Family wealth, advisers and governance

Private Wealth

1 A story: the family dinner

- Harald founded Brandt Timber and plans the handover
- Jonas runs the firm and expects to inherit it
- Elsa and Linnea are rarely asked anything
- Wealth carries identity, status and history

IN THE LESSON

- Picture a long dinner table at the Brandt family home.
- Harald Brandt founded a timber company and is planning how to hand it on.
- His wife Elsa pours the wine and says very little.
- His son Jonas runs the firm and expects to inherit it.
- His daughter Linnea, a painter, wonders why nobody ever asks her anything.
- Nobody mentions money, yet the whole evening is about money.
- That is the first lesson.
- Wealth is never only a portfolio.
- It carries identity, status, family history and hope, and an adviser who ignores all that will watch a sound plan fall apart.

2 Who decides, who lives with it

The Brandt family: decide and affected

Person	Position
Harald, founder	Decides
Elsa, wife	Unheard
Jonas, son	Expects firm
Linnea, daughter	Not consulted

IN THE LESSON

- Mira Voss starts by drawing two lists.
- The first is who has the power to decide.
- The second is who will live with the result.
- They are not the same.
- Harald decides alone, and he has told Mira to take instructions only from him.
- Elsa is a joint owner of the family assets, yet nobody hears her.
- Jonas has no formal say, but a sale would end his future, so he is the likeliest source of conflict.
- Linnea is an heir who has not been consulted.
- The trap is to serve only the dominant person, and then be surprised when the others derail the plan.

3 Events that shift power

Events that trigger conflict, and what is at stake

Event	At stake
Business sale	Control
Divorce	Ownership
Founder's death	Leadership
Inheritance	Fairness

IN THE LESSON

- Family systems are stable until something shakes them.
- Four events matter most.
- A business sale turns a shared project into cash, and then the question is who controls the cash.
- A divorce splits ownership and may bring a stranger into the family's affairs.
- The death of a founder removes the one voice that held the rest in line, so leadership is suddenly open.
- And an inheritance forces the question of fairness, which is rarely the same as equality.
- Mira watches for each of these, because they turn quiet disagreements into open conflict, and they are when plans most often fail.

4 Different attitudes to risk

- Elsa
- Linnea
- Harald
- Grandchildren
- Jonas

IN THE LESSON

- Now look at attitudes.
- This line runs from protect what we have, on the left, to grow it boldly, on the right.
- Elsa sits far to the left.
- She lived through the early lean years and wants safety.
- Linnea is left of centre, though she rarely says so.
- Harald sits in the middle, careful but proud of what he built.
- The grandchildren sit right of centre, because they have decades ahead.
- Jonas sits at the far right, because he wants to reinvest in the firm.
- One portfolio cannot match all five views, and Mira's job is to hear each of them before she proposes anything.

5 Example 1: fair is not the same as equal

Brandt family: firm 135m, everything else 90m

Family wealth	135m + 90m	**225m**
Plan: Jonas gets the firm	business	**135m**
Plan: Linnea gets the rest	other assets	**90m**
Equal share each	225m ÷ 2	**112.5m**
Linnea short of equal	112.5m − 90m	**22.5m**

IN THE LESSON

- Here is the money behind the tension.
- Brandt Timber is worth one hundred and thirty five million.
- Everything else, property, funds and savings, is worth ninety million.
- The family's wealth is two hundred and twenty five million.
- Harald's plan is simple: the firm goes to Jonas and the rest goes to Linnea.
- To Harald that feels natural, because Jonas works in the firm.
- But one hundred and thirty five million against ninety million is not equal.
- An equal share is half of two hundred and twenty five million, which is one hundred and twelve point five million each.
- Linnea is short by twenty two point five million, and she will feel it.

6 Two ways to divide it

Share of wealth (millions)

Jonas: plan	**135**
Linnea: plan	**90**
Jonas: equal	**112.5**
Linnea: equal	**112.5**

Same family, two ideas of fair

IN THE LESSON

- Here are the same numbers as bars.
- The side axis shows each person's share of the wealth, in millions.
- The first pair is Harald's plan.
- Jonas, in gold, receives one hundred and thirty five.
- Linnea, in green, receives ninety.
- The second pair is an equal split, with one hundred and twelve point five each.
- Notice that neither picture is simply right.
- Harald's plan matches the work Jonas does.
- The equal split matches Linnea's feeling of being treated as a full member of the family.
- Mira does not choose between them.
- Her job is to put both on the table, in numbers, so the family can talk about what fair means to them.

