

The Private Markets Forum

THE PRIVATE MARKETS FORUM

Evergreen Funds Are Scaling. What Infrastructure Does That Require?

Buying evergreen funds has become easier.
Holding, redeeming and rebalancing them is still largely manual.

Findings from interviews with advisors, fund managers, wealth platforms and infrastructure providers

NOVEMBER 2026

IN PARTNERSHIP WITH

monark

info@private-markets.com

www.private-markets.com

Executive Summary

> ***"Alts are ten percent of clients' portfolios, but advisors have to spend fifty to sixty percent of their time on them."***
>
> A head of investor services at a fund manager

That time goes to paperwork, records that do not match, and slow redemptions. The volume is set to grow. Evergreen funds have become a leading way for wealth investors to reach private markets. The next step is holding them inside model portfolios and other managed accounts at scale.

A model portfolio trades the same holdings across thousands of client accounts on a fixed schedule. To fit, an evergreen fund has to pass three tests. It has to be easy to buy for many accounts, easy to track once held, and easy to redeem when the portfolio rebalances. We asked advisors, fund managers, wealth platforms, custodians, transfer agents, fund administrators and data providers whether evergreen funds pass those tests today. Here is what we found.

1. **Most evergreen funds are still bought and serviced one client account at a time.**

   Interval funds and some other registered funds trade by ticker, like mutual funds. Most other evergreen funds need paperwork and manual steps for every client. Participants across the chain described the same problem.

2. **Buying is easier, but most funds still need a subscription document for every client.**

   One advisor wanted to put 150 clients into six funds. That meant 900 documents. The fix that helps most is taking the paperwork off the client. Interval funds do it by trading on a ticker. Some firms do it by signing for their clients. But the document is how a fund manager checks that each investor is allowed to buy. Whoever takes over that check also takes on the risk of getting it wrong. That is why the change is slow.

3. **Once clients own a fund, the records across firms often do not match.**

   Every firm in the chain keeps its own record of who owns what. No one works from a single shared record, so the records drift apart. Advisors see the result: values that arrive months late, purchases that do not show up, and transfers between firms that take months.

4. **Redemptions are slow and manual. Partial fills add more work.**

   A redemption can take weeks to settle. When requests exceed a fund's limit, each investor gets only part of what they asked for. The rest usually has to be resubmitted the next quarter. The recent wave of capped redemptions showed this in practice. The funds followed their own rules, and advisors we interviewed said few clients raised it. Several participants said the bigger problem was how the funds had been described and understood. Clients heard "quarterly liquidity." They missed the limits.

5. **Model portfolios are the hardest test. Buying, tracking and redeeming all have to work together.**

   A model rebalances on fixed dates. Most evergreen funds can be redeemed only on their own dates, and sometimes only in part. So the model cannot rebalance on time. A bank team that already runs a model with these funds said shifting a position can take quarters or even years, and model platforms are still building the automation. Combining clients into fewer accounts at the fund, through funds of funds or omnibus accounts, would cut paperwork and volume. Some see tokenized records as another way to do the same. Participants said none of these would fix rebalancing on its own.

6. **Three things slow progress: familiarity, incentives and disagreement.**

   Familiarity is uneven. People from mutual funds know tools like omnibus accounts well. Many in private markets had not heard of them. Not everyone gains from change. Some transfer agents and fund administrators are paid per account, so fewer accounts would mean less revenue. And firms disagree on the fixes, such as whether to standardize the subscription document or remove it, and on who should set standards.

Why This Matters Now

Evergreen funds made private markets easier for wealth investors to reach. There are no capital calls. The full amount is invested at the start. The fund offers redemptions at set intervals, within limits.

They also suit fee-based advisory accounts. A senior wealth management executive said drawdown funds raise questions about charging fees on committed capital that is not yet invested. Evergreen funds avoid that problem.

The growth shows across the chain. The same executive said evergreens now make up most of his firm's alternatives sales. One fund administrator said its number of evergreen private credit funds is growing at twice the pace of its drawdown funds. "What was a manual process for a couple of funds… now the sheer volume makes that nearly impossible," a senior executive there said.

