TRANSACTIONS OF SOCIETY OF ACTUARIES
1991 VOL. 43

MULTIVARIATE IMMUNIZATION THEORY

ROBERT R. REITANO

ABSTRACT

Extending the general nonparallel shift approach to duration analysis developed previously [28], this paper explores the immunization properties of that model. In particular, results are developed for directional immunization, in which the yield curve shift direction vector is specified, as well as for nondirectional immunization. Throughout, the goal of immunization at a time k periods into the future is seen to be intimately linked to the relationship between the durational and convexity attributes of the portfolio and those of a k-period zero-coupon bond. Applications to asset/liability management are then explored in theory and in a detailed example, which illustrates the potential shortcomings of traditional parallel shift immunization.

I. INTRODUCTION

The concepts of duration and immunization have been the subjects of increasing interest, from both a theoretical and an applied perspective. Originally discovered more than 50 years ago, duration was defined to better reflect the length of a payment stream (Macaulay [21]). A short time later (Hicks [14]), it was independently derived in an investigation into the elasticity of the price of a bond with respect to the discount factor $v=(1+i)^{-1}$.

Soon thereafter (Samuelson [30]), Redington [23]), duration was rediscovered in the context of the immunization of a firm's or portfolio's net worth, that is, in pursuit of conditions under which assets and liabilities would be equally responsive to changes in an underlying interest rate. Redington's approach [23] was later adapted by Vanderhoof [34] and became what to many of today's actuaries represented an introduction to this field of thought and its application to insurance company portfolios. Common to the above investigations was the assumption of a single interest rate for all discountings of cash flows, that is, a flat yield curve.

Fisher and Weil [11] first extended the Redington model to reflect a nonflat term structure and developed a corresponding duration measure sometimes denoted D_2, to distinguish it from the Macaulay duration, D_1. This measure reflected price sensitivity to parallel shifts in the term structure, that is, shifts for which each yield point moves by the same amount.

Other definitions of duration were developed (Bierwag [3], Khang [20], Brennan and Schwartz [8]) corresponding to other models of yield curve dynamics, or the manner in which the term structure changes. Surveys of these models and related matters can be found in Bierwag, Kaufman and Toevs [7] and in Bierwag [2], who also provides a broad survey of many aspects of this theory and its applications.

The fact that immunization against a given yield curve shift assumption generally fails to provide protection against more general yield curve shifts was noted by Ingersoll, Skelton and Weil [17], Fong and Vasicek [12], and Shiu [31]. The importance of the correct choice for yield curve dynamics was noted in Milgrom [22], as well as in Bierwag, Kaufman and Toevs [4], who investigated stochastic process risk and demonstrated that losses associated with choosing the wrong model can be substantial.

Other extensions of Redington's work include that of Grove [13], who immunized a non-zero initial net worth; Kaufman [19], who investigated the immunization of the net worth asset ratio; and Bierwag, Kaufman and Toevs [5,6], who introduced a methodology for developing an immunizing asset portfolio and investigated the concept of an efficient frontier in this context.

More recent approaches have involved immunizing multiple liabilities (Shiu [32]), tax-adjusting the duration measure (Stock and Simonson [33]), and utilizing a duration vector approach to immunization (Chambers, Carleton and McEnally [9]). This last approach defines a vector in which the components reflect "moments" of adjusted times-to-receipt of the underlying cash flows. In this context, traditional duration is closely related to their first moment, while the concepts of convexity and inertia (Bierwag [2]) are closely related to their second moment. The adjustment made to the times-to-receipt of the cash flows is a reduction by one time unit.

A general nonparallel shift approach to duration analysis was developed in Reitano [24,28], and applications to measuring potential yield curve risk were given in Reitano [25,27,29]. For this analysis, the yield curve is identified with a vector of values representing the "yield curve drivers," which can be taken, for instance, as the yields at the commonly quoted maturities. The underlying technique employed is a general multivariate analysis. Although multivariate models are not new (Bierwag [2], Ho [16]), the general model utilized provides great insight to portfolio sensitivity to general yield curve shifts.

In particular, "partial" durations are defined to reflect yield sensitivities point by point along the yield curve. These measures are then easily combined to produce "directional" duration measures that reflect portfolio sensitivity to any yield curve shift. The traditional duration measure, for example, reflecting sensitivity in the parallel shift direction, is seen to be the sum of the underlying partial durations.