7 Example 2: what an equal split would cost

Equal split: Jonas must find 22.5m

Amount to move to Linnea	from Example 1	**22.5m**
As a share of the firm	22.5m ÷ 135m	**16.7%**
Firm pays out each year	assumed dividends	**4.5m**
Years of dividends needed	22.5m ÷ 4.5m	**5 years**

IN THE LESSON

- Suppose the family does choose equal shares.
- Then twenty two point five million must move to Linnea.
- Since the money is tied up in the firm, that is sixteen point seven per cent of the value of the firm.
- Say the firm pays four point five million in dividends each year, an assumption for this example.
- Then it takes five years of dividends to fund the gap.
- So there are real choices: Jonas buys Linnea out over time, Linnea holds some shares without a vote, or other assets move her way.
- Mira proposes these options.
- She does not impose one, because the family must own the answer.

8 How Mira handles the family

Discovery

Map who decides → Hear every person → Stay neutral

Mira's proposal

Widen the mandate → Agree privacy rules → Meet all the adults

IN THE LESSON

- Now let us turn the lesson into a method.
- Mira first maps the family: who decides, who is affected, and what each person values.
- Then she hears every person, one to one and together, so that quiet voices such as Elsa and Linnea are not lost.
- She stays neutral, treating each person fairly, even though Harald pays the bill.
- Her proposal has three parts.
- Widen the mandate, so Harald agrees that she may speak with the whole family.
- Agree rules on what she keeps private.
- And hold one meeting with all the adults.
- This does not make the family agree.
- It makes the disagreements visible, early, and manageable.

9 A story: the questionnaire

- The questionnaire scored Linnea as aggressive
- In conversation, a big loss would keep her awake
- A form records answers, a talk finds feelings
- The adviser reads both and listens first

IN THE LESSON

- Mira meets Linnea alone, and Linnea has already filled in the firm's risk questionnaire.
- It scored her as aggressive.
- Mira could stop there and file the form.
- Instead she asks, in plain words, what a very bad year would feel like.
- Linnea goes quiet and says a large loss would keep her awake at night.
- She also admits that the meetings with Harald and Jonas make her anxious, and that she does not understand the reports.
- A form records answers.
- A conversation finds the feelings behind them.
- Good advisers use both, and they listen far more than they talk.

10 Five abilities of a private wealth adviser

Winning and understanding

Win: trust, referrals → Understand: listen

Counselling and teaching

Counsel: skill, judgement →

Inform: honest, adapted →

Teach: clients, heirs

IN THE LESSON

- The outcome names five abilities.
- The top row happens first.
- Winning a client rests on trust, referrals and a clear statement of what the adviser offers.
- Understanding the client means structured discovery of goals, circumstances, risk tolerance and behaviour, using open questions and active listening.
- The bottom row runs through the whole relationship.
- Counselling combines technical skill in investments, tax, estate and insurance with judgement about what matters most.
- Informing means adapting language, frequency and format to each person, and explaining risk honestly.
- Teaching covers financial literacy for clients and their heirs.
- Each ability is a skill that can be practised and improved.

11 Example 3: the form against the conversation

Linnea: 4.0m portfolio; questionnaire score 8 of 10

Loss she says she can bear	10% × 4.0m	**0.40m**
Bad year, aggressive mix	25% × 4.0m	**1.00m**
Loss above her own limit	1.00m − 0.40m	**0.60m**
Times her limit	1.00m ÷ 0.40m	**2.5 times**

IN THE LESSON

- Let us put numbers on Linnea.
- She has four million to invest.
- The questionnaire scored her eight out of ten, aggressive.
- In conversation she says she could bear a loss of ten per cent, which is four hundred thousand.
- Now take the model portfolio that suits an aggressive score.
- In a bad year it might fall twenty five per cent, which is one million.
- That is six hundred thousand more than she says she can bear, two and a half times her own limit.
- The form would have put her in a mix she cannot live with.
- Mira proposes a balanced mix whose bad year stays near her limit, and she writes down why.