The next step is the model portfolio. **Broadridge projects model portfolio assets will reach $18.6 trillion by 2030.**[1] **Private markets barely feature in them today.** A senior executive at a large fund manager said investors in public-only managed accounts, and their advisors, are "effectively 0% penetrated by private-market assets."

Several platforms launched combined public and private models in 2025 and 2026. They are early, and most use interval funds.[2] The reason is simple. Interval funds trade by ticker, like mutual funds. **Most other evergreen funds need a subscription document for every purchase. That makes them hard to fit into a model.** The difference runs through this report. (The appendix compares the main types of evergreen fund, including how each is bought and redeemed.)

Models raise the bar. A model buys and sells across thousands of accounts on a fixed schedule. **Today's process already struggles at a far smaller scale.**

Operations are not the only barrier. The CIO of a large wealth manager would not put evergreens in models: "We would never do that." He also asked: "Should they? And what is the cost of doing that?"

An asset manager's research on its interval fund found that advisors ask more about where it fits in a portfolio than about how it clears. **Better operations will not answer those questions. They will make it easier to act on the answer, for many clients at once.**

1. Subscriptions Are Easier than Redemptions, but Most Still Need a Document for Each Client

The subscription document has received more fixes than any other part of the process. It is still the complaint we heard most often.

A broker-dealer executive described an advisor who wanted to put 150 clients into six funds. That meant 900 documents. "Even if each one took 15 minutes… you don't get to the scale of ticker trading," he said.

Errors add to the load. A fund manager's head of investor services still sees 5% to 10% of subscriptions come back not in good order. Reviews are inconsistent too. A custodian sent about 20 identical subscriptions for the same fund. One was rejected over a stamp that appeared on all of them.

> ***"People, paper, emails, and files."***
>
> An infrastructure head at a custodian, on how an alternatives order is processed today

Why the document is hard to fix

Two things stand in the way. First, every fund manager writes its own version. A custodian's product lead said managers "are effectively meeting the same regulatory requirements, just with different words." Second, the document does a job. It records the manager's checks on each investor. It is hard to remove because "the GP is taking on the risk on each individual client," the same product lead said.

Four kinds of fixes

- **Easier documents.** Platforms pre-fill client data, add e-signature and connect directly to custodians. A European platform builder said a digital subscription document is "already a 10x improvement." He also said that even standardized documents are "still a manual process."
- **Standard data.** Several participants want one set of fields that every manager accepts. A senior executive at a large fund manager described "whatever those twenty data elements are that standardize a sub-doc."
- **Fewer documents or signatures.** Funds of funds put many funds behind one subscription, so a client signs once instead of once per fund. Feeder funds put many investors behind one subscription at the underlying fund. Pooling clients into one account at the fund would do the same. Some platforms try to bundle several documents under one signature. One advisor paused new evergreen purchases and is building a fund for his firm, so that "we buy with one piece of paper, we sell with one piece of paper."
- **Taking the document out of each trade.** This happens in three ways:
  - *No document at all.* Interval funds trade by ticker, so there is nothing to sign. "I can put in a hundred clients and press purchase," an advisor said.
  - *The firm signs instead of the client.* Some advisors and banks with discretionary authority sign subscription documents for their clients. A Canadian advisor became an associate portfolio manager so he could run managed accounts. His clients no longer sign subscription documents. A bank team said each extra fund is then "a marginal increase… once you have one doc done."
  - *Eligibility checked once (proposed).* Several participants want each client's eligibility confirmed once per account, the way a broker approves an account for margin. Every later purchase would then go through as a simple trade.

The fix that helps most is challenging to get adoption for

Taking the document out of each trade helps most. It also moves slowly. The document is how a fund manager checks that each investor is allowed to buy. If the document goes, someone else has to make that check: a custodian, a broker-dealer or the advisor. That firm then carries the risk of getting it wrong.

Some of the delay is simple policy. At one broker-dealer, advisors have discretion on the model platform but not for alternatives. Its head of alternatives called this "a simple solve. That's a policy issue."

Removing the document also does not remove every check. Broker-dealers still apply their own supervision. An asset manager said advisors still need a supervisor's approval for its interval fund, even though the fund has no accredited investor requirement.

