



MINERVA FUND MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS LIMITED

MF ECLIPSE FUND

ASSESSMENT OF VALUE REPORT 2023

Assessment as at 31 July 2023

Publication date 30 November 2023

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Company Details.....	3
Executive Summary	3
Letter from the Board.....	4
About Minerva.....	5
About this Report	5
FCA Assessment of Value Criteria	6
Explanation of Assessment Ratings	7
Summary of Assessment Results	8
Future Developments.....	8
1 Quality of Service.....	9
2 Performance.....	11
3 Authorised Fund Manager Costs.....	13
4 Economies of Scale	15
5 Comparable Market Rates.....	16
6 Comparable Services.....	16
7 Classes of Shares.....	17
8 Glossary.....	18

Company Details

Company	MF Eclipse Fund
Funds included within this Report	MF Eclipse Active Adventurous Fund; MF Eclipse Passive Adventurous Fund MF Eclipse Active Defensive Fund MF Eclipse Passive Defensive Fund
Authorised Corporate Director	Minerva Fund Management Solutions Limited (“Minerva”)
Investment Manager	Sentinel Portfolio Management Limited (“Sentinel”)

Executive Summary

As part of a move to strengthen fund governance, the UK financial services regulator, the Financial Conduct Authority (“FCA”) requires authorised fund and asset managers to conduct an annual review of their UK domiciled funds to assess whether they provide value to their customers. This assessment is required to be conducted against the seven criteria set out within this report.

In July 2023, the FCA introduced the Consumer Duty which focuses on customer outcomes and is designed to drive up standards of care across the financial services sector. One key outcome of the Consumer Duty relates to price and value which in summary require firms to ensure that their products and services provide fair value to retail customers. Minerva welcomes the Consumer Duty initiative and the positive benefits this will bring to ensure that retail customers get a fair deal from the financial products and services they buy.

In this report we display the results of our assessment covering each of the seven criteria as set out by the FCA, taking into account relevant industry guidance as well as related publications issued by the FCA.

In summary, while we believe that our funds overall provide good value to our customers and that we have offered a good service, our assessment has concluded the need to take further action in respect of the funds in the following areas:

- For the passive funds, fund costs; and
- For all funds comparable market rates, and economies of scale.

Given the relatively short period of time since the funds were launched, the outcome of our assessment is broadly in line with our expectations. Over the past year we have subsidised the costs of all of the funds through the use of our own capital given they have lower assets under management than was initially expected. This lower fund size has, in turn, meant that the funds have not yet been able to benefit from economies of scale as initially envisaged. Some additional steps will be taken to further reduce the impact of costs are being pursued, being:

Minerva Fund Management Solutions Limited - MF Eclipse Fund – Assessment of Value Report 2023

- Seeking to secure additional assets into the passive funds, or alternatively, to merge the funds and/or close them if the additional assets are not received;
- As a consequence, seeking to disperse the fixed cost elements of the fund over a larger fund size;
- Continuing to monitor the funds as they increase in maturity.

We hope that customers will find this report useful and are pleased to present this, our first Assessment of Value Report for the MF Eclipse Funds.

Letter from the Board

The Board believes the annual Assessment of Value is an important report and is closely involved in its production. From a governance perspective, the FCA requires a minimum of two independent non-executive directors (“iNEDs”) to sit on a fund board in order to improve governance through the provision of robust oversight, review and challenge. Minerva has three iNEDs, one of which is the Chair, all of which actively and collectively oversee Minerva’s activities, as well as the production of this Assessment of Value report. We believe that the iNEDs play an important role in our governance arrangements as well the processes of assessing the value of our funds. They represent our customers’ best interests through providing robust oversight, challenge and scrutiny of the methodology, assessments and conclusions of this Assessment of Value report.

At Minerva, our customers come first and value for money to us does not just mean costs. We view value as a measure of factors including (but not limited to): investment performance consistent with customer expectations; transparency in fees charged; and having a robust governance structure. We, the Board, are committed to having processes that oversee our appointed investment manager’s and third-party providers’ efforts to create and maintain value for our customers’ funds.

This report is written on behalf of the board of Minerva Fund Management Solutions Limited which is referred to as “Minerva”, “us” or “we” throughout this report. This report aims to provide customers with an informed view of whether their investment in our funds provides value to them, – or not. The assessment is based on the framework provided by our regulator, the FCA, along with guidance provided by the Investment Association (“IA”) (the trade body that represents UK investment managers and investment management firms), and the findings of the FCA’s review of Value Assessments (FCA Findings) published in July 2021.

