

# **Benchmark Approach to Finance**

**ECKHARD PLATEN**

University of Technology, Sydney

Pl. & Heath (2006, 2010) A Benchmark Approach to Quantitative Finance. Springer

# Challenges

- Low or negative interest rates
- Too low return on investment for long dated bonds (pensions, green bonds, life insurance...)
- Financial planning practice not supported by classical theory  
⇒ Current classical pricing and hedging too restrictive

# Best Performing Portfolio as Benchmark

Criterion: **Highest value in the long run!**

- path wise
- no expectation
- prefer more for less
- ranking independent from denomination
- difficult to manipulate

## Long Term Growth Rate

$$g^\pi = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \ln \left( \frac{S_t^\pi}{S_0^\pi} \right) \rightarrow \max$$

e.g. Pl. & Heath (2010), Karatzas & Kardaras (2007)

$\Rightarrow$

$$g^\pi \leq g^{\pi^*}$$

**$S^*$  numéraire portfolio (NP)** (Long 1990)

## Existence of NP

$\Leftrightarrow$

**Supermartingale property:**

$$\hat{S}_t^\pi = \frac{S_t^\pi}{S_t^*} \geq E \left( \hat{S}_s^\pi | \mathcal{F}_t \right)$$

$$0 \leq t \leq s < \infty$$

$$\hat{S}_t^\pi \geq 0$$

**Key property of financial market !**




Figure 1: Primary security accounts under the MMM




Figure 2: Benchmarked primary security accounts






Figure 3: EW1141 and MCI




Figure 4: logarithms of EW114 and MCI




Figure 5: Long term growth of EWI114 and MCI

# Performance Measure

- estimated long term growth rate

$$g_t^\pi = \frac{1}{t} \ln \left( \frac{S_t^\pi}{S_0^\pi} \right)$$

- difficult to manipulate
- allows systematic search for better proxies of NP
- well-diversified portfolios, proxies of respective NP
- driven by the same non-diversifiable uncertainty
- factors
- smart beta
- ...




Figure 6: The MCI and five equi-weighted indices: EWI1 (market), EWI10 (industry), EWI19 (supersector), EWI41 (sector), EWI114 (subsector).




Figure 7: The MCI and five equi-weighted indices in log-scale: EWI1 (market), EWI10 (industry), EWI19 (supersector), EWI41 (sector), EWI114 (subsector).

# Approximation of the NP

Pl. & Rendek (2012)

- Naive Diversification Theorem:  
generalized law of large numbers for benchmarked returns

$$\hat{S}_t^{EWI} = \frac{S_t^{EWI}}{S_t^*} \approx 1 \Rightarrow S_t^* \approx S_t^{EWI}$$

- Hierarchical equal value weighting provides excellent proxy without modelling or estimation
- Better proxies of NP
- MCI different to NP

Transaction cost	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>240</b>
<hr/>						
Reallocation terms	<b>1</b>					
Long term growth rate	0.1919	0.1901	0.1774	0.1529	0.1184	0.1049
Annualised average return	0.1979	0.1961	0.1834	0.1689	0.1254	0.1109
Annualised volatility	0.1135	0.1135	0.1135	0.1135	0.1134	0.1134
Sharpe ratio	1.4205	1.4046	1.2930	1.1654	0.7822	0.6544
<hr/>						
Reallocation terms	<b>2</b>					
Long term growth rate	0.1889	0.1878	0.1799	0.1710	0.1440	0.1351
Annualised average return	0.1949	0.1938	0.1859	0.1770	0.1500	0.1411
Annualised volatility	0.1134	0.1134	0.1134	0.1134	0.1135	0.1136
Sharpe ratio	1.3955	1.3856	1.3163	1.2369	0.9987	0.9193
<hr/>						
Reallocation terms	<b>4</b>					
Long term growth rate	0.1861	0.1852	0.1790	0.1720	0.1508	0.1437
Annualised average return	0.1921	0.1912	0.1850	0.1780	0.1568	0.1497
Annualised volatility	0.1135	0.1135	0.1134	0.1134	0.1134	0.1135
Sharpe ratio	1.3699	1.3622	1.3080	1.2459	1.0591	0.9967



# Economically Meaningful Arbitrage

- When estimated long term growth rate  $g_t^{\pi*}$  explodes for finite time
  - $\Leftrightarrow$  NP does not exist.
  - $\Leftrightarrow$  economically meaningful arbitrage (EMA)
  - $\Rightarrow$  model not viable

