On Integrated Chance Constraint in ALM for Pension Funds

Oslo, Norway

Youssouf Toukourou
(joint work with F. Dufresne)

youssouf.toukourou@unil.ch

Department of Actuarial Science – University of Lausanne,
Extranef 134, CH-1015 Unil Dorigny

UNIL | Université de Lausanne
HEC Lausanne

Colloquium of the International Actuarial Association
June 7-10, 2015

1. Introduction
2. Intoduction to stochastic programming
3. Application to ALM for pension funds
4. Conclusion

1 Introduction

2 Intoduction to stochastic programming

3 Application to ALM for pension funds

4 Conclusion

Asset Liability Management (ALM) for pension fund

The pension fund ALM problem is an **optimization problem**.

Stochastic programming is a good tool for pension fund ALMs

- Ziemba and al. [1986], Carino and al. [1994], Consigli and Dempster [1998].

Constraint: Guarantee sufficient solvency over the studying period

- Expected amount of shortage: One-year risk Integrated Chance Constraint (OICC) (Vlerk and al. [2003])
- Novelty: The risk parameter is scale free, time dependent. OICC is exended to multiperiod ICC (MICC) as well.

Objective: Analyse and measure the impact of ICCs by the means of an example.

1 Introduction

2 Intoduction to stochastic programming
- Stochastic linear program (SLP)
- Risk constraints

3 Application to ALM for pension funds

4 Conclusion

Stochastic linear program: Structure

Linear program (LP)	Stochastic LP (SLP)
$\min_X \quad C^\top X$ s.t. $BX \quad \substack{\leq \\ = \\ \geq} \; d$ $X \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$	$\min_X \quad C^\top X$ s.t. $B(\omega)X \quad \substack{\leq \\ = \\ \geq} \; d(\omega), \quad \omega \subset \Omega$ $X \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$
Algo: Simplex Interior point methods	**Algo:** L-shaped (two-stage) Bender's decomposition (multi-stage) **e.g.:** One period asset allocation.

Solution methods may significantly differ:

- LP is easily handleable in most cases
- In some cases, one may determine deterministic equivalent of the SLP
- SLP algorithms often take advantage of the problem structure

Classical SLP with recourse

The SLP with recourse is stated as

$$\begin{aligned} Z = \min_{X} \quad & C^\top X + \mathbb{E}^\omega \left[\mathcal{Q}(X, \omega)\right] \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & BX \begin{matrix} \leqslant \\ = \\ \geqslant \end{matrix} d \\ & X \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(X, \omega) := \min_{y^\omega} \quad & f(\omega) y^\omega \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & E^\omega y^\omega = e^\omega - A^\omega X \\ & y^\omega \in \mathcal{Y}^\omega \end{aligned}$$

Two-stage SLP

- Deterministic equivalent of the two-stage SLP

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{X,y} \quad & C^\top X + \mathbb{E}^\omega \left[f^\omega y^\omega \right] \\ \text{s. t. } & BX \begin{matrix} \leq \\ = \\ \geq \end{matrix} d \\ & A^\omega X + E^\omega y^\omega = e^\omega \\ & X \in \mathcal{X};\ y^\omega \in \mathcal{Y}^\omega; \omega \in \Omega \end{aligned}$$

- S scenarios with probability $p^s, s \in \mathcal{S} = \{1, \cdots, S\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{X,y} \quad & C^\top X + \sum_{s=1}^{S} p^s f^s y^s \\ \text{s. t. } & BX \begin{matrix} \leq \\ = \\ \geq \end{matrix} d \\ & A^s X + E^s y^s = e^s;\ s \in \mathcal{S} \\ & X \in \mathcal{X};\ y^s \in \mathcal{Y} \end{aligned}$$

Scenarios and decisions: Kouwenberg [2001]



Figure: A scenario tree with 40 scenarios and 66 nodes.