We are conscious of our obligation to our customers, and we always do our best to ensure that the funds deliver good outcomes for them, and are managed in our customers’ best interests. Our aim is to create a report that customers will understand and engage with, that will be of interest to them and, most importantly, that will provide our customers with a clear summary of their investments in our fund(s), clearly indicating further action is required and the steps we are taking or propose to take. This in turn should help our customers evaluate whether or not we are providing them with value, in order that they can make more informed decisions when choosing investment providers. Where further actions have been identified, we will be clear about the actions to be taken to remedy the shortfall.

In this report we have done our best to view the funds through the eyes of our customers, and the Minerva Board is always interested to receive feedback or questions our customers may have on this report.

About Minerva

Minerva is an FCA Authorised Fund Manager (“AFM”) that acts as the Authorised Corporate Director (“ACD”) to the funds. As AFM/ACD, Minerva is responsible for the day-to-day management of the funds, ensuring that they are managed in line with their objectives, strategies and policies. Our funds are currently primarily designed to be used in customer portfolios, via centralised investment propositions offered through our partnerships with financial advisers.

Unlike many other ACDs Minerva is independent and is not part of the same group as any of the third-party providers appointed to its funds. We believe our independence enables us to act in the best interests of our customers at all times and to identify without bias what, if any, remedial actions may be required to ensure our customers received value for money from the assets that they place in our care.

Putting our customers’ needs first is embedded into Minerva’s culture, its existing oversight, governance and service. We review our funds throughout the year to ensure they are suitable for our customers. We welcome the introduction of the Consumer Duty rules by the FCA as we believe this will help to drive customer interests and needs further within the financial services sector and put customers where they should be – at the heart of every business.

We also welcome the opportunity to present our customers with our Assessment of Value Report.

About this Report

As part of a move to strengthen fund governance, the UK financial services regulator, the Financial Conduct Authority (“FCA”) requires asset managers to conduct an annual review of UK domiciled funds to assess whether they provide value for customers. For the purposes of this report, the term “customer” includes Minerva’s clients and the funds investors.

In July 2023, the FCA introduced the Consumer Duty which aims to ensure customers are placed at the heart of every business in the financial services sector. Of particular relevance to this report are the Consumer Duty Outcomes relating to price and value which require firms to ensure that their products and services provide fair value to retail customers in the Target Market for those products; and carry out a value assessment of their products and review that assessment on a regular basis appropriate to the nature and duration of the product.

In this report, we have set out the results of our assessment for the MF Eclipse Fund range against each of the FCA’s seven criteria as outlined below using a simple traffic light system as explained further within this report.

This report is designed to help you, our customer, to understand whether the funds managed by Minerva are providing value by meeting their objectives and service obligations, and whether we are doing this at an appropriate price. It outlines each fund’s assessment and concludes on whether we believe that the funds have demonstrated good value. Where relevant, we also outline the measures that we, as the AFM/ACD are putting in place, in the event that the value provided by the funds does not meet our own high standards.

For ease of reference, we have included a Glossary at the end of this document for words or terms that may need more explanation in order to support customer engagement with and understanding of the contents of this report.

FCA Assessment of Value Criteria

The seven assessment of value criteria with a summary description of each are set out below:

Criteria	Criteria Description
Quality of Service	<p>Under the assessment of quality of service criteria, we consider whether we are meeting our customers' reasonable expectations on the service we deliver.</p> <p>In order to assess this, we consider the range and quality of the services we provide to our customers. This includes the quality of every aspect of the service provided, including, for example, accounting, administration, customer services and communications.</p>
Performance	<p>Under the performance criteria, we monitor whether our funds have performed in line with a customers' reasonable expectations.</p> <p>In order to do this, we assess the performance of the fund, after the deduction of fees from the scheme property against the fund's stated objectives, and benchmarks in the investment policy and strategy, over the Recommended Holding Period. Where the fund has not been in existence for the Recommended Holding Period, we believe it is too early to assess the performance of the fund(s).</p>
AFM Costs	<p>Under the AFM costs criteria, we consider whether the fees charged to the fund were reasonable and appropriate, taking into account the service to which the charge relates, and whether money is paid directly to associates or external parties.</p>
Comparable Market Rates	<p>For the comparable market rates criteria, we consider how our fees compare to those of our competitors and whether the total charges to customers is reasonable taking into account the average market rate charged by our peers for similar funds. This assessment also includes the costs of any aspect of the management of the fund which has been delegated.</p>
Economies of scale	<p>For the economies of scale criteria, we consider whether we are able to achieve savings and benefits from economies of scale, relating to the direct and indirect costs of managing the fund.</p> <p>This assessment also considers whether the fund has grown or contracted in size over the reporting period. For new funds, we also take into account that the benefits of economies of scale may be limited where they have not reached a size at which economies of scale can be achieved.</p>
Comparable Service	<p>Unlike the comparable market rates criteria which looks to the wider market for comparison, the comparable services criteria is an internal assessment based on services Minerva provides to other funds that it manages.</p>
Classes of units/shares	<p>Under the classes of units/shares criteria we consider whether our customers are invested in the most appropriate share class for their investment needs.</p> <p>This assessment takes into account whether it is appropriate for customers to hold shares in classes subject to higher charges than those applying to other classes of the same scheme with substantially similar rights.</p>