12 Showing a bad year honestly

Bad year = μ − z × σ

Expected return	Average yearly return
Critical value	One-tailed 5% value, 1.645
Standard deviation	Usual swing in yearly returns
Bad-year return	A one-in-twenty bad year

IN THE LESSON

- Informing a client means showing the downside in numbers.
- A simple tool assumes that yearly returns are normally distributed.
- The bad year return equals the expected return, minus a critical value times the standard deviation.
- The standard deviation is the usual swing in yearly returns.
- The critical value depends on how rare a year you want to describe.
- For a one tailed five per cent, one year in twenty, the value is one point six four five.
- This is a rough guide, not a promise, and real markets can fall further.
- A number like this is more honest than saying the portfolio might dip a little.

13 Example 4: telling Elsa the downside

Elsa: 20m portfolio, mean 6.0%, deviation 11.0%

Expected return	average per year	**6.0%**
Swing in a bad year	1.645 × 11.0%	**18.1%**
Bad-year return	6.0% − 18.1%	**−12.1%**
Loss on the portfolio	12.1% × 20m	**2.42m**

IN THE LESSON

- Elsa fears losing the money.
- Her liquid portfolio is twenty million.
- Mira expects it to earn six per cent a year with a standard deviation of eleven per cent.
- Multiply one point six four five by eleven and you get eighteen point one.
- Six minus eighteen point one gives a bad year return of minus twelve point one per cent.
- On twenty million, that is a loss of about two point four two million.
- Mira says it plainly: in about one year in twenty, assuming normal returns, the portfolio could lose around two point four million.
- Elsa now knows the price of the plan before markets test her, and the surprise is gone.

14 Matching the message to the person

Four people, four styles

Person	Style
Harald	Short, numbers
Elsa	Plain, often
Linnea	Pictures, time
Grandchildren	Teach in steps

IN THE LESSON

- Communicating means adapting language, frequency and format to each person, and the Brandts show how different people need different treatment.
- Harald likes short notes with the main numbers.
- Elsa wants plain words and frequent contact, so that nothing comes as a surprise.
- Linnea prefers pictures and time to ask questions, because she finds reports confusing.
- The grandchildren need teaching in steps, since their ability to take part in decisions will grow.
- The same adviser, with the same facts, gives each of them a different style.
- Managing expectations before markets test them is what keeps the relationship intact when a bad year arrives.

15 Teaching the next generation

- Start at the heirs' level: saving and spending
- Move on to risk, giving and the charter
- Use small real decisions, not lectures
- Teach the adults too, not only the children

IN THE LESSON

- The last ability is teaching.
- Wealth passes on, and heirs who do not understand it often lose it.
- Mira proposes a simple education plan for the Brandt grandchildren.
- She starts at their level, with saving and spending, and moves on to risk, giving, and how the family charter works.
- She uses small real decisions, such as choosing a charity grant, instead of lectures.
- She also teaches the adults, because Linnea and Elsa are clients too.
- Financial literacy supports continuity, since an heir who understands the plan is less likely to fight it and more likely to keep the family together.

16 Mistakes to avoid so far

- Taking instructions from the loudest voice only
- Taking sides when the family disagrees
- Trusting a questionnaire without a conversation
- Hiding the downside to keep the client happy
- Assuming technical skill alone keeps clients

IN THE LESSON

- Let us collect the common mistakes from the first two outcomes.
- One: taking instructions from the loudest voice only, and ignoring the family dynamics that later derail the plan.
- Two: taking sides when the family disagrees, instead of staying neutral and fair to each person.
- Three: trusting a questionnaire without a conversation, so that a score hides what the client really feels.
- Four: hiding the downside to keep the client happy, which only makes the surprise worse.
- Five: believing that technical skill alone keeps clients.
- Relationships are far more often lost through poor communication than through poor performance.

17 A story: the bigger version

- Ansel: just a bigger version of our usual client
- A typical client: simple accounts, one country
- The Brandts: a company, trusts, private funds
- Different problems, not bigger ones

IN THE LESSON

- A colleague at Tarn Wealth Partners, Ansel Kruger, hears about the Brandts and shrugs.
- They are just a bigger version of our usual client, he says.
- Put them in the model portfolio, send the standard quarterly report, and offer a lower fee.
- It sounds sensible, and it is the trap.
- A typical client has savings and a home in one country, held in simple accounts.
- The Brandts have an operating company, property in several countries, private funds and trusts.
- Their problems are not bigger versions of the usual problems.
- They are different problems, and they need a different kind of service.

