The Fee Opacity Thesis

How Transparency Will Split Wealth Management Into Two Industries

March 2026

A Strategic Analysis for Wealth Advisors and Firm Owners

By Mike Garrison, Founder, Values Based Mindset LLC

In collaboration with Jon Robinson, CEO and Co-Founder, Blueprint Investment Partners

Blueprint Investment Partners provides outsourced investment management services to RIAs.

Audience & Purpose

Audience: Wealth advisors and owners of independent financial advisory firms navigating fee pressure and business model transformation.

Purpose: To help advisors and firm owners understand how fee opacity—not technology alone—is the structural vulnerability driving the repricing of advice, and how to position for one of two emerging practice models over the next 5–15 years.

Executive Summary

The financial advisory industry is not facing a single disruption. It is splitting into two distinct businesses, and fee opacity is the fault line.

For fifty years, the advisory model has relied on a pricing mechanism that most clients do not fully understand. Fees are deducted silently from portfolio assets rather than invoiced. Services—portfolio management, planning, behavioral coaching, tax guidance—are bundled under a single percentage charge, making it difficult to evaluate whether any individual component justifies its cost. And fees scale linearly with account size while the work performed does not. This opacity has been the economic foundation of the advisory industry.

That foundation may be weakening. AI-powered planning tools are making the cost base of advice visible for the first time. The asset-weighted average expense ratio for index equity ETFs has fallen 59% since 2009, reaching just 0.14% in 2024, while the advisory layer on top has remained largely stable at 1% [2]. Generational wealth transfer is shifting approximately $124 trillion to cohorts that expect transparent, modular pricing [39]. Media and litigation are reframing fee structures as consumer harm. And macroeconomic research—including data from the St. Louis Fed Real Time Population Survey and institutional analysis from Citadel Securities—is forcing a more honest assessment of how quickly AI will diffuse through the economy.

As opacity erodes, two fundamentally different practice models are emerging:

The Scale Practice. Technology-first firms that use AI to serve dramatically more clients at lower per-client margins. These practices compete on transparency, efficiency, and accessibility. Their sales process is systematic, their pricing is explicit, and their ideal client values cost clarity over bespoke service. They win by volume.

The Complexity Practice. Relationship-first firms that solve problems AI cannot: multi-generational estate planning, business succession, tax optimization across entities, behavioral stewardship through real crises. Their sales process is consultative, their pricing is justified by demonstrable ROI beyond investment management, and their ideal client has problems worth paying a premium to solve. They win by depth.

The advisors and firms most at risk are those straddling the middle: charging premium fees while delivering commoditized service, relying on opacity to sustain pricing that transparent alternatives will expose. This paper argues that the strategic imperative is not to resist fee compression but to choose a lane and build deliberately for it.

What This Means for Advisors

Fee compression is structural, not cyclical. In many cases, technology has lowered the cost base of portfolio management and routine planning; fee pressure will persist and likely accelerate.

The 1% AUM model is vulnerable to narrative attack. High-profile litigation or public campaigns could rapidly shift client perception of fee fairness, like the NAR real estate settlement [36].

Behavioral coaching alone will not defend current fees. AI tools are increasingly being used to assist with planning, communication, and scenario-modeling functions that advisors have historically bundled into AUM pricing [7][8].

The wealth transfer window creates urgency. As $79 trillion moves from boomers to younger generations over the next 15 years, 70–90% of heirs change advisors—often to lower-fee, digital-native platforms [39][40].

The strategic question is not whether to adapt, but which model to build. Scale practice or complexity practice—straddling both is the highest-risk strategy.

What This Means for Firm Owners

Enterprise value is directly tied to fee sustainability. Buyers apply multiples to revenue; if AUM fees compress 30–50% over the next decade, valuations decline proportionally unless alternative revenue streams are established [A.1].

Valuation will increasingly depend on practice model clarity. Buyers will pay premiums for firms clearly positioned as scale or complexity practices; firms stuck in the middle will face discounted multiples.

The exit timing window is narrowing. Owners planning exits in the next 3–5 years face the highest risk. Accelerating restructuring or exit planning is essential (see Appendix A).

I. The Opacity Foundation

1.1 How Fee Invisibility Built an Industry

The AUM fee model succeeded in large part because it made costs invisible. Unlike a legal retainer, a consulting invoice, or even an insurance premium, the advisory fee is never written as a check. It is deducted from portfolio assets, reducing a number the client may check quarterly at most. Behavioral economics research consistently shows that costs deducted at the source are psychologically less salient than explicit payments.

This invisibility has allowed a pricing structure that would be difficult to sustain under scrutiny. An advisor running the same six-ETF model portfolio for a $500,000 client and a $5 million client performs essentially identical work but generates ten times the revenue from the latter. At 1% AUM, the $5 million client pays $50,000 annually for a service whose delivery cost is functionally indistinguishable from the $5,000 paid by the smaller account [1].

1.2 The Widening Cost-to-Fee Gap

The underlying instruments have become remarkably inexpensive while the advisory layer on top has remained largely stable. The following table illustrates the declining cost of the core investment products that constitute most advisory portfolios:

Year	Index Equity ETF	Index Bond ETF	Cumulative Decline (Equity)
2009	0.34%	~0.25%	— (baseline)
2016	0.23%	0.20%	-32%
2019	0.18%	0.14%	-47%
2022	0.16%	0.11%	-53%
2024	0.14%	~0.10%	-59%

Table 1: Decline in Average Index ETF Expense Ratios (Asset-Weighted). Source: ICI Research Perspective, Vol. 31, No. 1 (March 2025) [2][3] These scenarios are hypothetical illustrations intended solely to demonstrate how varying fee and operating assumptions could affect advisory firm economics. They are not forecasts or projections of actual results.

