Valuation Model for Equity-Linked Securities with Guaranteed Return

David Lee

ABSTRACT

Equity-linked securities with a guaranteed return are desirable instruments in a volatile market environment. In this paper, we consider a security whose value depends on the performance of a basket of equities averaged over certain points in time, but that is bounded below by a guaranteed amount. We show that the security's price is given by the sum of the guaranteed amount plus the price of an Asian style option on the basket above. Here we present a new method for valuing the embedded Asian option. The method provides analytical formulas for the security's price as well as for corresponding hedge ratios; these respective formulas appear, based on numerical testing against a Monte Carlo benchmark, to be accurate over a wide range of underlying security parameter values. Finally, we apply our method to value the embedded European style put option arising from a type of segregated fund with a maturity guarantee.

Key Words: Equity-linked securities, segregated fund, asset pricing, derivative valuation, hedge ratio.

JEL Classification: E44, G21, G12, G24, G32, G33, G18, G28

1 Introduction

Equity-linked derivatives become popular mainly due to the guaranteed minimum returns that investors receive. This guarantee feature allows investors to benefit from the upside potential of equity growth without full exposure to the downside risk.

There is a vast literature studying equity-linked securities. Kotadia (2021) provides a brief background on the pricing of equity-linked structured products and discusses issues around valuation of these products.

Rieger (2012) analyzes the reason for retail investors buying structured products and concludes the probability mis-estimation and behavioral biases play dominant role in investors mind while buying such products.

Zhang et al. (2020) utilize the exponential Lévy process for modeling the stock price process to analyze the equity-linked pricing problem. By using the Fast Fourier Transform, they derive the price of the structured products and obtain the price for various payoffs.

Wang et al. (2021) analyze the valuation problem of equity-linked instruments with regime-switching jump diffusion models. Their method of Fourier expansion and Fourier transform has been used to derive closed expressions for some contracts. Their method's effectiveness is demonstrated by numerical values that confirm its efficiency.

Kirkby and Nguyen (2021) focus their work on determining the payoff of equity-linked products and are able to derive a closed form of the price of such products when the risky index process follows the exponential Lévy process.

In this paper we present a new method for valuing a type of equity-linked security that provides a guaranteed return. The yield from the security depends on the performance of a basket consisting of one or more equity-linked indices. Here the basket level is given by a certain weighted sum of the respective price of each index. The security's return at maturity is based on the arithmetic average of the basket's level over certain points in time, but is bounded below by a guaranteed amount. In this sense we can view the security as including an embedded Asian style option on the basket of indices above. In this paper we focus on valuing the embedded option and its sensitivity to different market conditions.

Furthermore, we consider a type of segregated fund whose value at maturity is guaranteed to be greater than the starting invested principal. Here the fund holder incurs, in addition to a management fee, a protection fee towards the fund's guaranteed minimum value at maturity. We show that the value of this guaranteed return, which amounts to the price of a certain European style put option, can be computed using the method considered above.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the form of the equity-linked security with guaranteed return. Then, in Section 3, we present our method for valuing this security. In Section 4 we show numerical pricing results. Next, in Section 5, we describe a type of segregated fund, and how to value its maturity guarantee using the method described in Section 3. Finally, Section 6 contains our conclusions.

2 Product Definition

We consider a security whose payoff depends on the return from a finite number, M, of equity-linked indices. Let I_t^j, for $j = 1,\ldots,M$, denote the price of the j^{th} index at time equal to t, and let ω_j denote a fixed, positive weight corresponding to this index.

Next let T denote the security's maturity. Furthermore let $\{t_1,..., t_N\}$, where $N > 0$ and $0 < t_1 < ... < t_N \leq T$, be a finite set of observation times. Finally let P denote an amount guaranteed to the security holder at maturity.

The payoff at maturity depends on the weighted sum, over each index, of the relative change in the arithmetic average of the index's price, with respect to the set observation points above, from the index's initial level. Formally the payoff at maturity is given by

$$\max\left(P + \sum_{i=1}^{M} \omega_i \frac{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N} I_{t_j}^i - I_0^i}{I_0^i},\ P \right) = P + \max\left(\sum_{i=1}^{M} \omega_i \frac{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N} I_{t_j}^i - I_0^i}{I_0^i},\ 0 \right). \tag{2.1}$$

Next let

$$Z_t = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \alpha_j I_t^j$$

denote the price at time t of a basket of the equity-linked indices above; here $\alpha_j = \dfrac{\omega_j}{I_0^j}$ is the ratio of the j^{th} index's weight over the index's initial level.