Minerva Fund Management Solutions Limited - MF Eclipse Fund – Assessment of Value Report 2023

Scope of the Report

This report has been prepared for the MF Eclipse Fund range, which is comprised of the following funds:

- MF Eclipse Active Adventurous Fund;
- MF Eclipse Passive Adventurous Fund;
- MF Eclipse Active Defensive Fund;
- MF Eclipse Passive Defensive Fund.

Audience

This Assessment of Value report is aimed at individuals who invest in the funds, or their financial advisers (collectively referred to as “customers” throughout this report).

Explanation of Assessment Ratings

The results of our assessments are presented below using a Red, Amber or Green rating. In addition to the Red, Amber and Green ratings, there is also a Grey rating for newly launched funds where there has been an insufficient period since launch for the fund to be assessed against the relevant criteria, for example, where the fund’s Recommended Holding Period is five years, but there is only one year’s performance data available since the fund was launched.

The assessment ratings are categorised as follows:

RAG	RAG Description
Green	Offers value
Amber	Has provided value in some but not all areas. Additional monitoring and/or actions may be required to address specific areas identified by the assessment.
Red	Has not provided value. Appropriate further action is required.
Grey	Not rated – too early to assess – newly launched fund.

Summary of Assessment Results

The table below summarises the outcome of the review of each of the funds using the seven assessment criteria as described by the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA).

A simple traffic light system has been adopted to show the results per fund. The results of the assessment are covered in greater detail within the report.

Funds	Quality of services	Performance	Authorised Fund Manager costs	Economies of scale	Comparable market rates	Comparable services	Classes of units
MF Eclipse Active Adventurous Fund	Green	Grey	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Grey	Green
MF Eclipse Passive Adventurous Fund	Green	Grey	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Grey	Green
MF Eclipse Active Defensive Fund	Green	Grey	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Grey	Green
MF Eclipse Passive Defensive Fund	Green	Grey	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Grey	Green

Future Developments

At Minerva, we see the Assessment of Value as an iterative process. In line with our responsibilities to ensure our customers' funds are appropriately managed and that funds deliver value to our customers, we will continue to review our reports against industry peers and where relevant, incorporate best practices. Our team of professionals are involved with the Investment Association and other industry bodies e.g. TISA to ensure that we keep up to date with industry developments.

1 Quality of Service

Are we meeting our customers' expectations on the quality of the service we deliver?

Under the assessment of quality of service criteria, we consider whether we are meeting our customers' reasonable expectations on the service we deliver. In this section, we review the quality of service we directly provide as well as the quality of service provided by any third-party used to provide services to the funds.

In order to assess this, we consider the range and quality of services we provide to our customers. This includes the quality of every aspect of the service provided, including, for example, accounting, administration, customer services and communications.

Overview

There are a number of third-party providers which deliver support to the funds. Minerva oversees all third-party providers, from an operational, risk and compliance perspective. There are a number of Key Performance Indicators for services provided by third-parties which are overseen on a day-to-day basis and discussed in monthly service review meetings. This allows Minerva to track the performance of the services being provided.

Minerva has delegated investment management of the funds to Sentinel Portfolio Management Limited ("Sentinel"). Although we have delegated this activity, we independently review and challenge the investment manager and maintain oversight of the risk and compliance of the funds. We believe that having the right level of governance and oversight of our funds and our third parties is essential to protect our customers' best interests.

Methodology

A number of elements contribute to our assessment of the quality of service we provide to customers. In particular, fund operations, investment management, customer services, fund administration and depositary and custodian services.

When assessing the quality of service, we have focused on the following:

- The quality of the administrative services provided to the funds; and
- The quality and integrity of our appointed investment manager, – Sentinel.

Assessment

Minerva employs a robust governance and risk management framework in our oversight and monitoring processes with respect to the funds, the various third-party providers (e.g., investment managers, administrators etc) and also the internal teams within Minerva. We undertake regular reviews to identify any potential issues in the administration, investment and product processes.