- **Existence of NP:**

simple and intuitive no-arbitrage condition of Benchmark Approach

$\triangleq$  NUPBR of Karatzas & Kardaras (2007)

- NFLVR  $\triangleq$  restrictive classical assumptions

$\triangleq$  risk neutral pricing; Delbaen & Schachermayer (1998)

- Beyond NFLVR: Loewenstein & Willard (2000), Pl. (2002), Fernholz (2002), Fernholz et al. (2005), Karatzas & Kardaras (2007), Galessio & Runggaldier (2010)

# Continuous Financial Market

$n$ -dimensional Brownian motion

$$W_t = (W_t^1, \dots, W_t^n)^\top,$$

$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{P})$ .

## Primary security accounts

$$S_t = (S_t^1, \dots, S_t^m)^\top,$$
$$\frac{dS_t}{S_t} = a_t dt + b_t \cdot dW_t.$$

## *Self-financing portfolio $S_t^\pi$*

- *Weights*

$$\pi_t = (\pi_t^1, \dots, \pi_t^m)^\top$$

$$\pi_t^\top \cdot \mathbf{1} = 1$$

$$\frac{dS_t^\pi}{S_t^\pi} = \pi_t^\top \cdot \frac{dS_t}{S_t} = \pi_t^\top \cdot a_t dt + \pi_t^\top \cdot b_t \cdot dW_t$$

# Characterising NP

- Filipović & Pl. (2009)  $\Rightarrow$  If NP exists, then for  $S_0^* = \mathbf{1}$ , NP value unique

$$\frac{dS_t^*}{S_t^*} = \lambda_t^* dt + \theta_t^\top \cdot (\theta_t dt + dW_t),$$

where

$$\theta_t = b_t^\top \cdot \pi_t^*,$$

with  $\pi_t^*$  and  $\lambda_t^*$  solving

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_t \cdot b_t^\top & \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \pi_t^* \\ \lambda_t^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_t \\ \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}$$

- no risk premium puzzle

Filipović & Pl. (2009)  $\Rightarrow$

$$\frac{dS_t^\pi}{S_t^\pi} = \lambda_t^* dt + \pi_t^\top \cdot b_t(\theta_t dt + dW_t)$$

⇒

- Benchmarked portfolio

$$\hat{S}_t^\pi = \frac{S_t^\pi}{S_t^*}$$

$$\frac{d\hat{S}_t^\pi}{\hat{S}_t^\pi} = (\pi_t^\top b_t - \theta_t^\top) dW_t$$

⇒  $\hat{S}^\pi$  driftless, **local martingale**.

- jump-diffusion market; Pl. & Heath (2010)
- semimartingale market: Christensen & Pl. (2005), Christensen & Larsen (2007), Karatzas & Kardaras (2007)



**Assumption:**  $\hat{S}^\pi$  local martingale.

**$\Rightarrow$  Efficient Market Property:**

Market is efficient in the sense that benchmarked security prices are over infinitesimal time their best forecast; fully reflecting all available information:

$$\hat{S}_t^\pi = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} E \left( \hat{S}_{t+\varepsilon}^\pi | \mathcal{F}_t \right)$$

- No preferences or representative agents.
- Answers Fama (1970) “Efficient Market Hypothesis”

# Capital Asset Pricing Model

- Sharpe (1964), Lintner (1965), Mossin (1966), Merton (1973)
- Is there a generalized CAPM?

- market with locally riskless *savings account*

$$B_t = \exp \left\{ \int_0^t r_s d_s \right\}.$$

Filipović & Pl. (2009)  $\Rightarrow \lambda_t^* = r_t$

$$\frac{dS_t^*}{S_t^*} = r_t dt + \theta_t^\top \cdot (\theta_t dt + dW_t)$$

$$S_0^* = 1.$$

- *Market price of risk* vector

$$\theta_t = b_t^\top \cdot \pi_t^*,$$

- $S_t^\pi = \hat{S}_t^\pi S_t^* \Rightarrow$

$$\frac{dS_t^\pi}{S_t^\pi} = r_t dt + \pi_t^\top \cdot b_t (\theta_t dt + dW_t)$$

- $\Rightarrow$  risk premium

$$q_t = \pi_t^\top \cdot b_t \cdot \theta_t$$

**Definition:** *Normalised covariance* of returns of  $S_t$  and  $V_t$

$$\mathbf{Cov}(S, V)_t = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} E \left( \left( \frac{S_{t+\varepsilon}}{S_t} - 1 \right) \left( \frac{V_{t+\varepsilon}}{V_t} - 1 \right) \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right)$$

Definition: *NP-efficient* portfolio  $V_t^f$  invests fraction  $f_t$  in NP:

$$\frac{dV_t^f}{V_t^f} = r_t dt + f_t \theta_t^\top (\theta_t dt + dW_t).$$

- expected utility maximizing portfolios; Pl. & Heath (2010).
- maximum drawdown constrained portfolios; Kardaras et al. (2014)
- zero coupon bonds, annuities; Pl. & Bruti-Liberati (2010).

