market dislocation — contractual provisions alone cannot substitute for active institutional judgment and the willingness to intervene.

5.6 Sovereign, emerging markets, and foreign exchange: Mandate and political risk governance

In sovereign debt, emerging markets, and foreign exchange, governance operates primarily through mandate constraints and risk limits rather than control rights. Institutions cannot influence issuers directly and must instead govern exposure, concentration, and escalation thresholds (IMF, 2016).

Governance failures in this domain often arise from implicit or unstated political assumptions that investment mandates quietly incorporate — for instance, a sovereign's policy framework will remain stable, capital controls are unlikely, or that enforcement of creditor rights will be consistent. Risk models may underweight regime change, capital controls, or abrupt policy shifts, while escalation mechanisms lag rapidly changing conditions.

Effective governance requires political and institutional risk to be treated explicitly as governance variables — not dismissed as unpredictable external events. Institutions that fail to integrate these risks into authority allocation and review processes are repeatedly surprised by events that were foreseeable in structure, if not in precise timing.

5.7 Commodities, derivatives, and quantitative strategies: Governing systems, not assets

In commodities, derivatives, and quantitative strategies, governance centers not on asset selection but on model governance, strict adherence to risk limits, and exception handling. The investment system itself is the governance subject.

Failure modes in these strategies frequently involve model drift, inadequate assumption monitoring, and unclear override authority when model signals break down. Information abundance can obscure rather than clarify risk when governance systems cannot distinguish persistent signal from temporary noise (BCBS, 2021).

High-quality governance in these strategies requires clear authority to intervene, well-defined escalation thresholds, and explicit accountability for how models perform across different market conditions — not merely technical validation through historical backtesting conducted under favorable conditions.

5.8 Multi-manager and fund-of-funds structures: Governance by selection and termination

Multi-manager and fund-of-funds structures shift governance from investment execution toward selection, monitoring, and termination. While diversification mitigates idiosyncratic risk, it can simultaneously dilute accountability — spreading capital in ways that complicate the exercise of corrective authority.

The common failure mode is governance dilution. As capital spreads across managers, institutions may substitute portfolio complexity for governance rigor, accumulating optionality and deferring difficult decisions to exit underperforming relationships. The governance question — who decides when a manager relationship ends, under what conditions, and with what authority — often receives less design attention than the question of which managers to select.

Governance quality in multi-manager contexts depends on disciplined monitoring frameworks, credible termination authority, and incentives that reward decisive oversight rather than perpetual relationship maintenance.

5.9 Digital assets and tokenized structures: Governance in emerging assets

Digital assets and tokenized financial instruments represent an emerging domain in which governance challenges are particularly acute — precisely because the infrastructure is new and governance conventions have not yet been established. The absence of settled legal frameworks, custodial standards, and enforcement precedents means that governance quality, rather than technology capability, is the primary determinant of whether tokenized structures can attract and retain institutional capital.

The dominant failure mode in digital asset markets mirrors patterns seen elsewhere: automation is used as a substitute for governance rather than as a tool within it. Smart contracts encode rules but cannot exercise judgment, escalate when conditions change, or assign fiduciary accountability for outcomes. Structures that rely on code to perform governance functions fail

precisely when those functions are most needed — during stress events, regulatory interventions, or disputes over rights and authority.

Institutional adoption of tokenized assets has followed the same governance-compatibility logic observed across other asset classes. Fund-based structures — which preserve existing legal frameworks, fiduciary relationships, and regulatory oversight — have attracted early institutional participation. Project-level tokenization, which requires bespoke governance arrangements and lacks established accountability frameworks, has remained largely experimental. This sequencing is not a temporary feature of market immaturity; it reflects the structural conditions under which institutional capital operates across every asset class in this framework.

5.10 Structural convergence across asset classes

Despite surface differences, governance failures across asset classes converge structurally. Authority becomes misaligned with responsibility; incentives distort behavior across time horizons; information loses decision relevance; and accountability weakens precisely when correction is most needed.

This convergence explains why institutions experience recurring governance failures even as they rotate across asset classes and strategies. The assets change; the underlying governance deficiencies persist. Without addressing governance quality at the system level, asset-level adjustments offer limited protection against institutional underperformance — and often introduce new forms of the same structural failure under a different label.

6. Governance Quality as a Fiduciary Multiplier

Fiduciary duty is often discussed in terms of intent, competence, or professional ethics. In practice, it is exercised through institutional design. Governance systems determine whether fiduciary responsibility can be meaningfully fulfilled or reduced to procedural compliance.