The current article extends this theory to the question of immunization. The yield curve is again modeled as a vector of yields, with other yields assumed to be functionally dependent, such as via interpolation. Consequently, all yield curve changes are identified with vector shifts, and immunization is pursued within this multivariate context.

This immunization model is introduced in Section II, along with the necessary definitions from Reitano [24,28]. Section III then develops the theory of "directional" immunization at time k, which is seen to be a natural extension of Redington's parallel shift approach to general but specified nonparallel yield curve shifts.

In this context, as throughout the paper, the goal of immunization at a time k periods into the future is seen to be intimately connected to the relationship of the portfolio's directional duration and convexity attributes to those of a k-period zero-coupon bond. Naturally, immunization results for the special case of parallel shifts are seen to be equivalent to well-known results. Also in this section, the concept of an immunization boundary is explored, extending the idea of duration window (Bierwag [2]), as is the portfolio return on investment, generalizing Babcock [1].

Section IV applies these general results to the context of asset/liability management. Surplus immunization conditions are developed in both the absolute and asset ratio contexts and the results translated to implications for the immunization boundary. An example is then developed in detail that demonstrates that immunization for one direction, for example, against parallel shifts, may provide little protection against more general shifts. This result is shown in theory and by using actual yield curve shifts from August 1984 through June 1990.

Section V then develops immunization results in the general nondirectional context, that is, conditions under which portfolio values at time k are preserved under all yield curve shifts. General return on investment results are also developed, as are the implications for asset/liability management.

Section VI investigates the relationship of immunization properties to the yield curve model employed.

A technical appendix contains the proofs of the duration theory underlying the immunization results.

II. MULTIVARIATE IMMUNIZATION

A. Multivariate Price Model

Let $P(\mathbf{i})$ denote a positive valued multivariate price function that reflects the dependency of the price of a portfolio of securities on an underlying yield curve vector, $\mathbf{i}=(i_1, \ldots, i_m)$. This portfolio could equally well reflect assets, liabilities, or a net worth or surplus position. The cash flows encompassed by $P(\mathbf{i})$ may be fixed or interest-dependent, with $P(\mathbf{i})$ correspondingly representing a simple present value price function, or the price values obtained via a model that incorporates the options or other interest dependencies (for example, Clancy [10], Ho and Lee [15], and Jacob, Lord and Tilley [18]).

The yield curve above is modeled as a discrete vector, representing the yield curve drivers in a given valuation model, which can be taken as the yields at the commonly quoted maturity points. This yield curve may reflect any system of units (bond yields, spot or forward rates) and any nominal basis (annual, semiannual, and so on). In practice, yield points at other maturities are typically derived from these values via interpolation and/or other conversion, so it is appropriate to view the price of the portfolio, $P(\mathbf{i})$, as a function of this yield curve vector. For example, with $\mathbf{i}$ reflecting bond yields, pivotal yield values for maturities 0.25, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 20, and 30 years are sufficient for most valuations, and $P(\mathbf{i})$ can be modeled as a function of these ten observed values.

As in Reitano [24,28], we make the following definitions, which generalize the notions of duration and convexity to this yield vector basis. Accordingly, we assume throughout that $P(\mathbf{i})$ is twice differentiable, with continuous second-order partial derivatives.

Definition 1

Given $P(\mathbf{i})$, the j-th *partial duration function*, denoted $D_j(\mathbf{i})$, and the jk-th *partial convexity function*, denoted $C_{jk}(\mathbf{i})$, are defined for $P(\mathbf{i}) \neq 0$ as follows:

$$D_j(\mathbf{i}) = -d_j P(\mathbf{i})/P(\mathbf{i}), \quad j = 1, \ldots, m \tag{2.1}$$

$$C_{jk}(\mathbf{i}) = d_{jk} P(\mathbf{i})/P(\mathbf{i}), \quad j, k = 1, \ldots, m \tag{2.2}$$

where $d_j P(\mathbf{i})$ and $d_{jk} P(\mathbf{i})$ denote the corresponding partial derivatives of $P(\mathbf{i})$.