**Definition:** For NP-efficient portfolio  $V^f$  and portfolio  $S^\pi$   
systematic risk parameter beta:

$$\beta_t^{f,\pi} = \frac{\text{Cov}(S^\pi, V^f)_t}{\text{Cov}(V^f, V^f)_t}$$

⇒ *Generalised Capital Asset Pricing Formula*

$$\beta_t^{f,\pi} = \frac{\pi_t^\top b_t \theta_t}{f_t \theta_t^\top \theta_t} = \frac{q_t^\pi}{q_t^f}$$

⇒ **risk premium:**

$$q_t^\pi = \beta_t^{f,\pi} q_t^f = \frac{\text{Cov}(S^\pi, V^f)}{\text{Cov}(V^f, V^f)} q_t^f$$

- holds when NP has no jumps
- holds for derivatives
- is a local statement



## **NP-efficient portfolio replacing the market portfolio**

- **No** representative agents
- **No** preferences
- Empirically, market portfolio is not NP-efficient, smart beta strategies, Pl. & Rendek (2012)

- Fatou's lemma
  - $\Rightarrow$  Nonnegative local martingales are supermartingales
  - $\Rightarrow$  Supermartingale Property confirmed

- Supermartingale property  
⇒ current benchmarked value  
**can be significantly larger**  
than its expected benchmarked future value

$$\hat{S}_t^{\pi_{\hat{H}_T}} \geq E \left( \hat{H}_T | \mathcal{F}_t \right)$$

- Benchmark Approach allows **several price processes** delivering the same contingent claim.
- **No Law of One Price**

- Minimal supermartingale is martingale; Du & Pl. (2014)

⇒

### Real world pricing formula

$$\hat{S}_t^{\pi \hat{H}_T} = E \left( \hat{H}_T | \mathcal{F}_t \right)$$

yields **minimal** possible price

- Law of Minimal Price
- Competitive, liquid market ⇒ real world price

# Pricing of New Contingent Claims

**Assumption:**

**Efficient market property holds for all price processes.**

⇒ benchmarked price processes are local martingales.

⇒ Generalise Capital Asset Pricing Formula

- $\Rightarrow$  NP does not explode
- **several** price processes usually exist for delivering a given benchmarked contingent claim  $\hat{H}_T$   
e.g. formally obtained risk neutral price, real word price, ...  
 $\Rightarrow$  no economically meaningful arbitrage (EMA)

Example:  $\hat{H}_T = \frac{1}{S_T^*}$  - benchmarked zero coupon bond payoff

assume deterministic short rate  $r_t$

- Minimal market model; Pl. & Heath (2010)
- S&P 500 as NP

- **real world pricing formula:**

$$\hat{P}(t, T) = E(\hat{H}_T | \mathcal{F}_t)$$

- martingale, minimal possible price,

- **formally obtained risk neutral price:**

$$\hat{P}^*(t, T) = \frac{B_t}{B_T S_t^*}$$

- strict supermartingale, higher price

$$\hat{P}^*(t, T) \geq \hat{P}(t, T)$$






Figure 8: Zero coupon bond and savings bond




Figure 9: Benchmarked zero coupon bond




Figure 10: Ratio in the NP

- makes **financial planning** rigorous
- higher **return on investment**
- less expensive **annuities**
- higher **pensions**
- attractive **green bonds**




Figure 11: Radon-Nikodym derivative and total mass of candidate risk neutral measure

- **discounted NP**

$$d\frac{S_t^*}{B_t} = d\varphi_t + \sqrt{\frac{S_t^*}{B_t}} dW(\varphi_t)$$

Time transformed squared Bessel process of dimension four!