Yet the advisor's AUM fee—typically 1% on portfolios up to $1 million—has remained largely stable. According to the 2024 Kitces Research, 86% of advisors now use AUM as their primary pricing method [15]. The true all-in cost to clients, including underlying fund expenses, platform fees, and transaction costs, averages approximately 1.65% for portfolios up to $1 million [4][16]. This creates a widening gap between what clients pay and the actual cost of delivering the service.

1.3 The Bundling Defense

The other structural support for current fees is service bundling. Portfolio management, financial planning, tax guidance, behavioral coaching, and client communication are packaged under a single AUM charge. This makes it nearly impossible for clients to evaluate whether any individual component justifies its proportional cost [5].

Bundling is a rational pricing strategy when component costs are genuinely difficult to separate and when alternatives for individual components do not exist. Neither condition holds any longer. AI planning tools like Altruist's Hazel platform now deliver tax planning with interactive scenario modeling for $60 per seat per month [29]. Robo-advisors deliver core portfolio management at 25 basis points [26]. The components that were once inseparable are being priced individually in the market, and the sum of their parts is significantly less than 1% of assets.

1.4 Why "Behavioral Coaching" Is a Fragile Defense

The industry's most persuasive defense of current fee levels rests on the value of behavioral coaching. Vanguards widely cited "Advisor's Alpha" research estimates that advisors can add up to 3% in net returns annually, with behavioral coaching alone contributing 100 to 200 basis points [7]. The argument is that keeping a client from panic-selling during a 30% drawdown provides value that far exceeds the advisory fee.

This defense has merit but is vulnerable on two fronts. First, behavioral coaching is episodic, not continuous—it provides enormous value during market crises but relatively little during the long stretches of normalcy between them. Pricing it as a perpetual percentage of assets is a structural mismatch between fee mechanism and value delivery.

Second, AI-driven tools are beginning to address behavioral management through automated communications, personalized nudging, and real-time scenario modeling. These systems can send proactive messages during market volatility, model "what if I sell now" scenarios instantly and provide 24/7 access to planning reassurance [33]. If AI tools are perceived by some consumers to deliver 60–80% of behavioral coaching value at 5% of the cost, many clients may accept that tradeoff [8][34].

Implications for Your Practice

The value you deliver is real, but the pricing mechanism increasingly appears misaligned with how that value is produced. Clients who understand this gap, or who are told about it by lower-cost competitors, will begin to question the fee structure, regardless of relationship quality. The question is not whether your value justifies a fee, but whether opacity is the right mechanism for pricing it.

1.5 Why Opacity Is Breaking Now

Three forces are converging to erode the opacity that has sustained current fee structures:

Technology makes costs visible. When an AI tool can interpret a client's 1040, model the tax implications of a Roth conversion, and generate a polished report in minutes for $720 per year per advisor seat, the economic argument for charging $30,000 annually to a $3 million client becomes difficult to sustain [29][30]. The cost base of advice is now observable.

Generational expectations are shifting. Approximately $124 trillion in assets will change hands over the next 25 years, with $79 trillion transferred from baby boomers specifically [39]. Research consistently shows that 70–90% of heirs change advisors after inheriting assets [40]. Millennial and Gen Z heirs are unlikely to accept bundled percentage-based pricing as a default.

Litigation is reframing the narrative. The NAR's $418 million settlement in March 2024 demonstrated that class action litigation can reframe an entire industry's fee structure as consumer harm in the public imagination [36]. Notably, the settlement has not yet produced meaningful fee compression—average buyer's agent commissions increased slightly in early 2025 [37]—but it made the existing fee structure visible and questionable in a way it had not been before. A parallel dynamic in financial advisory could produce similar results.

II. What the Macro Data Actually Says

The case for imminent, wholesale disruption of professional services by AI is weaker than much of the popular narrative suggests. Understanding why matters, because it shapes the timeline and nature of the advisory industry's transformation.

2.1 The Adoption Curve Is Not Exponential

St. Louis Fed data from the Real Time Population Survey shows that daily use of AI for work has been unexpectedly stable. Despite rapid improvements in AI capability, the frequency with which working-age adults use generative AI on the job has not shown the upward inflection that an imminent displacement narrative would require.

This is consistent with how every major technology has diffused through the economy. Adoption follows an S-curve: slow and expensive at first, accelerating as costs fall and complementary infrastructure develops, then decelerating as organizational integration costs, regulation, and diminishing marginal returns set in.

The current debate often conflates the recursive potential of AI technology with expectations of recursive economic deployment. Because AI systems can improve themselves, commentators extrapolate a future in which automation compounds exponentially. However, technological capability and economic adoption are different phenomena governed by different constraints.

Indeed job postings for software engineers, the profession most directly exposed to AI automation narratives, are rising 11% year-over-year as of early 2026. This is a concrete data point that cuts against the assumption that AI is already displacing cognitive workers at scale.

2.2 Compute Costs Create a Natural Boundary

Displacing white-collar work at scale requires orders of magnitude more compute intensity than current utilization levels. AI capital expenditure is running at approximately $650 billion annually, roughly 2% of GDP, with approximately 2,800 data centers planned for construction in the United States. If automation expands rapidly, demand for compute rises, pushing up its marginal cost. If the marginal cost of compute rises above the marginal cost of human labor for certain tasks, substitution will not occur.

This creates a natural economic boundary that contrasts sharply with narratives assuming frictionless replication of intelligence. Even if algorithms improve recursively, economic deployment remains bounded by physical capital, energy availability, regulatory approvals, and organizational change. Recursive capability does not imply recursive adoption.