Our AFM/ACD team aims to ensure that the funds operate efficiently and accurately. This includes oversight and challenge of activities contracted to third parties, such as depositary, registrar and fund administrator. We monitor whether key aspects have been met for each supplier. This oversight of suppliers provides a key area of governance for us to ensure that our customers and the funds receive value and experience positive outcomes.

Quality of Administrative Services

Minerva performs extensive oversight on all third parties and delegated service providers. This aims to ensure that service quality is maintained in line with acceptable standards which in turn, deliver performance that meets or exceeds our and our customers' expectations. This includes reviewing the following key elements:

Minerva Fund Management Solutions Limited - MF Eclipse Fund – Assessment of Value Report 2023

- Customer Services – The quality and timeliness of customer communications and resolution of any complaints;
- Fund Administration – timely and accurate calculation of the fund’s share prices;
- Depositary Services – safekeeping of customer assets and quality of oversight;
- Registration Services – registration of customers shareholdings, Anti-Money Laundering and Know Your Customer (“AML/KYC”) services.
- As part of the quality of administrative processes, in view of Minerva’s responsibilities as the AFM/ACD, we also considered, amongst other things:
 - The day-to-day administration of the funds;
 - The maintenance of fund documentation (such as Prospectuses and Key Investor Information Documents (“KIIDs”));
 - The maintenance of accounting and other records and the preparation of the annual audited and half yearly reports and accounts.

The results of our assessment are described further below.

Customer Services

Customer service is a critical part of our customers’ experience, and we regularly evaluate this through our Fund Product Governance Committee to ensure our products and services remain relevant to our customers’ objectives and needs. In assessing the quality of service, we work closely with the fund co-manufacturer on all aspects of the fund in order to identify any areas for improvements. This includes evaluating customer feedback as well as any complaints, which we view as a valuable source of information. To date, we have not received any complaints about the funds.

Fund Administration

Our Operations Team oversees the administration, accounting and pricing services of the funds provided by CACEIS Bank, UK Branch (“CACEIS”). The key elements of the services are monitored on a daily basis and formally discussed with CACEIS at monthly Service Review Meetings.

Depositary Services

We oversee CACEIS UK Trustee & Depositary Services Ltd who is responsible for providing custody and oversight services to the funds. Regular Service Review meetings are held with CACEIS.

Registration

Fund registration services are provided by Apex Fund Administration Services (UK). The key aspects of this service include: customer communications; fair and timely resolution of any complaints; processes customer dealing; accurate and timely distribution of payments; and customer onboarding (AML/KYC checks and ongoing monitoring). Key elements of the services are monitored on a daily basis and formally discussed with Apex at monthly Service Review Meetings.

Third-party Provider Due Diligence

The third-party providers appointed to the funds are subject to initial and ongoing due diligence.

Internal Control Functions

In reaching a view on the adequacy of services provided by Minerva, we reviewed the information provided by Minerva’s control functions (Compliance & Risk) on the adequacy of the internal services provided, including the quality of governance, oversight, risk management and monitoring.

Quality and Integrity of our appointed Investment Manager

For this part of this assessment, we engaged with Sentinel's Investment Management team to examine the following areas:

- Quality, capability, skills and expertise of the investment manager's human and material resources involved in the investment process;
- The different stages of the investment process;
- Whether the Investment Manager's trading activities were in line with the fund's objectives, investment strategy and investment restrictions (as described in the Prospectus).

In reaching our view on this element of the assessment, we also take into account the quality of Minerva's risk and fund liquidity management processes.

The investment management of the fund is assessed on a monthly basis by the Investment Management Committee. This assessment includes reviewing the timeliness and accuracy of the trade advice, trade amendments, weekly valuation signoffs, as well as fund performance, asset allocation, current market trends, and the resulting impact on the funds. As previously noted, the performance of the funds and their suitability for the identified Target Market is also assessed through our Product Governance Committee.

Delegated investment managers are also subject to Minerva's initial and ongoing due diligence.

Conclusions

Overall, we have concluded that a good quality of service has been provided throughout the assessment period by both Minerva and Sentinel.

Next Steps

Minerva will continue to review the quality of service provided to the funds in order to identify whether there are any areas where it can be improved.

2 Performance

Have the funds performed in line with customers' reasonable expectations?

Under the performance criteria, we monitor whether our funds have performed in line with a customers' reasonable expectations. In order to do this, we assess the performance of the fund, after the deduction of fees from the scheme property, against the fund's stated objectives, and the benchmarks in the investment policy and strategy, over the Recommended Holding Period. Where a fund has not been in existence for the Recommended Holding Period, we believe it is too early to assess the performance of the fund(s).