- **transformed time**

$$\varphi_t = \left\langle \sqrt{\frac{S_t^*}{B_t}} \right\rangle_t$$

## Stylized Minimal Market Model

Pl. (2001, 2002, 2006), Pl. & Rendek (2012)

- assume **discounted NP drift** as

$$\alpha_t = \alpha \exp \{ \eta t \} = \theta_t^2 \frac{S_t^*}{B_t}$$

- initial parameter  $\alpha > 0$
- net growth rate  $\eta$
- transformed time  $\varphi_t = \frac{\alpha}{4\eta} (\exp\{\eta t\} - 1)$




Figure 12: Fitted and observed transformed time



⇒ **volatility:**

$$\sigma_t = \sqrt{\frac{B_t \alpha_t}{S_t^*}}$$

- scaling parameter  $\alpha = 0.043$
- net growth rate  $\eta = 0.0528$

- **zero coupon bond**

$$P(t, T) = S_t^* E_t \left( \frac{1}{S_T^*} \right) = P_T^*(t) E_t \left( \frac{S_t^* B_T}{S_T^* B_t} \right)$$

with savings bond

$$P_T^*(t) = \frac{B_t}{B_T} = \exp \left\{ - \int_t^T r_s ds \right\}$$

$$P(t, T) = P_T^*(t) \left( 1 - \exp \left\{ -\frac{S_t^*/B_t}{2(\varphi_T - \varphi_t)} \right\} \right) < P_T^*(t)$$

for  $t \in [0, T)$ , Pl. (2002)

$$P(0, T) = 0.004$$

$$P_T^*(0) = 0.049$$

$$\frac{P(0, T)}{P_T^*(0)} \approx 0.085$$




Figure 13: ln from Zero coupon bond, hedge portfolio and savings bond

## Hedge Simulation

- **delta** units in the NP

$$\delta^*(t) = \frac{\partial P(t,T)}{\partial S_t^*} = \exp \left\{ - \int_0^T r_s ds \right\} \exp \left\{ - \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{2(\varphi_T - \varphi_t)} \right\} \frac{1}{2(\varphi_T - \varphi_t)}$$

- Fergusson & Pl. (2014)

# Generalized MMM

Pl. & Rendek (2012)

- time  $t$  becomes random market time  $\tau_t$

$$d\tau_t = \frac{1}{X_t} dt$$

$$dX_t = (\gamma - \varepsilon X_t) dt + \sqrt{\gamma X_t} dW_t$$

# Recovering Real World Density

Barkhagen et al. (2016),

- Ross Recovery, Ross (2015)
- S&P 500 option data
- real world pricing formula

$$\bar{C}_{T,K}(0, \bar{S}_0^*) = E(\Lambda_T \bar{C}_{T,K}(T, \bar{S}_T^*) | \mathcal{F}_0)$$

$$\Lambda_t = (\bar{S}_t^*)^{-1} = \frac{B_t}{S_t^*}$$

$$E(\Lambda_t | \mathcal{F}_0) \leq \Lambda_0 = 1$$

- real world probability

$$p(0, \bar{S}_0^*; T, \bar{S}_T^*) = \Lambda_T^{-1} q(0, \bar{S}_0^*; T, \bar{S}_T^*)$$

# Implied RND and volatility




Figure 14






Figure 15

Local volatility surface




Figure 16

Implied volatility surface




Figure 17




Figure 18




Figure 19




Figure 20




Figure 21




Figure 22



# Drawdown Constrained Portfolios

- running maximum

$$X_t^* = \sup_{u \in [0, t]} X_u$$

- drawdown

$$X_t^* - X_t$$




Figure 23: logarithm of discounted S&P500 and its running maximum




Figure 24: Relative drawdown of discounted S&P500

- maximum drawdown constrained portfolio

$$\alpha \in [0, 1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} {}^\alpha X_t &= \alpha (X_t^*)^{1-\alpha} + (1-\alpha) (X_t^*)^{-\alpha} X_t \\ &\in [\alpha X_t^*, (X_t^*)^{1-\alpha}] \end{aligned}$$