18 What the Brandts own

Brandt wealth (millions)

Business	**135**
Property	**36**
Private funds	**18**
Listed	**27**
Cash	**9**

Total 225m; liquid 36m, 16%

IN THE LESSON

- Let us look at what the Brandts actually own.
- The side axis shows value in millions, and the total is two hundred and twenty five.
- The tall red bar is the company, one hundred and thirty five million.
- Next is property in several countries, thirty six million.
- Then private funds, eighteen million.
- Now the two bars the usual model portfolio would cover: listed investments, twenty seven million, and cash, nine million.
- Together these liquid assets are thirty six million, only sixteen per cent of the wealth.
- A typical high net worth client holds mostly listed investments and a home.
- Here the largest part is a private, illiquid company, and the model portfolio touches just one slice.

19 What sets ultra-high-net-worth apart

Ultra-high-net-worth family: key features

Feature	In practice
Main assets	Business
Reach	Many countries
Horizon	Generations
Reporting	Institutional

IN THE LESSON

- Definitions of ultra high net worth vary, so the features matter more than any threshold.
- The first is what they own: an operating business, concentrated and illiquid positions, and private investments.
- The second is reach, with several countries and legal entities, which brings tax, legal and residency questions that depend on the jurisdiction.
- The third is horizon, which is typically multigenerational, so governance, succession, philanthropy and educating heirs feature strongly.
- The fourth is reporting, because these families expect institutional quality.
- They also want privacy, access to direct and co investment, and they have the bargaining power to negotiate fees.

20 Single or multi-family office

Which structure fits which family

Choice	Fits
Single family office	Very large
Multi-family office	Large, shared
Private bank alone	Simpler needs
Adviser alone	One main need

IN THE LESSON

- Many such families run their affairs through a family office.
- A single family office serves one family, with its own staff.
- It gives control and privacy, but it is costly, so it fits only very large wealth.
- A multi family office shares staff and systems among several families.
- It gives much of the same service at a lower cost, which fits large wealth that is not quite large enough to justify its own team.
- A private bank alone fits simpler needs, and an adviser alone fits one main need.
- Notice that the choice is about complexity and cost together, and that is the next question for Mira to answer in numbers.

21 Example 5: when does a family office pay?

Assumed: own office 2.7m a year; shared office 0.45%

Own office cost	assumed, per year	**2.7m**
Shared office fee	assumed rate	**0.45%**
Brandt fee, shared office	225m × 0.45%	**1.01m**
Break-even wealth	2.7m ÷ 0.45%	**600m**
Brandts against break-even	225m ÷ 600m	**37.5%**

IN THE LESSON

- Here is the cost test.
- Suppose a single family office costs two point seven million a year to run, and a multi family office charges zero point four five per cent of assets.
- Both numbers are assumptions for this example.
- At two hundred and twenty five million, the Brandts would pay about one point zero one million to the multi family office.
- The break even is the wealth at which the two cost the same: two point seven million divided by zero point four five per cent, which is six hundred million.
- The Brandts are at thirty seven point five per cent of that.
- For them the shared office is far cheaper, unless privacy or control justify the extra cost.

22 Example 6: bargaining power over fees

Standard client against the Brandts

Standard client	10m at 1.00%	**100k**
Brandt family	225m at 0.45%	**1.01m**
Cut in the rate	1 − 0.45 ÷ 1.00	**55%**
Assets compared	225m ÷ 10m	**22.5 times**
Fee income compared	1.0125m ÷ 0.1m	**10.1 times**

IN THE LESSON

- Ultra high net worth families can negotiate, and here is what it looks like.
- A standard client with ten million pays one per cent, which is one hundred thousand a year.
- The Brandts negotiate a rate of zero point four five per cent on two hundred and twenty five million, which is about one point zero one million.
- The rate has been cut by fifty five per cent.
- Yet the assets are twenty two and a half times larger, and the fee income for the adviser is about ten times higher.
- A lower rate and a higher bill go together.
- So it is wrong to think of these clients as simply a discounted version of a standard client.