This section advances the paper's most consequential claim: governance quality functions as a fiduciary multiplier. Well-designed governance amplifies the effectiveness of fiduciary judgment; poorly designed governance neutralizes it. As investment organizations expand in size, complexity, and delegation depth, fiduciary outcomes increasingly depend on governance architecture rather than on the competence of individual decision-makers (Drew & Walk, 2019).

6.1 Delegation as a fiduciary act

Delegation is an exercise of fiduciary responsibility, not a transfer of it. When boards, investment committees, or asset owners delegate authority — to internal teams, external managers, or automated systems — they make judgments about competence, incentives, scope of discretion, and the feasibility of retained oversight.

Poorly designed delegation arrangements weaken fiduciary control even when decision-makers are skilled and well intentioned. Broad discretion without proportional oversight converts

fiduciary duty into formality. Excessive constraint, by contrast, can suppress judgment and delay response under changing conditions. High-quality governance treats delegation as an active design choice: defining boundaries of authority, specifying escalation thresholds, and preserving the capacity to intervene when assumptions no longer hold (OECD, 2015).

6.2 Proportional governance and fiduciary scaling

Fiduciary governance must scale with the characteristics of the decisions being made. Governance intensity should increase with discretion, complexity, and irreversibility. Applying uniform governance across heterogeneous investment activities creates blind spots at the high-discretion end and inefficiency at the low-discretion end.

In low-discretion environments — passive public market exposures, for instance — fiduciary oversight may appropriately focus on mandate clarity and whether defined risk thresholds are being monitored. In high-discretion environments — private equity, infrastructure, and direct investing — fiduciary responsibility requires deeper engagement with authority allocation, incentive design, and ongoing substantive review.

A proportional approach helps avoid two distinct governance errors. Under-governance occurs when institutions rely on trust or reputation in environments that demand structured oversight. Over-governance occurs when rigid controls suppress legitimate risk-taking and impede institutional adaptation. Fiduciary effectiveness lies in calibrating governance intensity to decision context — not in maximizing governance volume.

6.3 Structural versus personal fiduciary failure

Institutional failures are frequently attributed to individual error: poor judgment, insufficient expertise, or misaligned personal incentives. While these factors matter, they often mask the more persistent cause of fiduciary breakdown: structural misalignment.

Structural fiduciary failure arises not from individual misconduct but from governance systems that shape behavior in predictable and undesirable ways. Even highly competent professionals will systematically underperform when governance systems diffuse accountability, make it impossible to reconstruct why decisions were made, or reward short-term outcomes at the expense of long-term stewardship. Over time, structural incentives dominate individual intent (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Holmstrom, 1979).

Recognizing this distinction shifts fiduciary evaluation away from individual blame and toward institutional design. It also changes the nature of remediation: replacing individuals without addressing the governance structures that shaped their behavior produces the same outcomes under new names (Sing, 2023).

6.4 Fiduciary accountability and decision review

Fiduciary accountability requires more than measuring realized outcomes. It requires the ability to assess whether decisions were made with appropriate care, within defined authority, and in alignment with institutional objectives — at the time those decisions were made, not in light of what subsequently occurred.

Governance systems that lack decision traceability and structured review cannot support meaningful fiduciary accountability. High-quality governance embeds accountability into decision processes, enabling ex post review that distinguishes acceptable risk-taking from preventable error, supports institutional learning without politicization, and preserves stakeholder trust even when outcomes disappoint (NACD, 2023).

6.5 Governance quality as primary institutional infrastructure

Viewed through a fiduciary lens, governance quality is not a secondary monitoring function layered on top of investment activity. It is a primary form of institutional infrastructure — one that coordinates authority, incentives, information, and accountability across the investment system over time.

Other forms of institutional infrastructure — legal structures, capital architecture, risk systems, and human capital — derive much of their effectiveness from governance design. Legal structures without governance enforcement become formalities. Risk systems without accountability become data repositories. Human capital without governance alignment becomes misallocated talent.

Institutions that neglect governance quality risk substituting procedural compliance for meaningful fiduciary control. Those that invest in coherent governance systems increase their capacity to preserve capital, manage risk, and adapt under uncertainty — not as a matter of good practice, but as a structural advantage that compounds across market cycles.

7. Implications for Institutional Design

Reframing governance quality as a determinant of outcomes has direct implications for how institutions design oversight, set priorities for monitoring and intervention, and evaluate performance. These implications are not asset-specific. They apply wherever capital is deployed through complex decision systems subject to uncertainty, delegation, and time.