> **Where views differ.** Participants agree the paperwork is too heavy. They split on the end goal. Some want one standard document that every manager accepts. A data provider who watched the industry try that a decade ago doubts it will work: "every firm's compliance office thinks they have some unique point of view." Others want no document per purchase at all. The CIO of a large wealth manager cautioned that the easiest structure is not always the best one: "Easy doesn't always mean the right thing to do." Firms that already sign for their clients see paperwork as a minor issue.

2. After the Purchase, the Records Often Do Not Match

Subscriptions are "only about twenty percent of the activity" over a fund's life, a fund manager's head of investor services said. Participants said the rest has received far less investment in systems. Three problems stand out: records that do not match, transfers that take months, and valuations that are hard to read.

Records

Advisors see the results first. One said NAVs sometimes arrive two to three months late: "I'm looking at a position on my screen today that shows zero yield for 2026, which I know is not correct." A solo advisor said a $1 million account can show $900,000 after a $100,000 subscription, with "not even a placeholder that says pending."

The cause lies in the systems behind the advisor. The managed-account software, the subscription platform, the custodian and the reporting system each keep their own records.

> ***"There isn't a consistent [investment book of record] data schema. So you've got four horizontals almost trying to reconcile data between each other."***
>
> A senior executive at a large fund manager

Asked which links cause problems, the same executive said: "Like, all of them."

Smaller managers have fewer tools to manage this. An emerging manager coordinates daily reporting for its new evergreen fund on spreadsheets: "We don't have a central source of truth." Large firms build their own systems, the same manager said. Smaller ones use "this patchwork of whatever is available to them off the shelf."

Services already address parts of the records problem, such as sharing position and NAV data between firms. Participants said gaps remain, especially in advisor reports.

Transfers

Stocks and mutual funds move between brokerage firms through a standard automated process. Many evergreen funds do not. A fund manager's head of investor services calls transfers "the wild, wild west." One advisor's transfers from a previous firm took up to a year. One position could not be moved at all.

Some fixes are being built. A transfer agent said the custodians it works with will start sending transfers to it electronically next year.

Valuations and fund data

Some managers are moving from quarterly to monthly or daily NAVs. Several participants doubted that more frequent values help on their own. "I know my fund went down 50 cents. What am I going to do with that?" a custodian's head of alternatives platforms asked. Daily values matter most for products that trade daily.

What is possible also depends on the asset. A private credit manager said performing loans are carried at cost plus accrued interest, so more frequent NAVs change little for credit. Real estate depends on appraisals. A real estate specialist said "a daily NAV is misleading."

Several participants said the method matters more than the frequency. A fund administrator said that if credit turns, people will "scrutinize what were the marks that were applied."

Advisors also lack the data to compare funds before they buy. One data provider said some funds do not disclose holdings below 5% of the portfolio. Another said many investors simply buy the best-known names.

> **Where views differ.** Participants agree the records need fixing. They differ on how much reporting matters. Several advisors put it at the top of their list. One platform executive ranked it lower, as long as the NAV is current. For advisors, the cost falls on the client relationship. "It's not the operational issue itself, but the second-derivative effect of how that impacts the client experience," a bank's director of private markets said.

3. Redemptions Are Slow and Manual, and Partial Fills Add More Work

Redemptions raise two problems. The process is slow and manual. And when demand runs high, funds pay out only part of each request.

The process

A custodian said redemptions can take up to 60 days to settle. The redemption form is still "just a paper-based process," even for interval funds, a senior executive at a large fund manager said. Partial fills add another round. When a fund prorates, the unfilled part of each request has to be resubmitted the next quarter, a broker-dealer executive said.

What the capped redemptions showed

Over the past year, several large evergreen funds received more redemption requests than their limits allowed. In the second quarter of 2026, requests at some of the largest private credit funds ran between 10% and 17% of shares, against 5% quarterly limits.[3] A model platform saw "14, 20% redemption requests all of a sudden get you one or 2% instead of five."

The fund managers we interviewed agreed the funds did what their documents said. A data provider added that the cap protects investors who stay. Without it, a fund facing a rush of redemptions would sell its most marketable assets first.