- Discrete time period of one year.
- A node is a possible outcome of the stochastic event at a given time t, denoted (t, s) in scenario s.
- Each path of nodes from $t = 0$ to $t = 3$ is called a scenario.
- Decisions are made at the beginning of each period (node) with full knowledge of the past.
- Scenario trees are the workhorse of Multi-stage SP.
- **Optimality is defined in terms of current costs plus expected future costs.**
- **Only time 0 variables' values are of interest.**
- **Non-anticipativity...**

Multi-period SLP: Dempster and al. [1998]

When objectives and constraints are linear and randomness can be approached by a set of S scenarios, multiperiod linear programming is defined as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\min_{X_0} C_0^\top X_0 + \mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ \min_{X_1} C_{1,s}^\top X_{1,s} + \mathbb{E}_1 \left\{ \min_{X_2} C_{2,s}^\top X_{2,s} + \cdots + \mathbb{E}_{T-1,s} \left\{ \min_{X_T} C_{T,s}^\top X_{T,s} \right\} \cdots \right\} \right\} \\
&\text{s.t.} \quad B_0 X_0 = b_0 \\
&\quad D_{11}^{s_0} X_0 + B_1^{s_0} X_1 = b_1 \\
&\quad D_{21}^{s_0} X_0 + D_{22}^{s_1} X_1 + B_2^{s_1} X_2 = b_2 \\
&\quad \ddots \qquad \vdots \\
&\quad D_{T1}^{s_0} X_0 + D_{T2}^{s_1} X_1 + D_{T3}^{s_1} X_2 \qquad D_T^{s_{T-1}} X_{T-1} + B_T^{s_{T-1}} X_T = b_T \\
&\qquad\qquad l_t \leq X_t \leq u_t; t = 1, \cdots, T \\
&\qquad\qquad X \in \mathcal{X}
\end{aligned}
\tag{1}
$$

with s_t is the history of the process up to time t and over the time horizon $[1, \ldots, T]$.

Integrated chance constraint (ICC): Klein [1986]

One may want to control the expected amount by which the goal (linear constraint) is not attained. We introduce the **Integrated Chance Constraint (ICC)**:

$$\mathbb{E}\left(B^s X - d^s\right)^- \leq \beta \tag{2}$$

where $(a)^- := \max\{-a, 0\}$ and β, a positive user-defined parameter, puts an upper bound on the expexted shortfall.

Remark:

- ICC measures the magnitude of not reaching the condition, Klein [1986].
- when randomness is defined by scenarios, (2) is equivalent to $\sum_{s=1}^{S} p^s \left(B^s X - d^s\right)^- \leq \beta$.
  - linear optimization problem with linear feasibility set
  - 1st application to ALM for pension fund: Vlerk and al. [2003]

1 Introduction

2 Intoduction to stochastic programming

3 Application to ALM for pension funds
- The ALM problem
- One period Integrated chance constraint in ALM
- Multiperiod Integrated Chance Constraints
- Comparison of OICC to MICC

4 Conclusion

Settings

We define by

- T the time horizon of the ALM study
- t the time index such that $t \in \{0, 1, \ldots, T\}$

- cr_t the contribution rate of year $t+1$ (decision)
- H_t the asset allocation at time t (decision)
- Z_t is the remedial contribution at time t (decision)

- (t, s) the node at time t in scenario s
- W_t^s the total level of salary during year t in scenario s
- A_t^s the total amount of asset at time t in scenario s
- L_t^s the total amount of liability at time t in scenario s

Funding ratio

The funding ratio (or cover ratio) is defined by

$$FR_t^s := \frac{A_t^s}{L_t^s} \tag{3}$$

- Good indicator of pension fund solvency
- Underfunding occurs when $FR_t^s \leq 1 \Leftrightarrow A_t^s - L_t^s \leq 0$
- The higher FR_t^s is, the healthier the fund is
- Target funding ratio γ s.t. $FR_t^s \geq \gamma \Leftrightarrow A_t^s - \gamma L_t^s \geq 0$

Remark: One can control FR_t^s by making the **right decision (H_0, cr_0 and Z_0)**.