$$D_N(\mathbf{i}) = -d_N P(\mathbf{i})/P(\mathbf{i}), \tag{2.5}$$

$$C_N(\mathbf{i}) = d_N^2 P(\mathbf{i})/P(\mathbf{i}), \tag{2.6}$$

where $d_N P(\mathbf{i})$ and $d_N^2 P(\mathbf{i})$ denote the first- and second-order directional derivatives of $P(\mathbf{i})$ in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$. □

Intuitively, $\mathbf{N}$ equals the "direction" of the yield curve shift in that it reflects the relative magnitude of the individual shift amounts. A typical shift can then be modeled as $t\mathbf{N} = (tn_1, \ldots, tn_m)$, corresponding to each yield point i_j shifting by the amount tn_j. When all $n_j = 1$, the classical parallel shift model is produced.

A related model was developed in Ho [16], in which "key rate" durations are defined. In this context, several key rates are identified among the 360 monthly spot rates on a 30-year yield curve vector. These 360 spot rates are initially obtained using a regression model, the goal of which is to reproduce as closely as possible the price of a given collection of assets subject to certain smoothness constraints. Pyramid-type direction vectors are then defined, such as:

$$\mathbf{N}_j = (0, 0, ..1/2, 1, 2/3, 1/3, 0, ..0),$$

where the component "1" corresponds to the location of the given key rate. Also, these direction vectors form a "partition" of the parallel shift direction vector, that is:

$$\sum \mathbf{N}_j = (1, 1, \ldots, 1).$$

The various key rate durations are then equivalent to directional durations with the direction vectors above. For more details on the models' relationships, see Reitano [28].

The directional measures of Definition 2 can be easily obtained from the corresponding partial measures as follows:

$$D_N(\mathbf{i}) = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i}) \cdot \mathbf{N} = \sum n_j D_j(\mathbf{i}), \tag{2.7}$$

$$C_N(\mathbf{i}) = \mathbf{N}^T \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{i}) \mathbf{N} = \sum \sum n_j n_k C_{jk}(\mathbf{i}), \tag{2.8}$$

where $\mathbf{N}^T$ denotes the transpose of the column vector $\mathbf{N}$.

When $\mathbf{N} = (1, \ldots, 1)$, the associated directional measures above reduce to the more traditional modified duration and convexity measures, $D(\mathbf{i})$ and $C(\mathbf{i})$, calculated with respect to parallel yield curve shifts. In addition, we have from (2.7) and (2.8) that these traditional measures equal the sums of the corresponding partial measures:

$$D(\mathbf{i}) = \sum D_j(\mathbf{i}), \tag{2.9}$$

$$C(\mathbf{i}) = \sum\sum C_{jk}(\mathbf{i}). \tag{2.10}$$

When necessary for clarity, duration and convexity functions will explicitly reflect $P(\mathbf{i})$, such as $D_N(P)$ or $D_N(P;\mathbf{i})$ for $D_N(\mathbf{i})$.

B. Immunization Definitions

Let $P_k(\mathbf{i})$ denote the forward value of the portfolio at time $k \geq 0$, on the yield curve vector $\mathbf{i}$, where it is assumed that no securities are either added or removed from the portfolio during this period. In addition, we assume that the yield vector changes from the initial value of $\mathbf{i}_0$ to $\mathbf{i}$ immediately after time 0 and evolves according to the forward yield curve structure implied by $\mathbf{i}$ throughout the period. Letting $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$ denote the price of a k-period zero-coupon bond with maturity value of 1, it is clear that $1/Z_k(\mathbf{i})$ then equals the forward value at time k of 1 invested now. Consequently,

$$P_k(\mathbf{i}) = P(\mathbf{i})/Z_k(\mathbf{i}). \tag{2.11}$$

For example, if $i_j = i$ for all j, then $Z_k(i) = (1+i)^{-k}$ and $P_k(i) = (1+i)^k P(i)$.