2.3 Complement, Not Just Substitute

The critical question for financial advisors is whether AI will be a complement or a substitute for their work. The macro evidence suggests it will be primarily a complement, but with an important caveat: it will be a complement to the work that is genuinely complex, and a substitute for the work that is routine.

This distinction is precisely what makes fee opacity so dangerous. If an advisor’s practice consists primarily of routine portfolio management and periodic reviews, AI is a direct substitute at a fraction of the cost. If an advisor’s practice consists of navigating multi-entity tax optimization, coordinating estate plans across generations, or stewarding a client through a business sale, AI is a powerful amplifier of the advisor’s expertise. The technology does not determine the outcome. The nature of the work does.

> ***The Keynes Lesson.*** *In 1930, Keynes predicted that productivity growth would reduce the workweek to fifteen hours by the early twenty-first century. He was right about productivity but wrong about labor markets: societies consumed more, not less. Rising productivity expanded the consumption frontier rather than eliminating labor. The lesson for advisors is that AI-driven productivity gains are more likely to expand the addressable market for financial advice than to eliminate the advisor’s role, but only for practices delivering value that justifies engagement.*

III. Lessons from the First Disruption

The current transition is not without precedent. The advisory industry has already split along a transparency fault line once before.

3.1 May Day 1975 and the Deregulation of Commissions

On May 1, 1975, SEC Rule 19b-3 ended 183 years of fixed-rate commission schedules on U.S. national securities exchanges [9]. The immediate effect was a reduction in brokerage commission rates across most major firms, with some offering cuts as high as 50%. Charles Schwab & Co. launched its first retail branch in September 1975 and began marketing low-cost stock trades to individual investors, inaugurating the “discount broker” category [10].

The deregulation forced a fundamental unbundling of financial services. Under the old regime, commissions cross-subsidized research, advice, custody, and execution as a single bundled product. Once commissions became negotiable, full-service brokers had to justify higher fees through demonstrable advisory value, while discount brokers competed purely on execution cost.

3.2 The Rise of Low-Cost Alternatives

Through the 1980s and 1990s, the proliferation of no-load mutual funds, electronic trading platforms, and custodial infrastructure for independent advisors dramatically lowered barriers to diversified investing. Between the early 1970s and the late 2000s, average per-share trading commissions declined approximately 95% [11]. By the time online brokerages launched in the mid-1990s, the transaction cost that had historically justified the broker’s role had been commoditized almost entirely.

The fee-based AUM model emerged as a direct response. If the transaction itself was no longer a viable revenue center, advisors needed a pricing mechanism that captured the value of ongoing portfolio oversight, asset allocation, and client relationships. Schwab, Fidelity, and TD Ameritrade built custodial platforms specifically designed to support independent RIAs, creating the infrastructure for a channel that had not previously existed at scale [12].

3.3 The Parallel to Today

The transition from commissions to AUM took roughly 20–25 years from catalyzing event (May Day 1975) to dominance (late 1990s/early 2000s). Key phases included incumbent resistance (1975–1985), parallel model coexistence (1985–1995), and rapid adoption driven by infrastructure maturation (1995–2005) [44].

The industry’s response followed a pattern that recurs in most disruption cycles. Wirehouse firms (Merrill Lynch, Morgan Stanley, Smith Barney) gradually introduced fee-based options but maintained commission-based revenue well into the 2000s. The independent RIA channel, unburdened by legacy economics, grew at substantially higher rates [13]. Consumer adoption was driven largely by advisor migration, not client demand; the marketing narrative was at least as important as the economic substance [14].

Critically, that first transition also produced a bifurcation: discount brokers competed on transparent, low-cost execution while full-service firms competed on advisory value. The firms that struggled were those in the middle—charging full-service commissions while delivering increasingly commoditized execution. The parallel to the current moment is direct.

Implications for Your Practice

The advisors who moved early to fee-based models captured the growth channel; those who defended commissions lost clients and market share. In the current transition, early adopters of transparent, modular pricing and AI-augmented service delivery are likely to be similarly rewarded. Waiting for clients to demand change typically means negotiating from a position of weakness.

IV. The RIA Landscape Today

Before examining the two emerging practice models, it is worth understanding the current state of the industry: its scale, its concentration, and its vulnerabilities.

4.1 Growth and Concentration

The RIA channel has experienced extraordinary growth. Regulatory assets under management reached approximately $146 trillion in 2024, with total client counts exceeding 69 million [22]. Over the past decade, AUM in the RIA channel expanded at double-digit compound annual growth rates, driven by both market appreciation and net new assets [23].

This growth is increasingly concentrated among larger firms. Cerulli Associates notes that almost all net new growth in the RIA channel is occurring at firms with at least $5 billion in AUM, driven heavily by M&A consolidation [24]. Goldman Sachs Asset Management's 2025 analysis identified this consolidation as a defining structural trend [24].

4.2 The Demographic Cliff

The advisor workforce itself faces a demographic cliff: McKinsey estimates the industry will be short more than 100,000 advisors by 2034, with 37% of current RIA advisors expected to retire within the next decade [25]. This shortage could paradoxically accelerate rather than slow fee compression. As retiring advisors' practices are acquired through consolidation, acquiring firms increasingly rely on standardized model portfolios and technology-driven service delivery. This makes the gap between service delivered and fee charged even more apparent [42]. For a complementary view of how outsourcing and capacity-leverage models can absorb part of the coming shortage, see [55].

4.3 Robo-Advisors: What They Proved

The first generation of technology-driven disruption arrived with robo-advisors in the early 2010s. Betterment (2010) and Wealthfront (2011) offered automated portfolio management at 25 basis points or less. By 2024, Betterment managed approximately $56 billion in assets, while Wealthfront surpassed $40 billion [26]. The combined robo-advisory market reached an estimated $634–754 billion—substantial in absolute terms, but modest relative to the $146 trillion in total RIA assets.

