

- 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  $\tau$  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  $\tau$ 's
- ▶ In a deterministic framework, it can be shown that  $P_{t+1}(\tau - 1) = \frac{P_t(\tau)}{P_t(1)}$  for all  $\tau$
- ▶ 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  $\tau$ )

# 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  $\tau$ ) [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  $\delta$

## 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 ( $\rho$  and  $\delta$ )
- ▶ 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  $n^{\text{th}}$  switching time of a system and  $X_n$  as the state at the  $n^{\text{th}}$  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  $\zeta_t$
- ▶  $\zeta_t$  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  $\zeta_t$  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  $\tau$  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  $\tau$
- ▶ Indeed, suppose  $u_i(\tau) > d_i(\tau) > 1$ . At  $t$ , buy a zero coupon of time to maturity  $\tau$ . 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  $\tau$  and  $H$  bonds of time to maturity  $\tau'$
- ▶ 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  $\tau$ :

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

- ▶ 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  $\delta_i$ .

## 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  $\rho_{ij}$  and  $\delta_j$  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