Then the payoff (2.1) is equivalent to

$$P + \max\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} Z_{t_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \omega_i, 0 \right),$$

which is the sum of the payoff from an Asian style option sampled at the discrete points above plus the guaranteed component.

3 Valuation Model

In this section we present our model for pricing an Asian style option with payoff at maturity, T, of the form

$$\max\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} Z_{t_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{M}\omega_i, 0\right). \tag{3.1}$$

Here we assume that each index follows geometric Brownian motion with drift under its respective risk-neutral probability measure. Each index is then expressed under the domestic risk-neutral probability measure by a corresponding change of measure. Observe that, under these assumptions, the random variable

$$Y = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} Z_{t_i} \tag{3.2}$$

is not log-normally distributed. This, then, makes it mathematically difficult to value the payoff (3.1) using analytical techniques.

The standard Levy approach (see Levy (1992)) towards valuing the payoff (3.1) is to approximate Y in (3.2) by a log-normally distributed random variable. Here the defining parameters for the log-normal random variable are uniquely determined by matching its first two moments with those of Y.

The option value is then given from an analytical formula by taking the expected value of the payoff (3.1), but where the underlying security value, Y, is replaced by that of the log-normally distributed random variable.

Our valuation approach aims to match more moments, and can be viewed as an extension of Levy's. Specifically, we approximate Y in (3.2) by a shifted log-normal random variable, of the form

$$a + e^{b+c\varepsilon}, \tag{3.3}$$

where a and b are constants, c is a positive constant, and ε is a standard, normally distributed random variable. Here a, b and c are uniquely determined, with analytical form, by matching the first three moments of Y with those of (3.3).

An analytical, approximate option pricing formula is then derived by taking the expected value of the payoff (3.1), but where the underlying security's value is replaced by that of the shifted log-normal random variable.

Assume that, under the domestic risk neutral probability measure, the process $\left\{ I_t^j \;\middle|\; t \geq 0 \right\}$, for $j = 1, \ldots, M$, satisfies a stochastic differential equation of the form

$$dI_t^j = I_t^j \left(\mu_j dt + \sigma_j dW_t^j \right)$$

where μ_j is a constant drift parameter, σ_j is a constant volatility parameter, and $\left\{ W_t^j \middle| t \geq 0 \right\}$ is a standard Brownian motion.

Suppose also that the Brownian motions $\left\{ W_t^j \middle| t \geq 0 \right\}$ and $\left\{ W_t^k \middle| t \geq 0 \right\}$, for $j, k \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$, have a constant instantaneous correlation coefficient, ρ_{jk}. The first moment of Y then equals

$$E(Y) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \alpha_i I_0^i e^{\mu_i t_k} .$$

Furthermore, the second moment of Y is given by

$$E(Y^2) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{k,l \in \{1,\ldots,N\}} E\left(Z_{t_k} Z_{t_l}\right),$$

where

$$E\left(Z_{t_k} Z_{t_l}\right) = \sum_{m,n \in \{1,\ldots,M\}} \alpha_m \alpha_n I_0^m I_0^n e^{\mu_m t_k + \mu_n t_l + \sigma_m \sigma_n \rho_{mn} \min(t_k, t_l)}.$$

Also, the third moment of Y equals

$$E\left(Y^3\right) = \frac{1}{N^3} \sum_{l,m,n \in \{1,\ldots,N\}} E\left(Z_{t_l} Z_{t_m} Z_{t_n}\right),$$

where

$$E\left(Z_{t_l} Z_{t_m} Z_{t_n}\right) = \sum_{i,j,k, \in \{1,\ldots,M\}} \alpha_i \alpha_j \alpha_k I_0^i I_0^j I_0^k e^{\mu_i t_l + \mu_j t_m + \mu_k t_n + \sigma_i \sigma_j \rho_{ij} \min(t_l, t_m) + \sigma_i \sigma_k \rho_{ik} \min(t_l, t_n) + \sigma_j \sigma_k \rho_{jk} \min(t_m, t_n)}.$$

By matching the first three moments of Y with those of the shifted log-normal random variable (3.3), we obtain the system of nonlinear equations

$$E(Y) = a + e^{b + \frac{c^2}{2}}, \tag{3.4a}$$

$$E(Y^2) = a^2 + 2ae^{b + \frac{c^2}{2}} + e^{2b + 2c^2}, \tag{3.4b}$$

$$E(Y^3) = a^3 + 3a^2 e^{b + \frac{c^2}{2}} + 3ae^{2b + 2c^2} + e^{3b + \frac{9}{2}c^2}, \tag{3.4c}$$

for the unknowns a, b and c. It can be shown that, under certain conditions, the nonlinear system of equations above has a closed-form, unique, real solution.

