

- Outline
- Interest rate theory
- Shortcomings of the Ho-Lee model
- Semi-Markov processes
- Regime switching model
- Absence of arbitrage
- Martingale measures
- Model implications
- Conclusions and future work

Discrete time semi-Markov switching interest rate models

Julien Hunt
Joint work with Pierre Devolder

January 29, 2009

Outline

Interest rate theory
Shortcomings of the Ho-Lee model
Semi-Markov processes
Regime switching model
Absence of arbitrage
Martingale measures
Model implications
Conclusions and future work

Interest rate theory

Shortcomings of the Ho-Lee model

Semi-Markov processes

Regime switching model

Absence of arbitrage

Martingale measures

Model implications

Conclusions and future work

On the importance of interest rate models

- ▶ Borrowing and lending: a dangerous business.....cfr. the current crisis

On the importance of interest rate models

- ▶ Borrowing and lending: a dangerous business.....cfr. the current crisis
- ▶ This crisis has created situations virtually unheard of....

On the importance of interest rate models

- ▶ Borrowing and lending: a dangerous business.....cfr. the current crisis
- ▶ This crisis has created situations virtually unheard of....
- ▶ To quote "The economist" of september 2008:
"Nationalisation happening as fast as one can say Hugo Chavez"

On the importance of interest rate models

- ▶ Borrowing and lending: a dangerous business.....cfr. the current crisis
- ▶ This crisis has created situations virtually unheard of....
- ▶ To quote "The economist" of september 2008:
"Nationalisation happening as fast as one can say Hugo Chavez"
- ▶ Size of the industry: hundreds of billions of dollars

On the importance of interest rate models

- ▶ Borrowing and lending: a dangerous business.....cfr. the current crisis
- ▶ This crisis has created situations virtually unheard of....
- ▶ To quote "The economist" of september 2008:
"Nationalisation happening as fast as one can say Hugo Chavez"
- ▶ Size of the industry: hundreds of billions of dollars
- ▶ This illustrates the importance of accurate and realistic models !!!

What are we talking about?

- ▶ Idea: model future uncertainty about interest rates
- ▶ Zero coupon T-bond: a financial instrument that gives you one euro at time T
- ▶ Price at time t of a zero-coupon of time to maturity τ denoted by $P_t(\tau)$
- ▶ Link to interest rates: zero coupon yield is the interest rate $R_t(\tau)$ defined as $P_t(\tau) = \frac{1}{(1+R_t(\tau))^\tau}$

The notion of arbitrage

- ▶ A central notion in modern financial theory
- ▶ Arbitrage: a way of making money without risk and without initial investment
- ▶ A central hypothesis: markets are arbitrage free
- ▶ In practice this is more or less true

The model of Ho and Lee

- ▶ Model the prices of zero-coupon bonds in a "binomial" framework (discrete time approach)
- ▶ At time $t = 0$, they suppose as given a whole set of bond prices $P_0(\tau)$ for many τ 's
- ▶ In a deterministic framework, it can be shown that $P_{t+1}(\tau - 1) = \frac{P_t(\tau)}{P_t(1)}$ for all τ
- ▶ In Ho and Lee, either $P_{t+1}(\tau - 1) = u(\tau) \frac{P_t(\tau)}{P_t(1)}$ or $P_{t+1}(\tau - 1) = d(\tau) \frac{P_t(\tau)}{P_t(1)}$ (for all τ)

The model of Ho and Lee

- ▶ They impose some no-arbitrage condition
- ▶ They impose path independence
- ▶ Condition 1 gives us the existence of a constant p such that $pu(\tau) + (1 - p)d(\tau) = 1$ (for all τ) [martingale measure]
- ▶ Condition 2 leads to $u(\tau) = \frac{1}{p+(1-p)\delta^\tau}$ and $d(\tau) = \delta^\tau u(\tau)$ for some constant δ

Some issues with the Ho and Lee model

- ▶ Although it is nice, it seems difficult to believe that the whole term structure be governed by only two constants (ρ and δ)
- ▶ Furthermore, these constants remain the same in good times or times of crisis.....
- ▶ Our idea is to introduce an underlying process representing the state of the economy that would affect the value of these parameters

A brief reminder/introduction

- ▶ Idea: the semi-Markov process is used to represent the underlying state of the economy
- ▶ Define $E = 1, \dots, m$, the possible states of the economy
- ▶ Let X_n be a r.v. taking value in E and T_n a r.v. taking values in \mathbb{N}^+ with $0 = T_0 \leq T_1 \leq T_2 \dots$
- ▶ Then think of T_n as the n^{th} switching time of a system and X_n as the state at the n^{th} transition