Large institutions both embraced and then partially retreated: Goldman Sachs transferred its Marcus Invest accounts to Betterment in mid-2024, and JPMorgan discontinued its automated investing platform in the same period [27]. Robo-advisors proved that technology can deliver core portfolio management at a fraction of traditional costs. What they did not prove is that technology alone can replace the full advisor relationship [28]. The space between fully automated robo platforms and traditional full-service practices is where most of the practical advisor opportunity now sits [56].

Why This Structure Is Vulnerable

The AUM model has thrived during a multi-decade period of rising asset values, stable fee expectations, and limited technological alternatives. All three conditions are now shifting. Asset growth may slow, client expectations are being reshaped by fintech entrants, and AI tools are making the cost base of advice visible in ways it has never been before.

V. Two Industries, Two Sales Processes

As fee opacity erodes, the advisory industry is not compressing into a single lower-fee model. It is bifurcating into two fundamentally different businesses, each with its own economics, sales process, and ideal client.

5.1 The Scale Practice

Economics

The scale practice uses AI and automation to serve a large client base at transparent, lower-margin pricing. Portfolio management is fully automated. Financial planning is AI-assisted with advisor oversight. Client communication is systematized. The cost to serve each client is low, and pricing reflects that: flat fees of $2,000–$6,000 per year, transparent AUM fees of 0.25–0.50%, or subscription models with tiered service levels.

Sales Process

The sales process is efficient and systematized. Marketing is digital and content driven. Client acquisition relies on demonstrating value through transparent pricing, clear service descriptions, and technology-enabled onboarding. The advisor's role in the sales process is to confirm fit and set expectations, not to build deep personal rapport before engagement. Discovery calls are short. Proposals are standardized. The conversion funnel is optimized for volume.

Ideal Client

The ideal client values cost clarity, digital access, and competent management over bespoke attention. They are often younger, digitally native, and accumulating wealth. Their financial situation is meaningful but not deeply complex: solid investment management, basic tax optimization, retirement projections, and periodic planning reviews. They do not need or want to pay $30,000 per year for quarterly meetings.

Competitive Moat

The moat is operational efficiency and client experience. The practice that delivers the best technology-enabled service at the lowest cost wins. This is a business that rewards scale, infrastructure investment, and continuous improvement in automation. It is difficult for solo practitioners to compete here without platform support.

For Scale-Practice Advisors

Adopt AI aggressively. Platforms like Hazel and Holistiplan allow you to deliver comprehensive planning at dramatically lower marginal cost [29][51]. The goal is to reduce cost-to-serve by 50–70%, enabling profitable operations at transparent pricing.

Optimize for client count, not AUM. Technology makes serving 500–1,000+ households operationally feasible. Systematize onboarding, standardize proposals, and build digital marketing funnels.

Price transparently. Flat fees, subscriptions, or low AUM rates with explicit service menus. Transparency is your competitive advantage against incumbents relying on opacity.

5.2 The Complexity Practice

Economics

The complexity practice uses AI as an amplifier of expert judgment, not a substitute for it. The advisor's value lies in solving problems that require integration across tax, estate, business succession, charitable strategy, and behavioral stewardship during high-stakes transitions. AI handles research, modeling, and documentation; the advisor handles synthesis, judgment, and the client relationship. Pricing is premium and justified by demonstrable ROI: retainers of $15,000–$75,000+ annually, or AUM fees that reflect genuine complexity.

Sales Process

The sales process is consultative and relationship driven. It begins with a deep discovery process that surfaces complexity the client may not have fully articulated. The advisor demonstrates expertise by identifying issues the client had not considered, modeling scenarios that reveal risk or opportunity, and presenting a coordinated strategy across domains. The sale is not about price; it is about competence and trust. Closing timelines are longer. Referral networks are the primary acquisition channel.

Ideal Client

The ideal client has financial situations that genuinely require expert coordination: business owners navigating succession, families managing multi-generational wealth transfer, executives with concentrated stock positions, individuals facing complex tax situations across jurisdictions, or clients experiencing major life transitions where the stakes of poor advice are high.

Competitive Moat

The moat is expertise, judgment, and the trust built through demonstrating it. This is a business that rewards deep specialization, credentialing, and a track record of solving difficult problems. AI makes these advisors more productive, but it does not replicate what they do.

For Complexity-Practice Advisors

Use AI as an amplifier. AI handles the research, modeling, and documentation that consume advisory hours. You handle the synthesis, judgment, and client stewardship that require expertise [51].

Specialize and credential. The complexity practice's moat is expertise. Specialization in business succession, multi-generational estate planning, executive compensation, or cross-border tax creates defensible positioning.

Price on value delivered, not assets managed. The advisor who surfaces $200,000 in tax savings during a discovery meeting does not face fee objections.

5.3 The Missing Mechanism: How Either Practice Actually Gets Built

Both the Scale Practice and the Complexity Practice are achievable. But there is a step between deciding on a practice model and actually operating as one that tends to get glossed over: the advisor has to give something up first.

Most independent advisors arrived at their current model by accumulating responsibilities over time. Portfolio management, financial planning, tax coordination, client communication, compliance, onboarding — all of it lands on the same person or small team. The result is a practice that is often growing but operationally maxed out. Every hour spent rebalancing accounts, researching positions, or explaining basic financial planning principles is an hour not spent on the activities that actually define each practice model — the digital marketing and onboarding infrastructure a Scale Practice depends on, or the deep discovery and scenario modeling a Complexity Practice is sold on.

The path to either set of economics runs directly through that tension. The advisors who have successfully made the transition share a common trait: they made a deliberate decision about what they would stop doing themselves.