The ALM problem

Objective: Direct cost + Penalty cost

$$\min_{H,cr,Z} \mathbb{E}_0 \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} v_{t+1} \left(cr_t W_{t+1} + \lambda_z Z_{t+1} \right) + \sum_{t=0}^{T-2} v_{t+1} \lambda_{\Delta_{cr}} \Delta_{cr_t} W_{t+1} \right] \tag{4}$$

where $\Delta_{cr_t} := \mid cr_{t+1} - cr_t \mid$ is the absolute variation of contribution rate from year t to $t+1$, v_t is the discount factor for a cash flow in year t, λ_z and $\lambda_{\Delta_{cr}}$ are, respectively, penalty parameters for remedial contribution and absolute variation of contribution rate.

Constraints:

- Risk constraints: One-period or Multiperiod ICC
- Other constraints: short selling, liquidity, Portfolio, budget, operating

Remark: Only H_0, cr_0 and Z_0 are of interest to the decision maker

Assumption: Defined benefit pension fund, $T := 5$ and 5 classes of assets

One-period integrated chance constraint (OICC)

We define the one-period ICC in ALM for pension fund:

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,s}\left(A^{*s}_{t+1} - \gamma L^{s}_{t+1}\right)^{-} := \sum_{s^{'} \in \mathcal{S}} p^{s^{'}}_{t,s} \left(A^{*s^{'}}_{t+1} - \gamma L^{s^{'}}_{t+1}\right)^{-} \leq \beta \tag{5}$$

where β is the risk parameter and $p^{s^{'}}_{t,s}$ stands for the conditional probability to reach node $\left(t+1, s^{'}\right)$ going from (t,s) and $p^{s^{'}}_{t,s} = 0$ for any scenario $s^{'}$ of $t+1$ not descending from (t,s)

- Decisions are taken at each node (t,s) with respect to (5)
- ALM one-year term constraints in a multistage framework
- Linear constraint at each node (t,s)
- **Application:** See Vlerk and al. [2003]
- **Limit:** β is neither scale free, nor time dependent

OICC (cont'd)

What if we define β as a function of obligations and depending on time: $\beta_t^s := f\left(A_t^s, L_t^s\right) := \alpha L_t^s$? Therefore, constraint 5 leads to

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,s}\left(A_{t+1}^{*s} - \gamma L_{t+1}^s\right)^- := \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} p_{t,s}^{s'} \left(A_{t+1}^{*s'} - \gamma L_{t+1}^{s'}\right)^- \leq \alpha L_t^s \tag{6}$$

where β_t^s can be obtained at each node (t, s) and α is a scale free parameter

- **Question 1:** *How does the first stage optimal decision change with respect to α ?*
- **Question 2:** *How does the first stage optimal decision change with respect to the initial cover ratio ?*

OICC: Results of question 1; $F_0 := 0.92$







OICC: Results of question 1 (cont'd)

- When $\alpha \leq 0.025$, cr_0 is at its maximum. From $\alpha = 0.025$, it decreases linealy until it reaches 0.27 at $\alpha = 0.04$ and remains unchanged thereafter.
- The proportion of remedial contribution linealy decreases from 9% at $\alpha = 0$ to reach 0% at $\alpha = 0.025$ and stays constant for $\alpha \geq 0.025$.
- From $\alpha = 0.035$, the fund can no more receive remedial contribution.
- The model parameters have been set for this purpose.
- The risk exposition increases with α.
- From $\alpha = 0.04$, the ICC has no more influence on the model.

