

House of Representatives – Standing Committee on Economics  
Wednesday, 16 October 2019

ASIC responses to Questions on Notice

---

QoN Number: 2

Hansard Page Ref: 5 & 6

Question

**Dr LEIGH:** Following on about a decision to go into SMSFs, Ms Press, perhaps you can remind us what the average returns are for low-balance SMSFs? In particular, am I correct in thinking that below around \$200,000 SMSFs actually produced negative returns, on average?

**Ms Press:** Yes, they did, on average. For the periods in 2016-17—can I take that on notice and give you the break-up of those returns, please?

Answer

SMSF average ROA by fund size, 2012-13 to 2016-17

Fund size	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
\$1 - \$50k	-17.29%	-12.57%	-17.43%	-17.27%	-14.67%
>\$50k - \$100k	-5.22%	-2.86%	-6.78%	-7.27%	-5.39%
>\$100k - \$200k	0.82%	1.50%	-1.05%	-3.41%	-0.48%
>\$200k - \$500k	6.34%	5.88%	2.42%	0.04%	4.65%
>\$500k - \$1m	9.29%	8.32%	4.59%	1.50%	7.01%
>\$1m - \$2m	10.64%	9.58%	5.70%	2.33%	8.37%
>\$2m	11.61%	11.30%	7.54%	4.66%	12.89%

Source: ATO's [Self-managed super funds: a statistical overview 2016–17](#)<sup>1</sup>, Table 23

For the period 2016-17 (and the preceding two financial years), SMSFs with a balance of less than \$200,000 had a negative return on assets (ROA) when compared to SMSFs with a balance of more than \$200,000.

In 2016-17, the ROA for SMSFs with a balance of more than \$100,000, but less than \$200,000 was -0.48%, whereas the ROA for SMSFs with a balance of more than \$200,000, but less than \$500,000 was 4.65%.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 2016–17 statistical overview is currently the most recent annual statistical report provided by the ATO.