Let r denote the risk-free interest rate (see https://finpricing.com/lib/IrCurve.html) for a term equal to the option maturity, T. The Asian style option with payoff (3.1) then has value

$$\Omega = e^{-rT} E\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} Z_{t_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \omega_i, 0\right)\right), \tag{3.7a}$$

which we approximate by

$$\tilde{\Omega} = e^{-rT} E\left(\max\left(a + e^{b+c\varepsilon} - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \omega_i, 0\right)\right). \tag{3.7b}$$

Let X denote $\sum_{i=1}^{M} \omega_i$. If $X > a$, then (3.7b) equals

$$e^{-rT} \int_{\frac{\log(X-a)-b}{c}}^{+\infty} \left(a + e^{b+cy} - X\right) f(y) dy$$
$$= e^{-rT}\left(\left(a - X\right) n\left(\frac{b - \log\left(X - a\right)}{c}\right) + e^{b+\frac{c^2}{2}} n\left(c + \frac{b - \log\left(X - a\right)}{c}\right)\right),$$

where $f(y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2}$ is the probability density function for a standard, normally distributed random variable and $n(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{z} f(y) dy$ is the corresponding cumulative distribution function.

If $X \le a$, then (3.7b) equals

$$e^{-rT}\left(a - X + e^{b+\frac{c^2}{2}}\right).$$

We may be interested in the option delta, $\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial I_0^j}$, and the option Vega, $\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial \sigma_j}$, for $j = 1, \ldots, M$. These hedge ratios are respectively approximated by $\frac{\partial \tilde{\Omega}}{\partial I_0^j}$ and $\frac{\partial \tilde{\Omega}}{\partial \sigma_j}$, for $j = 1, \ldots, M$, and are obtained from direct differentiation of $\tilde{\Omega}$ using the chain rule.

Let the floor level, F, be given such that $F \leq -1$. Furthermore let $N = 0$ be the number of price returns to be capped. The combined price return is then of the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{M} \max\left(\frac{I_i}{I_{i-1}} - 1, F \right) &= \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left(\frac{I_i}{I_{i-1}} - 1 \right), \\
&= -M + \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{I_i}{I_{i-1}}, \\
&= -M + \sum_{i=1}^{M} e^{\left(r - q - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)(t_i - t_{i-1}) + \sigma\left(W_{t_i} - W_{t_{i-1}}\right)},
\end{aligned}
$$

since $\frac{I_i}{I_{i-1}} > 0$, for $i \in \{1, .., M\}$. The value of the combined price return then equals

$$
E\left(\frac{-M + \sum_{i=1}^{M} e^{\left(r - q - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)(t_i - t_{i-1}) + \sigma\left(W_{t_i} - W_{t_{i-1}}\right)}}{e^{rT_M}} \right) = e^{-rT_M} \left(-M + \sum_{i=1}^{M} e^{(r-q)(t_i - t_{i-1})} \right).
$$

4 Numerical Results

It is interesting to compare the accuracy of our option pricing formula, as well as that of a Levy based pricing formula, against a Monte Carlo benchmark. To this end we consider the following Levy based pricing approach. Let U be a log-normally distributed random variable, of the form

$$U = e^{a+b\varepsilon},$$

where a is a constant, b is a positive constant, and ε is a standard, normally distributed random variable. We choose a and b by matching the first two moments of the basket's price at maturity with those of the log-normal random variable U. We then approximate the option's price, (3.7a), by

$$e^{-rT} E\left(\max\left(U - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \omega_i , 0 \right) \right).$$

We have implemented both our pricing model, described in Section 3, and the Levy based approach above.

As an example, we consider the Asian style option arising from a security dependent on the return from a basket of five indices. Here the payoff, of the form (3.1), depends on the arithmetic average of the basket's price at twelve observation points. These points are respectively set to the last business day in each of the eleven months that precede the month in which the security matures and the business day that immediately precedes the maturity date.

Here the security was issued on July 23, 2018, and matures on July 23, 2023; the valuation date is on June 2, 2019. In Figure 4.1 we show the initial level and corresponding weight for each index, as well as the observation points.

Figure 4.1. Snapshot of basket description screen (here we display two significant digits).