A brief reminder/introduction

- ▶ (X, T) is called a homogeneous Markov renewal process if $\mathbb{P}[X_{n+1} = j, T_{n+1} - T_n \leq k | X_0, \dots, X_n; T_0, \dots, T_n] = \mathbb{P}[X_{n+1} = j, T_{n+1} - T_n \leq k | X_n = i] = Q(i, j, k)$ for all (n, i, j, k) in $\mathbb{N}^+ \times E \times E \times \mathbb{N}^+$
- ▶ Define $\nu_k = \sup\{n \geq 0 : T_n \leq k\}$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$
- ▶ The process $Y_t = X_{\nu_t}$ with $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$ is called a discrete time semi-Markov process

Some properties

- ▶ Generally Y_t is not Markovian.....introduce process $K_t = t - T_{\nu_t}$, then (Y, K) is Markovian
- ▶ Markov processes are a subclass of semi-Markov processes
- ▶ Semi-Markov processes allow for more general duration distributions

The framework

- ▶ Discrete time financial market built on a probability space
- ▶ The market is assumed to carry two processes: a semi-Markov process Y_t and a vector process ζ_t
- ▶ ζ_t is a vector who can take two values $u_{Y_{t-1}}$ and $d_{Y_{t-1}}$ (the entries of the vector correspond to the different times to maturity)
- ▶ We define $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(Y_s, K_s, \zeta_s, 0 \leq s \leq t)$. We suppose that Y_t and ζ_t are conditionally independent given \mathcal{F}_{t-1}

Our model

- ▶ Given $Y_t = i, K_t = k$, the future is defined by the following set of events $A_{t+1}^{j,u} = \{\omega \in \Omega : Y_{t+1} = j, \zeta_{t+1} = u_i\}$ and $A_{t+1}^{j,d} = \{\omega \in \Omega : Y_{t+1} = j, \zeta_{t+1} = d_i\}$ for every possible state j .
- ▶ Given $Y_t = i, K_t = k$, the evolution of the value of a zero-coupon bond of time to maturity τ is given by

$$P_{t+1}(\tau) = u_i(\tau) \frac{P_t(\tau + 1)}{P_t(1)} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{1}_{A_{t+1}^{j,u}} \right) + d_i(\tau) \frac{P_t(\tau + 1)}{P_t(1)} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{1}_{A_{t+1}^{j,d}} \right)$$

First implications

- ▶ Arbitrage: a way of making money without risk ("Free Lunch")
- ▶ Modern finance based on the no arbitrage assumption
- ▶ In order to avoid arbitrage, it can easily be shown that $u_i(\tau) > 1 > d_i(\tau)$ for every i and every τ
- ▶ Indeed, suppose $u_i(\tau) > d_i(\tau) > 1$. At t , buy a zero coupon of time to maturity τ . That costs $P_t(\tau)$. So borrow this quantity.
- ▶ At $t + 1$, sell the bond and repay the loan. The net gain is $P_{t+1}(\tau - 1) - \frac{P_t(\tau)}{P_t(1)}$ which is certainly positive given our model and $u_i(\tau) > d_i(\tau) > 1$.

A second look at no-arbitrage

- ▶ Given $Y_t = i, K_t = k$, build a portfolio comprising one bond of time to maturity τ and H bonds of time to maturity τ'
- ▶ At time t , the portfolio is worth $W_t = P_t(\tau) + HP_t(\tau')$
- ▶ Choose H such that the value of the portfolio is the same whether $\zeta_{t+1} = u_i$ or $\zeta_{t+1} = d_i$ ($W_{t+1}^{u_i} = W_{t+1}^{d_i}$)
- ▶ This portfolio is then a risk free asset and its present value should be equal to its future value properly discounted (no-arbitrage)

A second look at no-arbitrage

- ▶ This approach imposes the existence, for every state i , of a constant p_i such that for every τ :

$$p_i u_i(\tau) + (1 - p_i) d_i(\tau) = 1$$

- ▶ Very similar to Ho and Lee
- ▶ Link to martingale measures (sort of average)