> ***"It's not a gate, it's a cap these funds are running up against. A gate is when I tell you I'm going to offer you liquidity and then I suspend that liquidity."***
>
> A head of investor services at a fund manager

Advisors we interviewed said few clients raised the capped redemptions. A bank team that uses only funds with lockups said that, for the managers it works with, the episode was "basically a non-event." Where concern did arise, several participants traced it to how the funds were described and understood.

> ***"When you tell someone they're going to have quarterly liquidity, but with a 5% gate or a 10% gate, clients hear quarterly liquidity. They don't hear gate and understand what it means."***
>
> A director of private markets at a bank

The episode has still changed plans. A fund administrator said one manager put a new evergreen launch on hold because of it. In Canada, a senior advisor at an investment platform said "at least five funds have had to gate. They're all reputable large funds."[4]

What better systems can and cannot fix

Better systems will not make these funds fully liquid. Several advisors do not want that anyway. "Illiquidity is part of the risk premium on these assets," one RIA said.

Providing liquidity also costs the fund. Borrowing lowers yield. Selling assets below their stated value raises doubts about the NAV. Paying redemptions from new subscriptions works only while subscriptions keep coming. **Better systems can make redemption terms clear before purchase, and visible as data after it.**

> ***"I need to see data, not a PDF, as to when I can sell, and how much, dynamically."***
>
> A senior wealth management executive

The rules may change too. On September 30, the SEC proposed the first substantive change to how interval funds repurchase shares since the rule was adopted in 1993. The proposal includes an option for monthly repurchase offers. It is open for comment, and our interviews took place before it was published.[5]

> **Where views differ.** Participants agree the funds followed their rules. They differ on what that means. Fund managers see the capped redemptions as the structures working as designed. Platform and wealth executives see an operational gap that will grow with volume.

4. Model Portfolios Need Every Step to Work Together

A model portfolio needs subscriptions, records and redemptions to work at once, across many accounts. That makes it the hardest test of everything in Sections 1 to 3.

"Evergreens in models" means three different things

Separate positions next to a model. This is how most advisors we interviewed work. None of the advisory firms in our research holds evergreens inside a combined public and private model.

> ***"If I buy IBM at the model level, it can automatically be cut. Everybody can buy IBM. The computer will do it. But if I want to buy [an evergreen fund], I can't necessarily put it in the model… because you need documents filled out in advance."***
>
> A solo RIA

Model platform executives said many firms announced alternatives in models before the automation existed. Many still hold the evergreen fund "as a carve-out."

A private-only sleeve. One bank wealth team runs an evergreen-only model and signs subscriptions for its clients. Two large managers have launched a private-only model entered with a single subscription document.[6]

Combined public and private models. These mostly use interval funds, which can be redeemed only during repurchase offers. On one large platform, the interval fund portion is rebalanced only at those times.[2] Separately, a direct-to-consumer platform runs a fully automated evergreen model today. It uses only funds that trade by ticker.

Why rebalancing is hard

Participants named four problems:

- **Slow cash.** Rebalancing systems "assume that you're going to get cash back in three days," a European platform executive said. "If suddenly you're waiting 70 days… that breaks a lot of the assumptions in the model."
- **Mismatched calendars.** Each fund sets its own redemption dates. Model platforms rebalance and bill fees on fixed schedules. A model platform executive asked a large manager to put all its funds on the same quarterly date. "And the answer was no."

- **Partial fills.** A capped redemption can turn "a 5% position" into "a 7% position," the CIO of a large wealth manager noted.
- **Market moves.** A custodian's product lead pointed to April 2025, when public markets fell and recovered within weeks. A redemption that settled 60 days later would have bought back into public markets at higher prices.

Scale multiplies all of this. If 10% of the assets in unified managed accounts moved into alternatives, "you're talking about millions of transactions, compared to the thousands most managers deal with today," a fund manager's head of investor services said. Some of the firms that would run this have not solved it yet. "I have tried to work through how to make it work, and I can't figure it out," a transfer agent executive said.

Combining investors into fewer accounts

One way to cut that volume is to combine investors into fewer accounts at the fund. Feeder funds and funds of funds do this, often with another layer of fees. In an omnibus, or pooled, account, a custodian or distributor holds one account at the fund for all its clients. It keeps the client records itself, as mutual funds have done for decades. Some participants see tokenized records as another route to the same result.