Extending the classical notions of immunization, we have the following:

Definition 3

The price function $P(\mathbf{i})$ is said to be *locally immunized at time k on the yield vector* $\mathbf{i}_0$ if:

$$P_k(\mathbf{i}) \geq P_k(\mathbf{i}_0), \tag{2.12}$$

for $\mathbf{i}$ sufficiently close to $\mathbf{i}_0$; that is, for $|\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{i}_0| < r$, where $r > 0$ and $|\mathbf{i}|$ denotes the standard Euclidean norm:

$$|\mathbf{i}|^2 = \sum i_j^2. \tag{2.13}$$

Similarly, $P(\mathbf{i})$ is said to be *globally immunized at time k on the yield vector* $\mathbf{i}_0$ if (2.12) is satisfied for all feasible yield vectors $\mathbf{i}$. □

For the purposes of Definition 3, "feasibility" is not rigorously defined. Certainly, the restriction $0 < i_j$ is a minimal requirement for feasibility, though in applications other bounds may be more practical.

We analogously define *local and global immunization in the direction of* **N** by:

$$P_k(\mathbf{i}_0 + t\mathbf{N}) \geq P_k(\mathbf{i}_0) \tag{2.14}$$

for all t such that $|t| < r$ (local) and for all feasible t (global).

For the purposes of directional immunization, we restrict our attention to yield curve shifts of a fixed type, **N**, so only the amount of the shift t is variable. For example, **N** could reflect the classical parallel shift direction vector, or a shift vector that changes the yield curve level and slope, or a more general type of shift. In the nondirectional immunization model, we consider all possible directions of shift from $\mathbf{i}_0$.

Given the above definitions, we now return to the definition of $P_k(\mathbf{i})$ in (2.11) and investigate in more detail the implications of immunizing $P(\mathbf{i})$ at time k.

Assume first that $P(\mathbf{i})$ encompasses only fixed cash flows; that is:

$$P(\mathbf{i}) = \sum c_t \, [1 + r(0,t)]^{-t},$$

where $r(0,t)$ denotes the t-period spot rate, or the rate used to discount cash flows from time t to time 0. Clearly, in this notation, $Z_k(\mathbf{i}) = [1 + r(0,k)]^{-k}$.

Letting $r(s,t)$ denote the rate used to discount cash flows from time t to time s, or the implied $(t-s)$-period forward rate at time s, where $0 < s < t$, we have that:

$$[1 + r(0,t)]^{-t} = [1 + r(0,s)]^{-s} \, [1 + r(s,t)]^{-(t-s)}.$$

Hence, a simple calculation produces:

$$P_k(\mathbf{i}) = \sum c_t \, [1 + r(t,k)]^{(k-t)} + \sum c_t \, [1 + r(k,t)]^{-(t-k)},$$

where the first summation is over all $t < k$, and the second is over all $t \geq k$.

Consequently, we see that $P_k(\mathbf{i})$ equals the value of the cash flows at time k, where maturing cash flows are assumed to have been invested at the forward rates, and then future flows discounted at the forward rates, implied by $\mathbf{i}$. Immunization of $P(\mathbf{i})$ at time k on $\mathbf{i}_0$ then ensures that the above value will be no smaller than $P_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$, or the forward value of these cash flows based on the above formula and the forward rates implied by the current yield curve, $\mathbf{i}_0$.

It is clear from the above formula why the definition of $P_k(\mathbf{i})$ requires that the yield curve shift from $\mathbf{i}_0$ to $\mathbf{i}$ immediately after time 0 and then evolve according to the forward yield curve structure implied by $\mathbf{i}$. Otherwise, the first summation in the above formula would reflect the yield curves prevailing at the time of each maturity and reinvestment. In the current formulation, only the initial yield curve, $\mathbf{i}_0$, and the shifted yield curve, $\mathbf{i}$, have a bearing on the problem.

In the special case in which the immunization horizon k precedes the time of the first cash flow, that is, $k<t$ for all t, this assumption can be relaxed when cash flows are fixed. Specifically, in this case the yield curve shift from $\mathbf{i}_0$ to $\mathbf{i}$ can be assumed to occur at any time before time k, and can occur after any given number of other shifts; only the yield curve prevailing at time k matters. That is, immunization of $P(\mathbf{i})$ at time k on $\mathbf{i}_0$ will ensure that $P_k(\mathbf{i})$ will not fall below $P_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$ independent of the path followed by the yield curve from $\mathbf{i}_0$ to $\mathbf{i}$.