Pictures4Paper.xls

Basket Description

Index #	1	2	3	4	5
Initial Level	2421.04	391.64	1147.27	15944.36	2913.59
Weight, %	25	30	10	2.5	2.5

Observation Points

Number	Term	Date
1	3.25	08/31/2002
2	3.33	09/30/2002
3	3.41	10/31/2002
4	3.50	11/30/2002
5	3.58	12/31/2002
6	3.67	01/31/2003
7	3.74	02/28/2003
8	3.83	03/31/2003
9	3.91	04/30/2003
10	3.99	05/31/2003
11	4.08	06/30/2003
12	4.14	07/22/2003

Sheet1 Sheet2 Sheet3

In Figure 4.2 we show pricing results for various embedded options specified from the parameters in Figure 4.1. Here the Volatility Shift parameter indicates a respective relative shift to all original volatility parameter values.

The corresponding benchmark option prices, shown in Figure 4.2, are numerical values for Formula (3.7a), which were computed using crude Monte Carlo simulation based on four million sample paths with .7% standard error. We note that, for the case of zero shift to the volatilities, the parameter values for the shifted log-normal random variable,

$$a + e^{b + c\varepsilon},$$

were computed as $a = .3259$, $b = -.6821$ and $c = 0.3332$.

Figure 4.2. Numerical option pricing results (expressed as a percentage of the notional amount).

Volatility Shift, %	Model Price based on Formula (3.7b)	Monte-Carlo Benchmark Price	Levy Price
-50	12.59	12.61	12.61
0	13.48	13.50	13.74
50	15.10	15.13	15.80
100	16.99	17.06	18.37

In Figure 4.3 we display various hedge ratios, with respect to the first index, for the option specified from the original parameters shown in Figure 4.1. The hedge ratios based on Formula (3.7b) are from the direct, analytical differentiation of (3.7b). Benchmark hedge ratios are computed using a one-sided finite difference approximation applied to the true option pricing formula, (3.7a); here numerical values for (3.7a) were obtained using crude Monte Carlo simulation based on 4 million sample paths.

Levy based hedge ratios are based on a finite difference approximation. Observe that the relative error in the Levy based vega value from the Monte Carlo (MC) benchmark is approximately 37%, while the vega from Formula (3.7b) differs from the benchmark only by 5.8%.

Figure 4.3. Hedge ratios with respect to the first index.

Hedge ratio	Model value	MC value	Levy value

Price Delta	0.0083	0.0083	0.0082
Vega	2.76	2.94	1.85

5 Segregated Fund Valuation

We consider a segregated fund that invests in various foreign and domestic equities and bonds. We assume that the fund provides a maturity guarantee, that is, the fund's price at maturity is assured to be greater than the original invested amount. We also assume that the fund has no dynamic lapse or reset features, and that the holder pays periodic management and protection fees.

We model the fund's value by the price of basket of representative equity and bond-linked indices; the guarantee at maturity then measures the net shortfall from the basket's constituent indices. Specifically suppose that the basket contains a fixed number, N, of indices. Furthermore let I_t^i, for $i = 1,\ldots,N$, denote the price of the i^{th} index at time t.

Next let P denote the principal amount originally invested in the fund. Assume also that at the fund's outset a percentage, v_i, of the principal is invested in the i^{th} ($i = 1,\ldots,N$) index; the initial number of units, u_i, associated with the i^{th} index then equal

$$u_i = \frac{v_i P}{I_0^i}.$$

Let T denote the fund's maturity. Assume that protection and management fees are both collected at a set of times, $\{t_1,\ldots,t_M\}$, where $0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_M < T$. Suppose also that the protection and management fee are taken, at time t_i ($i = 1,\ldots,M$), as respective percentages, p_i and m_i, of the fund's price at t_i. The fund's price at maturity then equals

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_i I_T^i \tag{5.1}$$

where $\omega_i = u_i \prod_{j=1}^{M} \left[1 - \left(m_j + p_j\right)\right]$.

Suppose that the invested principal, P, is 100% guaranteed at maturity. The payoff at maturity from this guarantee then equals

$$\max\left(P - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_i I_T^i, 0\right), \tag{5.2}$$

which has the same form as that of a European style put option. Our approach towards valuing the payoff above is based on that presented in Section 3.