The Outsourcing Decision

For most practices, investment management is the highest-leverage function to outsource — not because it is unimportant, but because it is time-intensive, requires continuous attention, and is increasingly commoditized in the client's perception. Despite this, roughly 78% of advisor practices are still building or managing portfolios primarily in-house [53]. That figure represents an enormous amount of advisor time spent on a function that a specialized manager could handle.

The payoff is concrete. Advisors who outsource investment management reclaim an average of nine hours per work week, with the majority reporting they redirect that time toward client relationships [54]. Nine hours a week is not a rounding error. It is the difference between a practice that is running the advisor and one the advisor is actually running.

In practical terms, outsourcing:

- Frees advisor time for the activities that are hardest to replicate.
- Shifts the cost of continuous research and trading infrastructure off the advisor's balance sheet.
- Introduces professionally managed portfolio infrastructure that most solo or small-team practices cannot replicate internally.
- Creates a clean division of labor that is easier to explain to clients than the alternative, where the advisor is doing everything.

This is not about removing the advisor from the investment process. The advisor still owns the client relationship, sets the risk parameters, and makes the asset allocation call. What changes is who handles day-to-day execution — and how much advisor time that frees up for everything else.

The Behavioral Dividend of Process-Driven Investing

As Section 1.4 argues, behavioral coaching is a fragile defense of current fee levels: episodic, mostly valuable during crises, and increasingly replicable by AI. An alternative is an investment process that structurally reduces the need for behavioral intervention in the first place.

Process-driven investing — systematic, rules-based, or model-driven strategies — refers to approaches governed by a defined, repeatable set of conditions. Positions are initiated and exited based on observable signals, not manager discretion or market predictions. The process answers four questions with explicit, predetermined rules: what to buy, how much to buy, when to sell at a loss, and when to sell at a gain.

When a client asks, "Why did you make this move?" the answer is not, "Because I believe the market is heading in this direction" — a claim that is impossible to verify. The answer is, "Because the process triggered a signal based on these observable conditions" — auditable, consistent, and not dependent on predicting the unpredictable. That distinction matters more as clients, and their heirs, become more sophisticated about asking the question.

Because many process-driven strategies use pre-defined rules designed to reduce exposure during sustained market deterioration and restore it once conditions stabilize, they introduce risk management by process, not by conversation. The intended client benefit is not just better risk-adjusted returns over time; it is a smoother experience that generates fewer panic-driven calls and reduces temptations toward emotionally driven decisions.

A client who understands that their portfolio has a built-in process for managing risk is a fundamentally different client to work with than one who is waiting to see how bad things will get before their advisor acts. The former has confidence in the process. The latter has only confidence in the relationship — which is real, but fragile under sustained pressure.

What This Means for Fee Defensibility

Much of the fee opacity debate focuses on how advisors price their services. Less attention has been paid to how they manage investments — and whether the investment process itself contributes to or undermines fee defensibility.

When an advisor handles portfolio management, financial planning, client communication, and business operations simultaneously, the bundled AUM fee covers all of it in an undifferentiated way — precisely the structure this thesis identifies as vulnerable. Clients cannot see what they are paying for because everything is mixed together.

When an advisor outsources investment management and redirects their time toward the appropriate Scale or Complexity Practice activities, the fee conversation changes. The advisor is no longer defending a percentage charge that vaguely covers "everything." They are charging for a clearly defined set of services that sit on top of a transparent, institutionally managed portfolio. Advisors who have made this transition consistently report that fee conversations with clients become easier, because clients can see the distinction between what the investment manager does and what the advisor does.

The opacity that today is a structural vulnerability for the industry begins to dissolve naturally — not through a pricing overhaul, but through a clearer division of what the advisor actually does.

Questions to Ask Before Making the Move

- What percentage of my working hours go to portfolio management and trading? What would I do with that time if it were freed up?
- Is my current investment process genuinely differentiated in a way clients understand and value, or is it functionally similar to what a specialized manager could deliver?
- Do I have a tax-aware investment process — and if not, what is the after-tax cost to clients of not having one?
- How would I communicate this change to clients in a way that frames it as an upgrade rather than a concession?

Advisors who work through those questions honestly tend to reach a clear answer quickly. The ones who resist are often those who have conflated portfolio management with their identity as an advisor — a conflation the current environment is making increasingly hard to sustain.

VI. The Dangerous Middle

The practices most at risk are those that occupy neither position clearly. They charge complexity based practice fees while delivering scale based practice service. They rely on fee opacity to sustain this gap.

These are practices where the advisor manages $100–$400 million in model portfolios of index funds, conducts annual reviews, performs occasional tax-loss harvesting, and charges 1% AUM. The service is competent but routine. The value is real but does not justify the fee when alternatives exist. And alternatives increasingly do exist.

The middle is dangerous because it is where most of the industry currently sits. According to the 2024 Kitces Research, 86% of advisors use AUM as their primary pricing method, and the median blended rate is approximately 1% [15]. Most of these advisors are delivering a service that technology can replicate at a fraction of the cost. These longstanding pricing structures might only continue to survive because many clients have not yet been presented with a transparent comparison.

When that comparison arrives—through a competitor's marketing, a lawsuit's headlines, a viral social media campaign, or an heir's due diligence after inheriting assets—the advisor in the middle has no defensible position. They cannot compete on cost with the scale practice. They cannot compete on expertise with the complexity practice. Their only chance of competing may be on inertia, and inertia is a depreciating asset.

The Question Every Advisor Should Ask

If my clients could see a transparent breakdown of what I do, what it costs me to deliver, and what alternatives exist at what price, would they stay at my current fee? If the answer is uncertain, you are in the middle.

6.1 Exiting the Middle

Audit your service delivery. What percentage of your clients have genuinely complex financial situations? For how many are you delivering a service that AI could replicate within three years? The answers determine which direction to move.