Overview

We believe that our customers can reasonably expect funds to be managed in line with the stated investment objectives. Under the Performance criteria, we consider whether our funds have performed in line with customers' reasonable expectations and whether they have been appropriately managed. We consider a fund to be providing good value when it consistently meets its investment objectives.

Where a fund has not been in existence for long enough (i.e., it has not reached its Recommended Holding Period) to be meaningfully compared against its benchmark, we have included the relevant performance data in this section but have not made an active assessment.

Methodology

A number of factors are typically considered in order to make an assessment of whether the investment objectives are being met, including specific investment or volatility objectives where applicable. Such factors generally include, for example, whether a fund has met its investment objectives (including

Minerva Fund Management Solutions Limited - MF Eclipse Fund – Assessment of Value Report 2023

volatility objectives) as stated in the Prospectus, as well as the investment performance of the fund relative to its benchmark (where a benchmark is stated).

Assessment

Minerva has delegated investment management to Sentinel. Although we have delegated this activity, we actively oversee the investment management of the funds – which includes fund performance.

As the funds were launched on 1 August 2022, we consider it too early to assess whether the funds have met their investment objectives overall.

Investment Objectives

The investment objectives for each fund are set out in the Prospectus and the relevant Key Investor Information Document (“KIID”). For ease of reference, these are replicated below:

Sub-Fund	Objective	Minimum Recommended Holding Period	Comparator
MF Eclipse Active Adventurous Fund	To provide capital growth over rolling five-year periods, with a target volatility between 12% and 15%	5 years	IA Flexible Investment
MF Eclipse Passive Adventurous Fund	To provide capital growth over rolling five-year periods, with a target volatility between 12% and 15%.	5 years	IA Flexible Investment
MF Eclipse Active Defensive Fund	To provide a combination of capital growth and income over rolling five-year periods, with a target volatility between 4% and 7%.	5 years	IA Mixed Investment 20 – 60%
MF Eclipse Passive Defensive Fund	To provide a combination of capital growth and income over rolling five-year periods, with a target volatility between 4% and 7%.	5 years	IA Mixed Investment 20 – 60%

We monitor Sentinel’s adherence to the stated fund objectives through our day-to-day oversight, our governance structures and ongoing monitoring.

As the funds were launched on 1 August 2022, it is considered too early to assess whether the funds have achieved their stated investment objectives as part of this Assessment of Value report. However, we have not identified any concerns do date through our oversight processes that would require us to take remedial action.

Fund Performance

Fund performance is not only assessed as part of the Assessment of Value process, it is also regularly reviewed and assessed by the Investment Committee which evaluates the fund performance against each fund’s investment objectives.

The funds were launched on 1 August 2022 with a Recommended Holding Period of five years. As a result, we have not assessed the funds’ performance as we consider it too early to do so.

Minerva Fund Management Solutions Limited - MF Eclipse Fund – Assessment of Value Report 2023

As stated in the Prospectus, the Funds have comparative benchmarks of the relevant IA sector. The performance of the funds is shown in the table below based on a one-year period since the inception of the funds:

Fund Name	1 Year Fund performance	1 Year comparator benchmark performance
MF Eclipse Active Adventurous Fund	2.15%	1.87%
MF Eclipse Passive Adventurous Fund	-0.41%	1.87%
MF Eclipse Active Defensive Fund	-4.33%	-0.44%
MF Eclipse Passive Defensive Fund	-3.76%	-0.44%

As described elsewhere in this report, due to the size of the funds, we have not been able to achieve the economies of scale initially anticipated as the small size of the funds has in turn proportionally resulted in a higher OCF than was envisaged. We had already taken action to mitigate the effect of costs with regards to the funds by offsetting the OCF through the use of Minerva's own funds in order to improve the outcome for our customers.

Conclusion

Given the funds were launched on 1 August 2022, it is considered too early to undertake a full review of whether the funds have achieved their investment objectives or of the fund performance over the Recommended Holding Period. We will continue to keep these under review through the Firm's Investment Committee and governance structures.

Next Steps

We are in the process of identifying new investors to increase the size of the funds in order to reduce the effect of the ongoing charges on them. In the event that additional investors do not materialise, funds may be merged or closed.

3 Authorised Fund Manager Costs

Are the fees charged to the fund reasonable and appropriate?

Under the AFM costs criteria, we consider whether the fees charged to the fund were reasonable and appropriate, taking into account the service to which the charge relates, and whether money is paid directly to associates of the AFM or external parties.

Overview

We believe the charges should be transparent to customers, with no hidden costs.