23 Example 7: a bad year for the firm

Business 135m of 225m; liquid wealth 36m

Business share of wealth	135m ÷ 225m	**60%**
Liquid share of wealth	36m ÷ 225m	**16%**
Business falls 30%	30% × 135m	**−40.5m**
All liquid wealth	27m + 9m	**36m**
Loss against liquid wealth	40.5m ÷ 36m	**1.125 times**

IN THE LESSON

- Now the concentration risk.
- The company is one hundred and thirty five million of two hundred and twenty five million, sixty per cent of the family's wealth.
- The liquid assets, the listed investments and the cash, are only thirty six million, sixteen per cent.
- Suppose the timber market slows and the firm loses thirty per cent of its value.
- That is a loss of forty point five million.
- The whole liquid portfolio is thirty six million, so one bad year in the firm costs more than all the liquid wealth put together, one point one two five times as much.
- A model portfolio can never fix that, which is why planning must start from the whole balance sheet.

24 Mira's offer to the Brandt family

What the family expects

One consolidated report →

Privacy and security → Direct and co-invest

What shapes the plan

Business and succession →

Governance and heirs → Negotiated fee

IN THE LESSON

- So what does Mira propose?
- Her offer is built around the family, not the portfolio.
- The top row is what the family expects as a matter of course.
- One consolidated report across every entity and country, in institutional quality.
- Privacy and security, with strict rules on who sees what.
- And access to direct and co investments, which a model portfolio cannot provide.
- The bottom row is what shapes the plan.
- Planning around the business and its succession, working with the family's own lawyers and tax advisers in each jurisdiction.
- Governance, philanthropy and education for the heirs.
- And a fee that is negotiated, not read from a price list.

25 A story: the charter written alone

- Harald drafted a family charter by himself
- It names Jonas head of the family council
- Every member must agree to change any clause
- No review date, and signing at the next dinner

IN THE LESSON

- Harald decides the family needs a charter, and so he writes one over a weekend.
- It names Jonas as head of a new family council.
- It says every family member must agree before any clause can change.
- It has no date for a review.
- He plans to ask everyone to sign it at the next family dinner.
- Harald means well.
- He wants peace after he is gone.
- But Elsa, Linnea and the grandchildren have never seen a word of it, and a rule they did not help write is a rule they may quietly ignore.
- A charter works only if the family believes it belongs to them.

26 Develop, implement, adhere, amend

Starting

Develop: all generations → Implement: roles, rules

Keeping it alive

Adhere: meetings, reports → Amend: agreed procedure

IN THE LESSON

- A governance structure has a life of four stages, and the outcome names all four.
- The top row is about starting.
- Developing the structure should be inclusive, so that every generation feels ownership.
- Implementing it assigns roles, decision rules and education programmes.
- The bottom row is about keeping it alive.
- Adhering is supported by regular meetings, transparent reporting and a conflict resolution process, sometimes with an independent facilitator.
- Amending needs agreed procedures, such as scheduled reviews and a qualified majority.
- The last stage leads back to the first, because the family changes and the structure must change with it.
- Governance is a cycle, not a document.

27 The parts of a governance structure

The charter sets values and rules; four bodies act

Body	Job
Family assembly	All adults
Family council	Elected few
Investment committee	Money rules
Family office	Day to day

IN THE LESSON

- Here are the usual parts.
- The charter, or constitution, sits at the top and sets out the family's values, mission and rules.
- The family assembly brings together all adult members, to share information and discuss values.
- The family council is a smaller elected group that acts between assemblies and speaks for the family.
- An investment committee sets and watches the rules for the family's money, with outside expertise where it helps.
- And where the wealth warrants it, a family office runs the day to day work.
- Each body has its own job, and the roles must be written down, so that nobody guesses who may decide what.

28 Harald's draft, and a better one

Four faults and their fixes

Harald's draft	Better
Written by him alone	Co-written
Jonas heads council	Elected
Unanimity to amend	Qualified vote
No review date	Set reviews

IN THE LESSON

- Let us test Harald's draft against the four stages.
- First, development: he wrote it alone, so it lacks the buy in of the others.
- A better route is to write it together, with every generation in the room.
- Second, implementation: naming Jonas as head of the council hands a key role to one person.
- A better route is an election, with set terms.
- Third, amendment: unanimity is needed to change any clause.
- Fourth, there is no review date at all.
- Better routes are a qualified majority and scheduled reviews.
- The trap is a framework imposed by the founder, or one so rigid that it cannot adapt and is ignored.