Choose a direction. Either invest in the technology and operational infrastructure to serve more clients at lower cost or invest in the expertise and credentialing to solve problems that justify premium fees. Trying to do both with a single practice model is the highest-risk strategy. Section 5.3 outlines the operational mechanism — what to stop doing — that turns this choice into a real transition rather than a stated intent.

Make your value stack visible. Most clients do not understand what they pay for beyond "you manage my money." Create explicit service menus that break out portfolio management, financial planning, tax coordination, estate planning support, behavioral coaching, and ongoing communication [50].

Document and communicate value delivered. Produce annual value reports that quantify tax-loss harvesting savings, behavioral coaching impact, planning recommendations implemented, and coordination with CPAs, attorneys, and other professionals.

Initiate the fee conversation before clients do. Proactively explain how your fees are structured, what clients receive, and how you use technology to deliver more value at competitive cost [52]. Clients who understand and trust your fee structure are far less likely to leave when a lower-cost alternative presents itself.

VII. Catalysts That Can Force Faster Repricing

7.1 Litigation as Narrative Catalyst

The legal framework governing advisory fees currently favors incumbents. The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Jones v. Harris Associates established that investment adviser fees violate Section 36(b) of the Investment Company Act only if they are "so disproportionately large that they bear no reasonable relationship to the services rendered" [35]. This standard places a heavy burden on plaintiffs.

However, the strategic value of litigation may be more about narrative than legal outcomes. The NAR's $418 million settlement in March 2024 reframed real estate commissions as consumer harm in the public imagination, even though commissions have not actually declined [36][37]. The most plausible scenario involves a well-funded fintech company funding class action litigation as a combined legal, marketing, and competitive strategy: legal fees become customer acquisition spend, the lawsuit generates media attention that functions as brand awareness, and the narrative shift erodes incumbent pricing power regardless of the legal outcome [38].

7.2 The Great Wealth Transfer

Cerulli Associates estimates that approximately $124 trillion in assets will change hands over the next 25 years, with $79 trillion transferred from baby boomers [39]. Millennials are projected to inherit $46 trillion, the largest share of any generation. The advisory industry's vulnerability lies in failing to retain heirs: 70–90% change advisors after inheriting assets [40].

Gen X stands to inherit $14 trillion within the next decade, but the larger millennial transfer will accelerate through the 2030s. This creates a window of approximately 10–15 years during which the combination of asset transfer and generational preference could fundamentally alter the fee landscape [41].

7.3 The Advisor Shortage as Accelerant

The projected shortage of more than 100,000 advisors by 2034 could paradoxically accelerate fee compression [25]. As retiring advisors' practices are acquired, consolidators rely on standardized portfolios and technology-driven delivery, making the gap between service and fee more apparent [42]. Large aggregators and PE-backed platforms have both the capital to invest in AI infrastructure and the incentive to drive efficiency at scale [43].

Implications for Your Book Over the Next 5–10 Years

Even if litigation fails legally, it can shift client expectations overnight. If your client base skews older and you have not built relationships with their heirs, you are at significant risk of losing 70–90% of transferred assets. Advisors who have already made their fees and value delivery transparent will be insulated. Those relying on fee invisibility will be vulnerable.

VIII. Three Timelines for the Opacity Collapse

The pace at which fee opacity erodes will determine whether the bifurcation is a manageable transition or a disruptive event.

Scenario 1: Gradual Erosion (10–15 Years)

Technology improves incrementally. Fee compression proceeds through competitive pressure and generational transfer. Adoption follows the historical S-curve. The median AUM fee declines from 1.00% to 0.50–0.65% over the next decade [46]. This scenario is most consistent with the macro adoption data and the historical pace of technology diffusion.

Revenue Impact

If you manage $100 million at 1% today ($1 million in revenue), gradual compression to 0.65% reduces revenue to $650,000 (a 35% decline) unless you grow AUM, add subscription revenue, or reduce cost-to-serve through AI adoption.

Scenario 2: Catalyst-Driven Acceleration (5–8 Years)

A well-funded fintech combines AI-native advisory delivery with litigation-as-marketing. Public awareness of the fee-to-service gap increases dramatically. The median AUM fee reaches 0.40–0.50% within five to eight years. In this scenario, the middle could collapse faster than expected [47].

Revenue Impact

Revenue compression to $400,000–$500,000 on the same $100 million book forces immediate restructuring. Solo and small practices without differentiated service offerings become economically unviable.

Scenario 3: Structural Break (3–5 Years)

A major regulatory action, such as an SEC mandate for fee-to-service disclosure, or a viral awareness campaign fundamentally could alter client expectations. The AUM model fragments rapidly. Flat-fee and subscription models become dominant [48].

Revenue Impact

AUM pricing becomes untenable except for clients above $10–20 million. Revenue shifts to subscription ($5,000–15,000/year/household) or retainer models. Advisors managing 100 households at $8,000 average subscription generate $800,000, comparable to current levels, but the service model must completely transform.

	Gradual (10–15 yr)	Accelerated (5–8 yr)	Structural (3–5 yr)
Median AUM Fee	0.50–0.65%	0.40–0.50%	Subscription replaces AUM
Scale Practice Revenue ($100M)	$500K–$650K	$400K–$500K	$6K–$10K/household
Complexity Practice Impact	Premium narrows modestly	Premium survives for genuine complexity	Premium strengthens (flight to quality)
Middle Practice Viability	Margin compression	Existential pressure	Collapse

Table 2: Fee Compression Scenarios and Practice-Model Impact

These scenarios are hypothetical illustrations intended solely to demonstrate how varying fee and operating assumptions could affect advisory firm economics. They are not forecasts or projections of actual results.