OICC: Results of question 2, $\alpha := 0.035$







OICC: Results of question 2 (cont'd)

- When $F_0 \leq 0.9$, cr_0 is at its maximum 0.3. From $F_0 = 0.9$, it continuously decreases.
- The proportion of remedial contribution linealy decreases from 52% at $F_0 = 50\%$ to reach 0% at $F_0 = 0.9$ and stays constant for $F_0 \geq 0.9$.
- From $F_0 = 0.9$, the fund can no more receive remedial contribution.
- The model parameters have been set for this purpose.
- When $F_0 < 0.9$, the optimal asset allocation is stable: approximatively 30% in riskier asset.
- From $F_0 = 0.9$, the funding ratio is high enough and the risk exposition increase progressively until it reach 50% at $F_0 = 1.275$.
- For $F_0 \geq 1.275$, the risk exposition decreases in order to guarantee the target funding ratio $\bar{F}$.

MICC

The pension fund ALM problem is a long term problem. Therefore, the long term risk constraint is of capital importance. We define the multiperiod ICC (MICC):

$$\mathbb{E}_{h-1,s}\left(A_h^{*s} - \gamma L_h^s\right)^- \leq \beta_t^s = \alpha L_t^s, \quad h \in \mathcal{T}_{t+1} \text{ and } \quad t \in \mathcal{T}_0 \setminus \{T\} \tag{7}$$

with

$$\mathbb{E}_{h-1,s}\left(A_h^{*s} - \gamma L_h^s\right)^- = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} p_{h-1,s}^{s'} \left(A_h^{*s'} - \gamma L_h^{s'}\right)^- .$$

- Safer and more conservative by definition

Proposition

The integration of constraint (7) in our ALM scenario program is equivalent to formulating the following statement at each node (t, s):

$$\sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} p_{t,s}^{s'} \left(A_{t+1}^{*s'} - \gamma L_{t+1}^{s'}\right)^- \leq \min_{0 \leq t' \leq t} \alpha L_{t'}^s . \tag{8}$$

MICC: Results of question 1; $F_0 := 0.92$







MICC: Results of question 1 (cont'd)

- When $\alpha \leq 0.027$, cr_0 is at its maximum 0.3. From $\alpha = 0.027$, it decreases until it reaches 0.27 at $\alpha = 0.07$ and remains unchanged thereafter.
- The proportion of remedial contribution linealy decreases from 9% at $\alpha = 0$ to reach 0% at $\alpha = 0.07$ and stays constant for $\alpha \geq 0.07$.
- From $\alpha = 0.07$, the fund can no more receive remedial contribution.
- The model parameters have been set for this purpose.
- The risk exposition increases with α.
- From $\alpha = 0.07$, the ICC has no more influence on the model.

Remark: *Comments are similar as in OICC, but key values differ.*

MICC: Results of question 2, $\alpha := 0.035$







Comparison of OICC to MICC









1 Introduction

2 Intoduction to stochastic programming

3 Application to ALM for pension funds

4 Conclusion

Conclusion

- We discuss the role of ICC in dynamic ALM
  - we include a scale free parameter and time dependence
  - the one-period constraint is extended to multiperiod

- MICC is preferable to OICC as:
  - it is safer, and
  - the cost of safety is not significant

  Limit: The results rely on the construction method of the scenario tree. It would be interesting to analyse its stability.

- **Email**: youssouf.toukourou@unil.ch

[1] John R Birge and François V Louveaux. *Introduction to stochastic programming*. Springer, 2011.

[2] Giorgio Consigli and MAH Dempster. Dynamic stochastic programming for asset-liability management. *Annals of Operations Research*, 81:131–162, 1998.

[3] Willem K Klein Haneveld. Duality in stochastic linear and dynamic programming. *Lecture notes in economics and mathematical systems*, 274, 1986.

[4] Roy Kouwenberg. Scenario generation and stochastic programming models for asset liability management. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 134(2):279–292, 2001.

[5] Youssouf AF Toukourou and François Dufresne. On integrated chance constraints in alm for pension funds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.05343*, 2015.

[6] Maarten H van der Vlerk, Willem K Klein Haneveld, and Matthijs H Streutker. Integrated chance constraints in an alm model for pension funds. 2003.

[7] William T Ziemba and John M Mulvey. *Worldwide asset and liability modeling*, volume 10. Cambridge University Press, 1998.