29 Example 8: the trouble with unanimity

Assumed: 12 voters, each 10% likely to object

One voter agrees	1 − 10%	**90%**
All twelve agree	0.9 ^ 12	**28.2%**
At least one blocker	1 − 28.2%	**71.8%**
Rule that creates this	change any clause	**12 of 12**

IN THE LESSON

- Let us see why unanimity is dangerous, with a rough illustration.
- Suppose twelve adult family members must all agree to change a clause.
- Assume, for this example, that each person has a ten per cent chance of objecting, and that they decide independently.
- The chance that one person agrees is ninety per cent.
- The chance that all twelve agree is zero point nine to the power of twelve, which is only twenty eight point two per cent.
- So the chance that at least one person blocks the change is seventy one point eight per cent.
- A single holdout can freeze a charter for years, and then the family stops meeting, and the framework dies.

30 Example 9: a qualified majority

Same family; a change needs 75%, which is 9 of 12

Votes needed	75% × 12	**9**
Objectors allowed	12 − 9	**3**
Chance 3 or fewer object	sum of four chances	**97.4%**
Chance a change is blocked	1 − 97.4%	**2.6%**

IN THE LESSON

- Now change the rule.
- A qualified majority of seventy five per cent means nine of the twelve must agree.
- That allows up to three objectors.
- Using the same assumption, the chance that three or fewer people object comes from adding the chances of no objector, one, two and three.
- The total is ninety seven point four per cent.
- So the chance that a change is blocked falls from seventy one point eight per cent to two point six per cent.
- A change still needs wide support, so it cannot be forced through by the founder.
- But it is no longer hostage to one person.
- Many families also keep a higher bar for the few core clauses.

31 Keeping it alive: when to revisit

Scheduled reviews and triggers

Revisit the charter	When
Scheduled review	Every 3 years
Generation hands over	Transition
Firm sale or payout	Liquidity
Marriage, divorce, death	Family change

IN THE LESSON

- A good framework says in advance when it will be reviewed.
- A scheduled review, say every three years, forces the question even when nobody is complaining.
- Then there are triggers, events that call for an early review.
- A generational transition, such as Harald stepping back, changes who holds power.
- A liquidity event, such as the sale of the firm, changes what the family has to govern.
- And family changes, such as a marriage, a divorce or a death, change who is in the room.
- Mira proposes that the Brandts write all of these into the charter, with an independent facilitator for the first review, so that change becomes normal rather than a crisis.

32 Recap: the lesson in five lines

- Wealth carries feelings: map who decides
- Win, understand, counsel, inform, teach
- Ultra-high clients: complexity, not size
- Governance: develop, implement, adhere, amend
- Unanimity blocks; scheduled reviews keep it alive

IN THE LESSON

- Let us pull the lesson together.
- First, wealth carries feelings, and the adviser maps who decides and who is affected, staying neutral.
- Second, the adviser needs five abilities: to win, understand, counsel, inform and teach, and technical skill alone does not keep clients.
- Third, ultra high net worth families differ by complexity, not size, so the Brandts need planning around their business, their countries and their heirs.
- Fourth, governance is developed, implemented, adhered to and amended, as a cycle.
- Fifth, unanimity blocks change, while a qualified majority with scheduled reviews keeps the framework alive.

33 Try three quick questions

1. Firm 90m to son, other 30m to daughter. Move how much?
   Answer: 120m in all, 60m each, so 30m moves to the daughter.
2. Mean 5%, deviation 10%, 10m. One-in-20 bad year loss?
   Answer: 5 − 16.45 = −11.45%, about 1.145m.
3. Own office 3.0m; shared office 0.50%. Break-even?
   Answer: 3.0m ÷ 0.50% = 600m.

IN THE LESSON

- Now try three quick questions yourself.
- Pause after each one.
- Question one.
- A family has a ninety million firm and thirty million of other assets, and the plan gives the firm to the son and the rest to the daughter.
- How much must move to make them equal?
- The total is one hundred and twenty million, so sixty million each, and thirty million must move to the daughter.
- Question two.
- Mean return five per cent, standard deviation ten per cent, on ten million.
- What is the one in twenty bad year loss?
- Five minus sixteen point four five is minus eleven point four five per cent, about one point one four five million.
- Question three.
- A family office costs three million, and a shared office charges half a per cent.
- At what wealth do they cost the same?
- Three million divided by point zero zero five is six hundred million.
- Remember the plain rule: fair is not always equal.