The savings can be large. With pooled accounts, a fund that pays its transfer agent for 1,000 investor accounts might pay for two, a transfer agent said. The client-level work moves to the custodian or distributor running the account. It tracks each client's eligibility, purchase date, fees and partial redemptions.

That work has to handle private-market rules. Europe shows why. Most accounts there are already pooled, a European platform executive said. Much of the client-level work is still done by hand. When a fund caps redemptions, firms "have to manually rebook every position for the 1,000 investors."

> ***"This is just a mechanism that would absolutely allow far more volume and assets to go into that… It absolutely has to be part of the thinking in terms of the long-run operating model."***
>
> A senior executive at a fund administrator, on pooled accounts

In the US, pooled accounts are still early for funds that need subscription documents. Three questions remain open:

- **Eligibility.** A custodian would have to certify every investor and take on the risk the fund manager carries today. "We want to do that. We're not doing it yet," a custodian said.
- **Equal treatment.** If a distributor nets its clients' purchases against their redemptions, its clients may redeem in full while investors elsewhere are prorated. A senior executive at a large fund manager said the regulator has not said whether that is allowed.
- **Tax reporting.** Funds that issue K-1s have no solution yet.

A test for any setup

Whatever the structure, the same test applies. **Can an advisor apply a model to many eligible accounts, track the weights, and rebalance after a partial or delayed redemption, without manual work?**

Where views differ. Participants differ on how close the industry is to passing that test. The bank team running the evergreen-only model said evergreens "could go in cleanly today," if clients accept that any shift takes quarters or years. A model platform executive said they can go in today, though "I don't know about cleanly," and that the automation is getting there. A solo advisor said they cannot.

5. Why Progress Is Slow

Participants gave three reasons.

Familiarity is uneven. Some of the tools already exist in mutual funds. The settlement systems behind them already process much of the registered evergreen market. "I've been on a lot of calls where people say the infrastructure doesn't exist. I call that baloney," a transfer agent said. He said many firms have never heard of those systems. Others said the systems do not cover onboarding, eligibility checks or the advisor's workflow. Pooled accounts showed the split most clearly. Participants from mutual funds explained them without prompting. Many from private markets had not heard of them. "I don't know what that means," said the CIO of a large wealth manager. The president of a fund manager that had just launched its own evergreen fund said: "I don't really understand it."

> ***"People who grew up in mutual funds totally get it. Other people don't."***
>
> A transfer agent executive

Some firms have less reason to change. A senior wealth management executive said simpler access will bring more competition: "Once you get to simplicity… that's when the competition comes and the margins decline." Some transfer agents and administrators are paid per account. Changes that reduce the number of accounts also reduce their revenue. Pressure on the largest managers is also limited for now. A model platform executive said the largest managers do not need to standardize yet, but expects their need for wider distribution to change that.

Participants disagree on the approach and on who should lead. On the approach, some want a standard subscription document, others none. On leadership, some want the largest firms to agree and require standards. Others point to a commercial standard-setter, the existing industry systems, or technology firms building adoption from the ground up. Some said no body is needed at all.

The industry has been here before. A data provider recalled a meeting about a decade ago on electronic signatures. The transfer agent, custodian and fund manager each blamed another party for not allowing them.

> ***"And we all said, okay, can we all just agree we're going to accept this?"***
>
> The founder of an alternatives data provider

He said the industry is now "having that same moment."

6. What Participants Asked For

Participants did not agree on a single plan. Their requests do fall into six areas. We list them in the order a fund moves through its life. The order does not rank them.

