Assignment 4.

1. Case Study: MBS Pricing

On the 15th of February 2008, the reference portfolio of the SPV Cayman V has a total notional of \in 1 bn: this portfolio can be considered homogeneous. Assume for simplicity that mortgages provide a single payment at the end of the interest period T equal to two years and defaults are independent from interest rates; for the period T the default probability of each mortgage is 6.5%, correlation is 40% and an average recovery of 65% for each mortgage.

- a. Value with a Vasicek model the price of a mezzanine Tranche (with subordinations -detachment points- K_d 6% and K_u 9%), considering valid the hypothesis of Large Homogeneous Portfolio. Express the price in percentage units.
- b. For the same tranche, estimate the impact of the hypothesis of Large Homogeneous Portfolio for I = 500. Show that the price of the Tranche in relative terms (as a percentage of tranche face value) is well described by the Kullback-Leibler (KL) approximation in the range $I = (10, 2 \ 10^4)$, where the LHP approximation holds. It is required to plot the price varying I (in log scale in the abscissa), with
- the exact solution (up to an I that your computer allows to obtain a price);
- the approximate solution;
- the LHP solution.
- c. When pricing the tranche, use a normalization constant more precise than the one arising from the Stirling formula. Do the results differ significantly?
- d. [optional] Price the Equity tranche with detachment points K_u 6% varying I in the same range considered at the point b. Is the KL approximation adequate? How can you modify it?

2. Case Study: Pricing in presence of counterparty risk

On the 15th of Feb 2008 at 10:45 a.m. CET bank XX buys form ISP a 5y Cliquet option for a 50 MIO € notional. Option payoff yearly payoff (annual bond) at each payment date is

$$\frac{\left[S(t_i) - S(t_{i-1})\right]^+}{S(t_{i-1})}$$

with i = 1, ..., 5. The option is on an equity stock (with no dividends) and constant volatility 20%. In case of default between t_{i-1} and t_i the value that should be considered is in t_{i-1} with payment in t_i . Compute numerically.

What should be the correct price? At what price ISP would try to sell?

[Hint: consider the dynamics of the underlying not of the corresponding forward]

3. Case Study: Variance-covariance method for VaR & ES in linear portfolio, plausibility check, a simple example of data mining

At the end of the 4th of July 2012 for an equally weighted equity portfolio with: Santander, AXA, Generali, Bayer. Compute daily VaR and ES with a 3y estimation using the dataset provided via Gaussian parametric approach and check VaR order of magnitude with a plausibility check.

Warning:

Pay attention that the trading days of the different stocks are not the same. Add previous day value in case of missing share price.

4. Numerical Exercise

For a Normal distribution and a t-Student with 3 degrees of freedom compute portfolio VaR & ES (with alpha = 99% and 10 business-day time horizon) given a portfolio of 2 stocks with the following data

```
w = [0.6; 0.4];
volatilities = [15%; 30%];
mu = [3%; 5%];
CorrMatrix = [1, 0.3; 0.3, 1]
```

with a unitary initial portfolio value. As usual volatilities and mu are p.a. values.

Function signatures

VaR = plausibilityCheck(returns, portfolioWeights, alpha, portfolioValue)

[ES, VaR] = AnalyticNormal(yearlyCovarianceMatrix, yearlyMeanReturns, portfolioWeights, riskMeasureTimeLag, alpha).

[ES, VaR] = AnalyticTstudent(yearlyCovarianceMatrix, yearlyMeanReturns, portfolioWeights, riskMeasureTimeLag, alpha, degreesOfFreedom);

All vectors are column vectors.

*Name of some M*atlab functions:

nchoosek(I,n): Newton Binomial coefficient

norminv(alpha): Inverse CDF normal

normpdf(x): pdf normal

quadgk: for numerical integration tinv(alpha,dof): Inverse cdf t-Student

tpdf(x,dof): Pdf t-Student

prctile(ptfLosses,100* alpha) Percentile for a given vector of portfolio Losses