Rather than prescribing organizational form, the four-pillar framework clarifies where institutional attention matters most: in the design and coherent interaction of authority, incentives, information, and accountability.

7.1 Implications for asset owners

For asset owners, governance quality should be treated as core capital infrastructure — not a compliance layer added after investment decisions are made. Traditional diligence emphasizes asset selection, manager credentials, and historical performance. A governance-oriented approach reallocates attention toward the systems that shape decision-making throughout the full investment lifecycle.

This shift implies greater emphasis on how authority is allocated across internal teams and external managers; whether incentives align with long-term objectives and downside risk; how information supports oversight rather than overwhelming it; and whether accountability mechanisms enable learning and timely correction.

This does not require asset owners to micromanage investment decisions. It requires ensuring that governance systems preserve judgment, escalation capacity, and fiduciary control across delegation chains — including at the points where those chains are longest and least visible.

7.2 Implications for boards and investment committees

Boards and investment committees occupy a critical governance position. Their responsibility extends beyond approving strategies to designing the institutional environment that shapes how decisions are made and reviewed (Sing, 2021).

A governance-quality perspective encourages boards and committees to move beyond outcome-only evaluation. Short-term performance provides limited signal about whether governance systems are functioning as intended. More informative oversight focuses on decision coherence: whether authority, incentives, information, and accountability remain aligned with institutional objectives over time and under changing conditions (ICGN, 2020).

This perspective also clarifies the governance role during stress. Effective boards do not require constant intervention. They require the capacity to intervene decisively when assumptions break down — and the discipline to preserve institutional discretion when they do not.

7.3 Implications for regulators and standard setters

Regulatory frameworks increasingly emphasize disclosure, reporting, and formal procedural controls. While these tools support transparency, they do not by themselves ensure governance quality (OECD, 2015).

A system-level governance perspective — focused on how authority, incentives, information, and accountability interact — highlights the limits of disclosure-centric oversight. Structural governance failures can persist in highly transparent environments when the underlying design of decision systems is misaligned. Conversely, institutions with strong internal governance may manage risk effectively in regulatory environments that rely less on detailed procedural mandates.

Oversight frameworks that recognize variation in discretion, complexity, and irreversibility are more likely to support durable fiduciary outcomes than one-size-fits-all procedural requirements applied without regard to institutional context.

7.4 Governance quality and institutional learning

Across institutional contexts, governance quality determines whether organizations learn from experience or repeat failure. Learning requires more than post hoc explanation. It requires governance systems that surface uncomfortable information, assign responsibility without politicization, and translate insight into structural change (Reason, 1990).

Institutions that treat governance as a static compliance checklist keep layering on processes and reports — accumulating administrative complexity — without gaining any real improvement in their capacity to make better decisions or catch problems earlier. Those that embed learning into governance design are better positioned to adapt as asset classes evolve, strategies change, and external conditions shift. Over investment horizons measured in decades, this adaptive capacity is not a secondary benefit of good governance. It is among its most important and durable advantages.

8. Conclusion: Governance as the Common Institutional Constant

Institutional investors operate across an environment of expanding complexity. Asset classes proliferate, strategies evolve, and financial innovation continues to reshape how capital is deployed. Yet across these changes, a familiar pattern persists: institutions with similar mandates, resources, and exposures achieve markedly different outcomes.

This paper has argued that governance quality is the most consistent explanatory variable behind these divergences. While asset classes differ in liquidity, control rights, and risk profiles, the governance systems that authorize decisions, shape incentives, enable oversight, and support adaptation perform the same fundamental functions across investment contexts. The financial instruments change; the governance questions do not.

The four-pillar framework — authority allocation, incentive architecture, information traceability, and accountability with adaptation — provides a portable lens for evaluating governance quality across public markets, private markets, real assets, direct investing, and emerging digital structures. Its value lies in the coherence of the system it describes, not in any single pillar considered in isolation.

The fiduciary implications are consequential. Fiduciary duty is not fulfilled through intent or expertise alone. It is operationalized through governance design. Structural governance failures — misallocated authority, distorted incentives, weak traceability, and compromised accountability — predictably undermine fiduciary outcomes regardless of the quality of the individuals involved. Addressing them requires institutional investment in governance design, not merely improvements in personnel or process (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; OECD, 2015).

As capital systems continue to scale and diversify, governance quality — not financial sophistication — will increasingly determine institutional durability. Strengthening governance is not a constraint on investment activity. It is the condition that allows institutions to exercise judgment responsibly at scale, and to sustain that capacity across the market cycles, personnel transitions, and structural shifts that define institutional life.