Each of our funds is subject to a range of charges relating to its running costs. These charges are deducted from the fund on a daily basis and therefore impact the value of the investment over time. The Ongoing Charges Figure (or "OCF") is the most common way to express the annual costs charged to a fund. The OCF covers most of the costs associated with operating a fund (and the particular share class of the fund in which customers are invested) and is presented as a percentage of the fund's average asset value over its financial Year.

The OCF includes the following costs and charges:

Minerva Fund Management Solutions Limited - MF Eclipse Fund – Assessment of Value Report 2023

- The Annual Management Charge (“AMC”) which includes the fees paid to the investment manager the ACD/AFM and the fund administration costs;
- Depositary fees;
- Other operating costs e.g., Audit and legal costs, etc.

The OCF does not include charges that relate to transactions i.e., transaction charges are buying or selling of the underlying shares or other assets that make up the fund e.g., broker commissions, transfer taxes and stamp duty as applicable.

Methodology

In assessing the reasonableness of costs, we also consider the services provided by Minerva as AFM/ACD to the fund. These services include:

- Maintaining oversight of the funds, monitoring the investment manager and third-party service providers;
- Managing risk;
- Maintaining systems and processes used in our oversight processes;
- Development and maintenance of fund documentation (e.g., Prospectus, KIID);
- Customer Service activity.

We determine the cost to us of providing the service and compare this to what we charge to the customer to ensure that the costs and charges are fair. In this context, we assess “fairness” through ensuring the fees and charges remain appropriate and fair for our customers’ investments(s) whilst allowing us to operate as a commercially viable entity, innovate and develop products and services for our customers.

Assessment

In conducting our assessment, we have considered the costs and charges applied to the funds, using the OCF as we believe this number provides an appropriate value against which to assess the funds. The OCF as applied to each of the funds is set out below:

Fund	OCF From 1 August 2022 – 31 July 2023
MF Eclipse Active Adventurous Fund	1.52%
MF Eclipse Passive Adventurous Fund	1.64%
MF Eclipse Active Defensive Fund	1.58%
MF Eclipse Passive Defensive Fund	1.63%

We regularly review our costs and charges to ensure they offer value for our customers and believe the costs that we pass on to customers via the funds, are fair and in line with industry practice. We have subsidised the running costs of all of the funds through the use of our own capital in order to manage down their OCFs as far as commercially practicable.

Conclusion

Based on our assessment, while our ACD/AFM costs are comparable to other ACDs/AFMs running similar funds, the fund costs have been higher than expected due to our being unable to benefit from economies of scale due to the small fund sizes. Minerva has sought to offset the costs of the fund through the use of its own capital where possible and believes its costs to be fair overall.

Next Steps

As part of our ongoing oversight we will continue to review the costs and charges of the funds to identify any opportunities to make savings through economies of scale as noted elsewhere in this report.

4 Economies of Scale

Were we able to achieve savings and benefits from economies of scale?

For the economies of scale criteria, we consider whether we are able to achieve savings and benefits from economies of scale, relating to the costs of managing the fund. This assessment also considers whether the fund has grown or contracted in size over the reporting period. For new funds we also take into account that the benefits of economies of scale may be limited where they have not reached a size at which economies of scale can be achieved.

Overview

The funds incur two types of charges; fixed and ad-valorem (a percentage of fund value).

Fixed charges such as audit costs are shared over the value of a fund and so have a larger percentage impact on smaller fund sizes. As funds grow the percentage impact to a fund is reduced.

The ACD levies its Annual Management Charge (“AMC”) to the funds on a tiered, ad-valorem basis. As the fund size grows beyond defined thresholds the percentage rate of charge is decreased to reflect the economies of scale that the AFM achieves as funds grow in size. The AMC is subject to a minimum fixed charge. Details of the AFM’s AMC charging basis is set out in the Fund Information sections of the MF Eclipse Fund Prospectus.

Methodology

When assessing the economies of scale criteria, we have considered whether investors have benefitted from economies of scale as well as through leveraging our relationship as ACD/AFM, and whether further economies of scale can be achieved as the fund grows.

Assessment

Minerva negotiated lower Depositary fees charged to the fund in the assessment period.

In terms of the AMC, we believe that the tiering that is applied to the AMC is fair to investors and competitive. The AFM has significantly reduced its minimum fixed charge in respect of the AMC to reduce the impact on the funds in the assessment period.

Conclusions

As noted elsewhere in this Assessment of Value report, the funds were launched on 1 August 2022 and as such, are still in the initial stages of growth. Over time, as the funds grow, we expect fees to proportionally reduce. As a result, economies of scale are likely to improve over time on the premise that funds grow in value.