The hunt for martingale measures

- ▶ Define $\pi_{Y_t j}(K_t) := \mathbb{P}[\zeta_{t+1} = u_{Y_t}, Y_{t+1} = j | \mathcal{F}_t]$
- ▶ Recall $A_{t+1}^{j,u} = \{\omega \in \Omega : Y_{t+1} = j, \zeta_{t+1} = u_{Y_t}\}$ and $A_{t+1}^{j,d} = \{\omega \in \Omega : Y_{t+1} = j, \zeta_{t+1} = d_{Y_t}\}$
- ▶ For each i , let us define a series of parameters $(p_{ij}(t), q_{ij}(t))_{j \in [1;m]; t \in \mathbb{T}}$ such that for every t , $\sum_{j=1}^m (p_{ij}(t) + q_{ij}(t)) = 1$
- ▶ Define $D_t = \prod_{s=0}^{t-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \left[\frac{p_{Y_s j}(s)}{\pi_{Y_s j}(K_s)} \mathbb{1}_{A_{s+1}^{j,u}} + \frac{q_{Y_s j}(s)}{\kappa_{Y_s j}(K_s)} \mathbb{1}_{A_{s+1}^{j,d}} \right] \right)$

The hunt for martingale measures

- ▶ Define \mathbb{P}^* as the the equivalent measure with density D_{T^*} with respect to \mathbb{P}
- ▶ Under the condition that $p_i = \sum_j p_{ij}(t)$ for every i and every t , \mathbb{P}^* is an equivalent martingale measure meaning that the discounted value of every bond behaves like a $(\mathbb{P}^*, \mathcal{F}_t)$ -martingale
- ▶ But there are of course an infinite of p_{ij} that will satisfy this condition: infinite number of martingale measures

Market completeness

- ▶ Loosely speaking, a market is said to be complete if every asset can be "replicated" by the other assets present on the market
- ▶ It has been shown that this is linked to the uniqueness of the martingale measure
- ▶ An infinite number of measures implies (again loosely speaking) an incomplete market

Market completeness

- ▶ In Ho and Lee, unique martingale measure, market completeness. Here more sources of risk (the underlying process), market incompleteness seems logical
- ▶ In practice, market incompleteness is good and bad. Bad since there is no unique way of pricing assets. Good since otherwise all derivatives are useless.

What the past tells us

- ▶ In Ho and Lee, binomial tree: recombining (up then down = down then up)
- ▶ In our case, this is more complicated: possibility of regime switches
- ▶ Is this idea still interesting?

First case: no switch

- ▶ At time t , state $Y_t = i$. We suppose that the state doesn't change for at least one period (i.e. $Y_{t+1} = i$).
- ▶ Then we impose that "up then down = down then up"
- ▶ This leads to the following relation $\frac{d_i(\tau)u_i(\tau+1)}{u_i(1)} = \frac{u_i(\tau)d_i(\tau+1)}{d_i(1)}$
- ▶ Eliminating d_i via the relation $p_i u_i(\tau) + (1 - p_i) d_i(\tau) = 1$ yields $u_i(\tau) = \frac{1}{p_i + (1 - p_i)\delta_i^\tau}$ and $d_i(\tau) = \delta_i^\tau u_i(\tau)$ for some constant δ_i .

Second case: regime switches

- ▶ Applying the same intuitive condition in the presence of regime changes yields $\frac{u_i(\tau)u_i(1)}{u_i(\tau+1)} = \frac{d_j(\tau)d_j(1)}{d_j(\tau+1)}$ for any pair of states i, j
- ▶ One can show that this relation implies that $u_i = u_j$ and $d_i = d_j$
- ▶ This means that if we apply this condition (recombining trees) in the presence of regime changes, all states have to have the same impact on the term structure: this condition makes regime switching useless
- ▶ So we choose not to apply this condition in the presence of switches

Conclusions

- ▶ We have presented an alternative model to the Ho and Lee model
- ▶ This model can be completely characterized by parameters ρ_{ij} and δ_j for all i
- ▶ The model can be made to be arbitrage free but is incomplete

- Outline
- Interest rate theory
- Shortcomings of the Ho-Lee model
- Semi-Markov processes
- Regime switching model
- Absence of arbitrage
- Martingale measures
- Model implications
- Conclusions and future work**

Future work

- ▶ Learn more about models with non-recombining trees and see how this applies or is linked
- ▶ Numerical simulation and testing
- ▶ Hopefully this will lead to an interesting paper

- Outline
- Interest rate theory
- Shortcomings of the Ho-Lee model
- Semi-Markov processes
- Regime switching model
- Absence of arbitrage
- Martingale measures
- Model implications
- Conclusions and future work

The end