References

BCBS. (2015). *Corporate governance principles for banks.* Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. Bank for International Settlements. https://www.bis.org/bcbs/publ/d328.htm

BCBS. (2021). *Principles for operational resilience.* Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. Bank for International Settlements. https://www.bis.org/bcbs/publ/d516.htm

Drew, M. E., & Walk, A. N. (2019). *Investment management governance for fiduciaries.* CFA Institute. https://rpc.cfainstitute.org/research/foundation/2019/investment-governance-for-fiduciaries

Gompers, P., Kaplan, S. N., & Mukharlyamov, V. (2016). What do private equity firms say they do? *Journal of Financial Economics, 121*(3), 449–476.

Holmstrom, B. (1979). Moral hazard and observability. *Bell Journal of Economics, 10*(1), 74–91.

ICGN. (2020). *Global stewardship principles.* International Corporate Governance Network. https://www.icgn.org/sites/default/files/2021-06/ICGN%20Global%20Stewardship%20Principles%202020_1.pdf

ICGN. (2021). *Global governance principles.* International Corporate Governance Network. https://www.icgn.org/sites/default/files/2021-11/ICGN%20Global%20Governance%20Principles%202021.pdf

IMF. (2016). *Global financial stability report: Potent policies for a successful normalization.* International Monetary Fund. https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/gfsr/2016/01/pdf/text.pdf

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics, 3*(4), 305–360. https://www.sfu.ca/~wainwrig/Econ400/jensen-meckling.pdf

Kaplan, S. N., & Schoar, A. (2005). Private equity performance: Returns, persistence, and capital flows. *Journal of Finance, 60*(4), 1791–1823. https://web.mit.edu/aschoar/www/KaplanSchoar2005.pdf

NACD. (2023). *Audit committee blueprint.* National Association of Corporate Directors. https://www.nacdonline.org/contentassets/aadd60c2311147dda1ef6d97be83c4af/nacd_fab_blueprint-report-audit_0423.pdf

OECD. (2015). *G20/OECD principles of corporate governance.* OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/g20-oecd-principles-of-corporate-governance-2015_9789264236882-en.html

Reason, J. (1990). *Human error.* Cambridge University Press.

Sing, C. H. (2020). When CSR/ESG pays — and when it doesn't: Risk mitigation, materiality, and the governance conditions for financial performance. Working paper.

Sing, C. H. (2021). Board governance as institutional design: What boards do well, where they fail, and how oversight actually works. Working paper.

Sing, C. H. (2022). Capital allocation is a board responsibility: Why strategy fails without governance. Working paper.

Sing, C. H. (2023). Fiduciary duty in complex organizations: A process-based framework for governance evaluation and oversight. Working paper.

World Bank Group. (2017). *Public-private partnerships reference guide* (Version 3). World Bank Group. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/entities/publication/e64a94b9-b0cb-51a3-b8dd-36bd7944284f

Selected References and Additional Reading

Aldasoro, I., Gambacorta, L., Gorjon, S., & Schiaffi, S. (2023). The tokenisation continuum. *BIS Bulletin*. https://www.bis.org/publ/bisbull72.pdf

Carapella, F., Chuan, G., Gerszten, J., Hunter, C., Swem, N. (2023). Tokenization: Overview and financial stability implications. *Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2023-060. Washington: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.* https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/feds/tokenization-overview-and-financial-stability-implications.htm

G20/OECD Task Force on Institutional Investors and Long-Term Financing. (2014). *Effective approaches to support implementation of the G20/OECD high-level principles on long-term investment financing by institutional investors.* OECD Publishing. https://cdn.gihub.org/umbraco/media/2604/report-effective-approaches-to-long-term-investment-finacing-g20_oecd.pdf

Langbein, J. H. (1996). The uniform prudent investor act and the future of trust investing. *Iowa Law Review, 81*(3), 641–669.

Merton, R. C., & Bodie, Z. (2005). Design of financial systems: Towards a synthesis of function and structure. *Journal of Investment Management, 3*(1), 1–23. https://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/research/math/seminars/200506/Merton040606.pdf

OECD. (2013). *G20/OECD high-level principles of long-term investment financing by institutional investors.* OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/daf/fin/private-pensions/G20-OECD-Principles-LTI-Financing.pdf

Uniform Law Commission. (1994). *Uniform prudent investor act.* National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. https://www.muni.org/Departments/finance/treasury/trustfund/Documents/Uniform%20Prudent%20Investor%20Act%20%28UPIA%29%20of%201994.pdf

Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The economic institutions of capitalism.* Free Press.