IX. Conclusion

Fee opacity is not a feature of the advisory business model. It is a vulnerability. It has sustained pricing that the underlying economics do not support, and the forces eroding it (technology, generational change, competitive pressure, and public narrative) are intensifying.

The macro evidence suggests this erosion will follow a curve, not a cliff. AI adoption has not yet inflected upward in the way imminent-disruption narratives assume. Compute costs impose real constraints on the pace of deployment. Historical technology diffusion has followed S-curves, not exponentials. The advisors who build for a five to fifteen-year transition, rather than either ignoring the shift or panicking about it, are making the highest-probability bet.

But the direction is clear. The advisory industry appears to be evolving toward two dominant business models: one that competes on scale and transparency, and one that competes on expertise and demonstrated value. The advisors and firms that choose their lane early and build for it deliberately will define the next era of wealth management. Those who remain in the middle, relying on the opacity that built the current model, may find that their most important competitive advantage is the one most likely to disappear.

The Bottom Line

The advisors who thrived in the commission-to-AUM transition were those who moved early, rebuilt their practices around the new model, and captured the growth channel. The same dynamic is unfolding now. Choose your lane (scale or complexity) redesign your pricing, make your value visible, and build deliberately. The next 5–10 years will define which advisors lead the industry forward and which are left defending an obsolete model.

Appendix A: Implications for Firm Owners

This appendix addresses the specific concerns of owners of independent financial advisory firms regarding how fee compression scenarios and the scale/complexity bifurcation affect enterprise value, operating margins, and strategic exit timing.

A.1 Valuation Under the Two Models

Independent RIA firms are currently valued at 2.0× to 8.0× recurring revenue, with multiples driven by firm size, growth rate, client demographics, and operational efficiency [A.1]. As fee transparency increases, buyers will increasingly differentiate between practice models:

Scale practices valued on client count, technology infrastructure, and operational efficiency—potentially at higher revenue multiples because the revenue model is defensible against further compression.

Complexity practices valued on advisor expertise, client complexity, and retention—at premium multiples because the revenue source is structurally differentiated.

Middle practices valued at steep discounts because revenue is perceived as vulnerable to compression and client attrition once transparency increases.

Scenario	Blended AUM Fee	Revenue ($10M base)	Enterprise Value (4×)
Current State	1.00%	$10.0M	$40.0M
Gradual Compression (10–15 yr)	0.65%	$6.5M	$26.0M
Accelerated Disruption (5–8 yr)	0.45%	$4.5M	$18.0M
Structural Break (3–5 yr)	Subscription model	$6–8M	$24–32M

Table A.1: Enterprise Value Sensitivity to Fee Compression (illustrative, $1B AUM baseline, 4× revenue multiple). These scenarios are hypothetical illustrations intended solely to demonstrate how varying fee and operating assumptions could affect advisory firm economics. They are not forecasts or projections of actual results.

A.2 Operating Margin Implications

Scenario 1: Gradual Compression

Firms that proactively adopt AI can maintain or improve margins despite fee compression. Example: A 10-advisor firm managing $1 billion at 1% ($10M revenue, 40% margin = $4M profit) faces compression to 0.65%. If AI allows each advisor to manage 40% more assets: new AUM reaches $1.4B at 0.65% = $9.1M revenue, with costs rising modestly to $6.5M. New margin: 28% ($2.6M profit). Firms that do not adopt technology see revenue fall to $6.5M against $6M in costs, driving margins to near zero.

Scenario 2: Accelerated Disruption

Rapid compression to 0.40–0.50% forces immediate restructuring: hybrid pricing to stabilize revenue, aggressive AI adoption to reduce delivery costs, and consolidation for economies of scale. Without restructuring, $1B at 0.45% generates $4.5M revenue against $6M costs, a $1.5M annual loss.

Scenario 3: Structural Break

The AUM model fragments entirely. Firms transition to subscription: 1,000 households at $7,500 average = $7.5M revenue. Margins depend entirely on technology leverage and service tier design. Firms that transition successfully maintain 30–40% margins; those that fail exit the industry.

A.3 Strategic Exit Timing

Exits in the next 3–5 years: Highest urgency. If Scenario 2 or 3 unfolds, valuations for middle-positioned firms could decline 40–60%. Either accelerate the exit or demonstrate clear repositioning toward scale or complexity.

Exits in 5–10 years: Time to adapt but narrowing. Redesign pricing, invest in AI infrastructure or expertise depth, and document results. Buyers in 2030–2035 will heavily discount firms still dependent on opaque 1% AUM pricing.

Exits beyond 10 years: Assume the current AUM model will not exist in its present form. Build from the start around transparent pricing—whether that means scale-practice efficiency or complexity-practice expertise.

A.4 M&A Strategy

If considering acquisitions: Avoid paying current multiples (4–6×) for firms dependent on 1% AUM without clear technology adoption plans. Target firms that have already transitioned to hybrid pricing, demonstrate strong next-generation client relationships, and have adopted AI tools.

If considering selling: Maximize valuation by positioning as "transition-ready": demonstrate hybrid pricing adoption, show AI efficiency gains, document next-generation client engagement, and provide scenario modeling under multiple fee compression levels.

If building for independence: Double down on technology leverage and pricing innovation. The firms that thrive will use AI to deliver exceptional service at 50–70% of incumbent cost structures.

A.5 Key Questions Every Firm Owner Should Be Asking

1. What percentage of our revenue would survive if AUM fees declined to 0.50% over the next 7 years?

2. Do we have alternative revenue streams (planning fees, tax services, subscriptions) that could replace lost AUM revenue?