Specifically, we assume that the i^{th} ($i = 1,\ldots,N$) index's price process, $\left\{I_t^i \;\middle|\; t > 0\right\}$, follows geometric Brownian motion with drift under the domestic risk-neutral probability measure. We then approximate the basket's price at maturity, $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_i I_T^i$, by a shifted log-normal random variable, of the form

$$a + e^{b + c\varepsilon}. \tag{5.3}$$

Here the parameters a, b and c are uniquely determined, as described in Section 3, by matching the first three moments of the shifted log-normal random variable with those of the basket's price at maturity. We next approximate the payoff (5.2) by replacing the basket's value at maturity with that of the shifted log-normal random variable, that is,

$$\max\left(P - \left(a + e^{b + c\varepsilon}\right), 0\right). \tag{5.4}$$

Let r denote the constant risk-free rate for a period equal to the fund's maturity, T. The payoff (5.4) then has value

$$e^{-rT} E\left(\max\left(P - \left(a + e^{b+c\varepsilon}\right), 0\right)\right) \tag{5.5}$$

where E denotes the domestic risk-neutral probability measure. If $a < P$, then (5.5) equals

$$e^{-rT}\left(\left(P-a\right)n\left(\frac{\log\left(P-a\right)-b}{c}\right)-e^{b+\frac{c^2}{2}}n\left(\frac{\log\left(P-a\right)-b}{c}-c\right)\right)$$

where n is the cumulative distribution function for a standard, normally distributed random variable. If $a \geq P$, then (5.5) equals zero.

6 Conclusion

We considered a type of equity-linked security that provides a guaranteed return. We saw that the security's price was given by a guaranteed component plus the value of an embedded Asian style option on a basket of equity-linked indices. In this paper we presented a new method for valuing the embedded option.

Our approach towards pricing the embedded option was to approximate the option's underlying security value using a shifted log-normal random variable. Here the defining parameters for this random variable were given from the analytical, unique solution to a system of non-linear equations arising from a moment matching technique. An analytical, approximate option pricing formula was then derived by taking the expected value of the payoff, but where the underlying security's value was replaced by that of the shifted log-normal random variable.

Our analytic, approximate pricing formula was numerically compared against both a Monte Carlo benchmark and a Levy based approximate option pricing formula. Our pricing formula showed close agreement with the Monte Carlo benchmark over a wide range of option parameter values. The Levy based formula, however, showed much larger relative errors (e.g., as much as 8%) depending on the option tenor and volatility parameter values.

We saw that our method provides analytical formulas for hedge ratios, from the direct differentiation of the approximate option pricing formula. These formulas were numerically compared against benchmark Monte Carlo based hedge ratios. We saw that delta hedge ratios were in close agreement with the corresponding benchmark, but that the Vega hedge ratios differed by approximately 6% under average parameter values. Hedge ratios computed from the Levy approximation, however, showed much larger errors (e.g., as large as 37%) depending on the tenor and volatility.

We also considered a type of segregated fund with a maturity guarantee. We saw that the value of the guaranteed return is modeled as the price of a certain European style put option on a basket of indices; furthermore, this price can be computed using the method described in Section 3.

In summary our method provides for the analytical, accurate pricing of certain Asian style options on a basket of underlying equity-linked indices. Furthermore, the method can be applied to value the embedded European style put option arising from a certain type of segregated fund. Although our analytical valuation method provides for a significant speed-up over an alternative Monte-Carlo pricing method, the accuracy of the method degrades depending on the tenor and the underlying volatility parameter values.

References

Gerber, H., Elias S., Shiu, W., and Yang, H., 2012. Valuing equity-linked death benefits and other contingent options: A discounted density approach. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 53: 615–23

Kirkby, J. and Nguyen, D., 2021, Equity-linked guaranteed minimum death benefits with dollar cost averaging. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 100: 408–428.

Klein, P. and Yang, J., 2010, Counterparty credit risk and American options, Journal of Derivatives, 20 (4), 20 – 40.

Kotadia, C., 2021, Evaluation of equity-linked structured products and pricing, International Journal for Innovation Education and Research, 9 (1), 314-335

Levy, E. (1992). Pricing European average rate currency options. J. of Int. Mon. and Fin., 11, 474-491.

Rieger, M., 2012, Why Do Investors Buy Bad Financial Products? Probability Misestimation and Preferences in Financial Investment Decision. *Journal of Behavioral Finance*, 13(2), 108–118.

Wang, Y., Zhang, Z. and Yu, W., 2021, Pricing equity-linked death benefits by complex Fourier series expansion in a regime-switching jump diffusion model. Applied Mathematics and Computations 399: 126031.

Zhang, Z., Yong, Y. and Yu, W., 2020, Valuing equity-linked death benefits in general exponential Lévy models. Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics 365: 112377.