Next Steps

We are already in the process of increasing the size of the funds to offset the effect of costs and charges as described elsewhere in this report. In summary, we are seeking additional investments into the funds or, alternatively, the funds may be merged with larger funds and/or closed if the additional investments are not received.

5 Comparable Market Rates

How do our fees compare to our competitors?

For the comparable market rates criterion, we consider how our fees compare to those of our competitors and whether the total fees charged to customers is reasonable, taking into account the average market rate charged by our peers for similar funds. This assessment also includes the costs of the investment management of the fund which has been delegated to Sentinel.

Unlike the comparable service criteria which is an internal assessment based on services we provide to other funds when we are acting as the AFM/ACD, the comparable market rates look to the wider market for comparison (i.e., similar funds managed by other firms within the relevant IA Sector).

Methodology

When considering comparable market rates, we assess how our funds' OCFs compare against our competitors for similar funds in the relative Investment Association ("IA") Sector.

We categorise an OCF as being "aligned" with the comparison group if it is within 10% of the median OCF of the comparison group. If an OCF is above the figure which is 110% of the median OCF of the comparison group, we categorise it as being higher than the comparison group and if the OCF is lower than the figure which is 90% of the median OCF, we categorise it as being lower than the comparison group.

We believe a fund offers good value if relative costs are within the above parameters. Our conclusion is also informed by the fund's size i.e., broadly we would expect a fund's charges to be lower the larger the fund.

Assessment

We considered our charges in relation to funds managed by other firms with similar investment objectives and strategies using the OCF and applicable IA Sector for comparison purposes. Having done so, we consider our costs and charges to be comparable to our competitors. However, the fund costs and charges are currently higher than comparable funds (due to economies of scale factors as noted elsewhere in this report). We took steps to address this during the period by reducing the fund costs and charges with the use of Minerva's own capital. We expect to be able to achieve greater economies of scale over time as described further in next steps section.

Conclusion

While we consider the AFM costs of the funds reasonable, further action is required to reduce the impact of costs on the funds overall through the achievement of economies of scale as noted elsewhere in this Report.

Next Steps

We are in the process of identifying new investors to increase the size of the passive funds in order to reduce the effect of the ongoing charges on them. In the event that additional investors do not materialise, the passive funds may be merged or closed.

6 Comparable Services

How do our fees compare to similar products we offer?

Under the comparable service criteria, we consider the total fees charged to customers for similar products we offer. Unlike the comparable market rates criteria which looks to the wider market for comparison (i.e., against our peers and the relevant IA sector), the comparable service criterion is an internal assessment based on services Minerva provides to other funds as AFM/ACD where those funds have similar strategies, investment remits and customer needs.

Overview

We are the AFM/ACD for funds that are similar to the MF Eclipse Funds. However, those funds were launched on 3 April 2023, and given their short lifespan, it is not possible to complete a meaningful assessment of this criterion.

Methodology

In order to conduct this assessment, we would typically have considered the total fees charged to customers invested in the MF Eclipse Fund Range compared with the total costs and charges paid by customers in other similar funds where Minerva is acting as the AFM/ACD.

Assessment

Not possible.

Conclusion

We have concluded that we are not able to undertake a meaningful comparison at this time with other funds managed by Minerva as AFM/ACD.

Next Steps

We will develop this assessment criteria as the Firm's funds grow in number and maturity.

7 Classes of Shares

Are our customers invested in the most appropriate share class for their investment needs?

Under the classes of shares criteria we consider whether our customers are invested in the most appropriate share class for their investment needs. This assessment takes into account whether it is appropriate for customers to hold shares in classes subject to higher charges than those applying to other classes of the same fund with substantially similar rights.

Some funds may issue different types of shares which may depend on the features and services offered. These are called "share classes" and can differ for various reasons, for example, some funds have different share classes for different types of investors/customers e.g., institutional share classes for institutional investors/customers and retail share classes for retail investors/customers.

Assessment

At Minerva, transparency and openness in all our dealings with our customers is of vital importance to us as is ensuring all of our customers are treated fairly. Our aims are to ensure that our customers are consistently invested in the most appropriate share class for their needs.

The Funds were launched on 1 August 2022 and only offer one share class – the accumulation share – with a single charge structure across all funds. The single costs structure helps us to ensure that our costs are transparent and that all of our customers are treated equally and fairly regardless of which fund they are invested in.

Conclusion

Given there is a single share class, we have concluded that all customers are invested in the most appropriate share class for their investment needs.

Next Steps

Not applicable.

8 Glossary

The following glossary provides the definitions of terms used in this report.