Kardaras et al. (2014):

$${}^\alpha g^{\pi^*} = (1-\alpha) g^{\pi^*}$$




Figure 25: Logarithm of maximum drawdown constrained portfolio,  $\alpha = 0.6$




Figure 26: Relative drawdown for drawdown constrained portfolio,  $\alpha = 0.6$




Figure 27: Fraction of wealth in S&P500 for  $\alpha = 0.6$

- **Kardaras et al. (2014) maximum long term growth rate**

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log({}^\alpha S_t^*) = (1 - \alpha) \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log(S_t^*)$$
$${}^\alpha g = (1 - \alpha)g$$

restricted drawdown  $\Rightarrow$  reduced maximum growth rate

long term view with short term attitude towards risk

realistic alternative to Markowitz mean-variance approach

and utility maximization






Figure 28: Logarithm of drawdown constrained portfolios




Figure 29: Long term growth of drawdown constrained portfolios

# References

- Barkhagen, M., Blomvall, J. & Pl, E. (2016), ‘Recovering the real-world density and liquidity premia from option data’, *Quantitative Finance* **10.1080/14697688.2015.1128117**.
- Christensen, M. M. & Larsen, K. (2007), ‘No arbitrage and the growth optimal portfolio’, *Stochastic Analysis and Applications* **25**(1), 255–280.
- Christensen, M. M. & Pl., E. (2005), ‘A general benchmark model for stochastic jump sizes’, *Stochastic Analysis and Applications* **23**(5), 1017–1044.
- Delbaen, F. & Schachermayer, W. (1998), ‘The fundamental theorem of asset pricing for unbounded stochastic processes.’, *Mathematische Annalen* **312**, 215 – 250.
- Du, K. & Pl., E. (2014), ‘Benchmarked risk minimization’, *Mathematical Finance* **Forthcoming**.
- Fama, E. F. (1970), ‘Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work’, *The Journal of Finance* **25**, 383417.

Fergusson, K. & Pl., E. (2014), ‘Hedging long-dated interest rate derivatives for Australian pension funds and life insurers’, *Australian Journal of Actuarial Practice* **1**, 2944.

Fernholz, R. (2002), *Stochastic Portfolio Theory*, Springer.

Fernholz, R., Karatzas, I. & Kardaras, C. (2005), ‘Diversity and relative arbitrage in equity markets’, *Finance and Stochastics* **9**(1), 1–27.

Filipović, D. & Pl., E. (2009), ‘Consistent market extensions under the benchmark approach’, *Mathematical Finance* **19**, 41–52.

Galesso, G. & Runggaldier, W. J. (2010), ‘Pricing without equivalent martingale measures under complete and incomplete observation’, *Chiarella, C. & Novikov, A. (eds.), Contemporary Quantitative Finance, Springer, Berlin - Heidelberg* pp. 99 – 121.

Karatzas, I. & Kardaras, C. (2007), ‘The numéraire portfolio in semimartingale financial models’, *Finance and Stochastics* **11**, 447–493.

Kardaras, C., Obloj, J. & Pl., E. (2014), ‘The numeraire property and long-term growth optimality for drawdown-constrained investments’, *Mathematical Finance* DOI: **10.1111/mafi.12081**.

Lintner, J. (1965), ‘The valuation of risk assets and the selection of risky investments in stock portfolios and capital budgets’, *Review of Economics and Statistics* **47**(1), 13–37.

Loewenstein, M. & Willard, G. A. (2000), ‘Local martingales, arbitrage, and viability free snacks and cheap thrills’, *Economic Theory* **16**(1), 135–161.

Long, J. B. (1990), ‘The numéraire portfolio’, *Journal of Financial Economics* **26**(1), 29 – 69.

Merton, R. C. (1973), ‘An intertemporal capital asset pricing model’, *Econometrica* **41**(5), 867 – 887.

Mossin, J. (1966), ‘Equilibrium in a capital asset market’, *Econometrica* **34**(4), 768–783.

- Pl., E. (2002), ‘Arbitrage in continuous complete markets’, *Advances in Applied Probability* **3**, 540 – 558.
- Pl., E. (2006), ‘A benchmark approach to finance’, *Mathematical Finance* **16**(1).
- Pl., E. & Bruti-Liberati, N. (2010), *Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations with Jumps in Finance*, Springer.
- Pl., E. & Heath, D. (2010), *A Benchmark Approach to Quantitative Finance*, Springer.
- Pl., E. & Rendek, R. (2012), ‘Approximating the numéraire portfolio by naive diversification’, *Journal of Asset Management* **13**, 34–50.
- Platen, E. (2001), A minimal financial market model, in ‘Trends in Mathematics’, Birkhäuser, pp. 293–301.
- Ross, S. (2015), ‘The recovery theorem’, *Journal of Finance* **70**(2), 615–648.
- Sharpe, W. (1964), ‘Capital asset prices: A theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk’, *Journal of Finance* **19**(3), 425–442.