Area	What participants asked for	Who would need to act, based on the interviews
1. Buying	One standard set of subscription data. Eligibility confirmed once per account, with later purchases treated as trades.	Fund managers, custodians, broker-dealers, advisors
2. Records and reporting	One shared record of orders, positions and NAVs. Timely, accurate values in advisor reports.	Fund administrators, transfer agents, custodians, reporting platforms, fund managers
3. Redemption terms	Terms that are clear before purchase. Redemption dates, caps and partial fills sent to trading systems as data. Common redemption dates across funds.	Fund managers, fund administrators, model platforms
4. Rebalancing	Models that plan trades around redemptions that take weeks and fill only in part.	Model platforms and model providers, with support from transfer agents and custodians
5. Pooled accounts	Clear answers on eligibility, netting and tax reporting.	Custodians, distributors, regulators
6. Fund data	Comparable holdings, fee and valuation data for choosing and monitoring funds.	Fund managers, data providers, fund administrators

> **Where views differ.** Participants agree on the areas. They weigh them differently. When we asked advisors to rank their needs, buying with a single order and better reporting came up most. Some also wanted to buy and sell at NAV between redemption windows. The bank team put automated rebalancing second. Pooled accounts drew the widest split. Some participants see them as necessary for scale. Others said they do not change the underlying problem. Data providers raised fund data most strongly.

Each structure has its own gaps. Interval funds already trade by ticker, so redemptions are their main open issue. Private evergreen funds need investor qualification checks and often issue K-1 tax forms. That makes them the hardest to automate.

Measuring progress. Participants' complaints also point to better ways to measure progress. The number of funds on a platform says little about whether the process scales. Better measures are:

- The time from allocation to booked position
- The share of subscriptions rejected
- The days until a client report is correct
- The time to transfer between firms
- The manual steps needed to rebalance after a partial redemption

Conclusion

Participants largely agree on the problems. They split on the fixes: whether evergreens belong in models, whether to standardize the subscription document or remove it, and who should set the rules.

Five developments will show whether the industry is moving:

- Custodians and broker-dealers checking eligibility at the account level
- Model platforms automating redemptions
- A large manager aligning redemption dates across its funds
- A regulator's answer on netting in pooled accounts
- How valuations hold up if credit turns

Evergreen funds are now easier to buy. The work ahead is making them possible to hold, redeem and rebalance for thousands of accounts at once.

Appendix

Evergreen Structures at a Glance

Structure	How it works operationally
Interval funds	Registered, open to most investors, and usually bought daily by ticker. Must offer to buy back 5% to 25% of shares at set intervals, usually quarterly. Excess requests are prorated.
Tender offer funds	Registered. The board decides whether and when to buy back shares. Some trade by ticker. Others need a subscription document. Some are limited to accredited investors.
Non-traded BDCs and REITs	Sold mainly through broker-dealers, with income and net worth standards. Often need a subscription document. Repurchases are often capped near 5% a quarter, and the board can limit or suspend them.
Private evergreen funds	Unregistered, for accredited investors or qualified purchasers. Need qualification checks and subscription documents. Often carry lockups and long notice periods.
Feeder funds and funds of funds	Put many investors behind one subscription. Funds of funds also give each investor exposure to several funds through one subscription. Often add a layer of fees and reporting.
Daily-traded funds and ETFs	Price and trade daily, using estimated values for private holdings. Often mix private and public assets.

Outside the US, European Long-Term Investment Funds (ELTIFs), the UK's Long-Term Asset Funds (LTAFs) and Canada's offering memorandum funds play similar roles.

Notes

[1] *WealthManagement.com, "Model Portfolios Projected to Reach $18.6T by 2030," June 17, 2026.*

[2] *WealthManagement.com and Alternatives Watch reporting on model portfolios that include interval funds, 2025 and 2026.*

[3] *Public quarterly repurchase disclosures by large non-traded private credit BDCs, as reported by AltsWire, 2026.*

[4] *Consistent with The Globe and Mail and Bloomberg reporting on Canadian private real estate and mortgage funds, 2025 and 2026.*

[5] *U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, proposed amendments to interval fund rules, September 30, 2026. Proposed, not adopted.*

[6] *WealthManagement.com reporting on a private markets model portfolio for the wealth market, 2025.*

About This Research

Between June and October 2026, The Private Markets Forum interviewed 39 senior participants at 33 firms across the United States, Canada and Europe. They included independent RIAs, bank and wealth manager CIOs, fund managers, wirehouses, broker-dealers, custodians, model portfolio platforms, alternatives and direct-to-consumer platforms, transfer agents, fund administrators, a market utility and data providers.

All interviews were held under the Chatham House rule. Quotes are attributed by role only.

This research was conducted in partnership with Monark.

Brought to you in Partnership with