Term	Definition
Active management	The management of investments based on active decision-making by the investment manager. The investment manager aims to beat the benchmark through research, analysis and their own skill, expertise and judgement.
Assessment of Value	The FCA requires AFMs of UK funds to publish an annual report demonstrating how they are providing value to the investors in their funds.
Asset Allocation	The apportionment of a portfolio's assets between asset classes and/or markets. For example, a fund may hold a combination of shares, bonds and cash. The weightings vary according to the investment objective and the investment outlook.
Benchmark	A standard (usually an index or a market average) against which an investment fund's performance is measured.
Comparator benchmark	A standard (usually an index or a market average) against which an investment fund's performance is compared to.
FCA (Financial Conduct Authority)	The FCA regulates the UK's financial markets. Its objective is to ensure that relevant markets function well – for individuals, for businesses and for the economy as a whole.
The Investment Association (IA)	The Investment Association is a trade body that represents investment and asset managers in the UK.
IA (Investment Association) Sector	As published by the Investment Association, the IA sectors divide the fund universe to reflect the asset type, industry sector, or geographic regions funds are invested in. There are over 35 IA sectors. These are there to help navigate the large universe of funds in the UK and include some offshore (EU) funds. The sectors divide up the funds into smaller groups, to allow like-for-like comparisons between funds in one or more sectors. For instance to look at performance and/or fund charges.
KIID (Key Investor Information Document)	A two-page document that summarises a fund's investment objectives, key risks, ongoing charges figure, and past performance. It is required for funds that come under EU law and is designed to allow comparability across funds.
OCF (Ongoing Charges Figure)	The OCF is made up of Annual Management Charge the administration charge and "other costs". The administration fee includes directly attributable costs, such as Registrar costs and Fund Accounting fees, and allocated costs to support functions.
Passive Investment	A style of investment management that does not involve active decision-making by the investment manager.
Peer group	A group of funds that may be compared with one another, often for performance purposes. A peer group will usually be based on the fund's investment objectives and customer outcomes.
Recommended Holding Period	The period of time over which we expect the fund to deliver its investment objectives as stated in the Prospectus and KIID.

Minerva Fund Management Solutions Limited - MF Eclipse Fund – Assessment of Value Report 2023

Term	Definition
Target Market	One or more groups of customers sharing common features whose characteristics, needs and objectives the fund is or will be designed to meet.
Volatility	A statistical measure of the fluctuations in a security's price or particular market. For example, a highly volatile share experiences greater changes in price than other investments. High volatility is taken as an indication of higher risk.

the 1990s, the number of publications on the topic has increased steadily, and the number of authors has increased from 1 to 10.

There are a number of reasons for the increase in research on the topic. First, the number of people who are interested in the topic has increased. This is due to the fact that the topic has become more relevant in the 1990s, as a result of the increasing number of people who are interested in the topic.

Second, the number of people who are interested in the topic has increased. This is due to the fact that the topic has become more relevant in the 1990s, as a result of the increasing number of people who are interested in the topic.

Third, the number of people who are interested in the topic has increased. This is due to the fact that the topic has become more relevant in the 1990s, as a result of the increasing number of people who are interested in the topic.

Fourth, the number of people who are interested in the topic has increased. This is due to the fact that the topic has become more relevant in the 1990s, as a result of the increasing number of people who are interested in the topic.

Fifth, the number of people who are interested in the topic has increased. This is due to the fact that the topic has become more relevant in the 1990s, as a result of the increasing number of people who are interested in the topic.

Sixth, the number of people who are interested in the topic has increased. This is due to the fact that the topic has become more relevant in the 1990s, as a result of the increasing number of people who are interested in the topic.

Seventh, the number of people who are interested in the topic has increased. This is due to the fact that the topic has become more relevant in the 1990s, as a result of the increasing number of people who are interested in the topic.

Eighth, the number of people who are interested in the topic has increased. This is due to the fact that the topic has become more relevant in the 1990s, as a result of the increasing number of people who are interested in the topic.

Ninth, the number of people who are interested in the topic has increased. This is due to the fact that the topic has become more relevant in the 1990s, as a result of the increasing number of people who are interested in the topic.

Tenth, the number of people who are interested in the topic has increased. This is due to the fact that the topic has become more relevant in the 1990s, as a result of the increasing number of people who are interested in the topic.

Eleventh, the number of people who are interested in the topic has increased. This is due to the fact that the topic has become more relevant in the 1990s, as a result of the increasing number of people who are interested in the topic.

Twelfth, the number of people who are interested in the topic has increased. This is due to the fact that the topic has become more relevant in the 1990s, as a result of the increasing number of people who are interested in the topic.