3. What is our current cost to serve a client, and how much could we reduce it with AI-driven tools?

4. How good is our client acquisition process? Can predict success in either or both evolving practice models?

5. Are we building relationships with the children and heirs of our primary clients?

6. Are we clearly positioned as a scale practice, a complexity practice, or are we stuck in the middle?

7. If we sold today vs. in 5 years under Scenario 2, what is the difference in enterprise value?

8. Are we positioned as a buyer, a seller, or a long-term independent in the consolidating RIA landscape?

The Window Is Narrowing

Fee compression is not just an advisor practice management issue—it is a firm-level strategic and financial risk that directly impacts enterprise value, operating margins, and exit optionality. The decisions you make in the next 24–36 months will determine whether you exit at a premium or at a discount—or whether you exit on your terms at all.

References

[1] Author analysis based on industry service delivery norms.

[2] ICI Research Perspective, Vol. 31, No. 1 (March 2025), "Trends in the Expenses and Fees of Funds, 2024." Available at ici.org/files/2025/per31-01.pdf.

[3] ICI, "Mutual Fund Expense Ratios Have Declined Substantially over the Past 27 Years," ici.org (2024).

[4] Bob Veres, Inside Information advisor fee study; reported all-in cost averaging 1.65% for portfolios up to $1 million. See also Kitces.com independent advisor fee comparison.

[5] Author analysis.

[7] Vanguard, "Putting a Value on Your Value: Quantifying Vanguard Advisor's Alpha" (August 2022).

[8] Author analysis based on emerging AI behavioral coaching tools.

[9] SEC, "In the Midst of Revolution: The SEC, 1973–1981," sechistorical.org.

[10] Jason Zweig, "How May Day Remade Wall Street," jasonzweig.com.

[11] Author synthesis of industry data on trading cost evolution.

[12] Industry sources: Schwab, Fidelity, TD Ameritrade platform histories.

[13] Author analysis of wirehouse vs. RIA channel growth data.

[14] Author analysis of advisor migration patterns and client adoption drivers.

[15] Michael Kitces, "How Financial Advisors Actually Charge for Their Services," kitces.com (2024 Kitces Research).

[16] Bob Veres, Inside Information advisor fee study.

[22] SEC Investment Adviser Statistics (2024); Cerulli Associates.

[24] Goldman Sachs Asset Management, "Unlocking Growth: The Rise of RIAs and the Road Ahead" (2025). Cerulli Associates RIA channel concentration data.

[25] McKinsey & Co., cited in IAA/CircleBlack: the industry will be short 100,000+ advisors by 2034.

[26] Statista Market Forecast, Robo-Advisors Worldwide (2025); Betterment and Wealthfront AUM reports.

[27] Industry sources: Goldman Sachs Marcus Invest transfer to Betterment; JPMorgan automated investing platform discontinuation (2024).

[28] Author analysis.

[29] Altruist, "Altruist Unveils Hazel, an AI Platform Built for Wealth Professionals" (September 2025); BusinessWire (February 2026). $60/seat/month.

[30] Author analysis.

[33] Author analysis of emerging AI behavioral coaching platforms.

[34] Author analysis.

[35] Jones v. Harris Associates L.P., 559 U.S. 335 (2010).

[36] NAR Settlement, March 2024. $418 million. See nar.realtor.

[37] Kiplinger, "Why a Landmark Real Estate Commission Settlement Hasn't Lowered Costs for Homebuyers" (2025). Redfin data: buyer's agent commissions rose to 2.40% in Q1 2025.

[38] Author analysis.

[39] Cerulli Associates, "The Great Wealth Transfer" (June 2025); Fortune (July 2025). $124 trillion through 2048, $79 trillion from baby boomers, $46 trillion to millennials.

[40] Author synthesis of industry research on heir retention rates (70–90% change advisors).

[41] Cerulli Associates wealth transfer timeline data. Gen X: $14 trillion in next decade.

[42] Author analysis.

[43] Author analysis.

[44] Author synthesis of commission-to-AUM transition timeline.

[46]–[48] Author scenario modeling.

[50]–[52] Author recommendations based on industry best practices.

[53] Cerulli Associates, 2024 U.S. Advisor Metrics: 78% of advisor practices build or manage portfolios primarily in-house.

[54] 8 Acre Perspective, 2024 advisor outsourcing study: advisors who outsource investment management reclaim an average of nine hours per work week; 72% redirect that time toward client relationships.

[55] Blueprint IP, “Solutions Coming for the Financial Advisor Shortage,” blueprintip.com/blog/solutions-coming-financial-advisor-shortage.

[56] Blueprint IP, “The Sweet Spot Between Robo-Advice and the Dinosaurs,” blueprintip.com/blog/sweet-spot-between-robo-advice-and-the-dinosaurs.

[A.1] Based on Schwab, Fidelity, and industry M&A data (2024–2026): typical RIA valuations range 2–8× revenue.

Macro data and adoption analysis in Section II draws on: Citadel Securities, “2026 Global Intelligence Crisis,” citadelsecurities.com (2026); St. Louis Fed Real Time Population Survey; Indeed job postings data; BLS; US Census Bureau new business applications.

Important Disclosures:

This material reflects the views and opinions of the authors as of March 2026 and is provided for informational and educational purposes only. Statements regarding future industry developments, fee compression, adoption trends, regulatory developments, or advisor business models are forward-looking statements based on current assumptions and available information. Actual outcomes may differ materially.

References to specific technologies, firms, platforms, investment approaches, or industry developments are for illustrative purposes only and do not constitute endorsements or recommendations.

Any discussion of investment processes, systematic strategies, or risk management approaches is general in nature and should not be interpreted as a guarantee of investment performance, downside protection, tax outcomes, client retention, or business results.

Nothing herein constitutes legal, regulatory, accounting, tax, or investment advice.