In the general case of interest-sensitive cash flows, $P_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$ in (2.11) cannot be expressed in terms of forward rates as in the above formula. However, its interpretation remains the same as the forward value of the portfolio given the current yield curve $\mathbf{i}_0$. This is because the portfolio can in theory be sold for $P(\mathbf{i}_0)$, its current market value, and the proceeds invested in a k-period zero-coupon bond, which will mature at time k for amount $P_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$.

In this context, immunization of $P(\mathbf{i})$ at time k on $\mathbf{i}_0$ again ensures that the actual forward value will not fall below this initial value when the yield curve shifts from $\mathbf{i}_0$ to $\mathbf{i}$. That is, although the current portfolio value will change from $P(\mathbf{i}_0)$ to $P(\mathbf{i})$, and the price of a zero-coupon bond will change from $Z_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$ to $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$, the above sale and purchase can still be implemented and will result in a value at time k no smaller than that originally targeted.

In contrast with the simple case of fixed cash flows, the assumption regarding the timing of the yield curve shift from $\mathbf{i}_0$ to $\mathbf{i}$, and the evolution of yields thereafter, cannot be relaxed in the case of interest-sensitive cash flows. That is, the value of the portfolio at time k will in general reflect both the timing of the shift in the simplest case, as well as the actual path the yield curve takes in the more complex case.

However, this assumption about the yield curve shift from $\mathbf{i}_0$ to $\mathbf{i}$, while necessary for the development of the theoretical results, does not prevent the application of the results to the real world. Rather, the results are fully applicable in the context of active portfolio management, whereby assets are frequently added or traded and new liabilities sold. In this context, the various criteria for immunization can be regarded as establishing targets for the asset and liability yield curve sensitivities.

For example, assume that the portfolio is structured so that surplus is immunized at time k on $\mathbf{i}_0$. Consider the value of the portfolio on the following business day, by which time the yield curve has inevitably shifted to $\mathbf{i}$. On the assumption that this shift was consistent with the direction assumed under a directional immunization program, or more generally if it is assumed that the portfolio was immunized against all shifts, it is clear that $P_k(\mathbf{i}) \geq P_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$. To remain immunized, the criteria implemented on the previous day must again be implemented in light of the new yield curve and any new assets or liabilities. In this sense, the immunization criteria become active management targets.

In the context of this day-to-day active management strategy, it makes little difference whether k is fixed in absolute terms or fixed in calendar time. In the former case, the management criteria will reflect fixed k, while in the latter case, k will be a function of time that decreases linearly as the target date approaches.

Returning to the general problem, it is clear from (2.12) and (2.14) that, for $P(\mathbf{i})$ to be immunized at time k on $\mathbf{i}_0$, $\mathbf{i}_0$ needs to be a relative minimum of $P_k(\mathbf{i})$ in the local immunization case and a global minimum in the global immunization case. For the results below, we utilize the well-known sufficient conditions for a point to be a minimum value. For example, a sufficient condition for $\mathbf{x}_0$ to be a local minimum of $f(\mathbf{x})$ in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$ is that:

$$d_N f(\mathbf{x}_0) = 0 \tag{2.15}$$

and

$$d_N^2 f(\mathbf{x}_0) > 0. \tag{2.16}$$

A sufficient condition for $\mathbf{x}_0$ to be a global minimum is that (2.15) holds and (2.16) is satisfied for all $\mathbf{x}$.

Similarly, a sufficient condition for $\mathbf{x}_0$ to be a local minimum of $f(\mathbf{x}_0)$ is that (2.15) and (2.16) hold for all $\mathbf{N}$; that is:

$$d_j f(\mathbf{x}_0) = 0, \qquad j = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{2.17}$$

and

$$(d_{jk} f(\mathbf{x}_0)) \text{ is positive definite,} \tag{2.18}$$

where $(d_{jk}f(\mathbf{x}_0))$ denotes the second derivative matrix, or Hessian matrix, of $f(\mathbf{x})$. A sufficient condition for $\mathbf{x}_0$ to be a global minimum is that (2.17) is satisfied and (2.18) holds for all $\mathbf{x}$.

We now investigate the immunization of $P(\mathbf{i})$. We will see that the durational and convexity properties of $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$ provide insight to sufficient conditions for immunization of $P(\mathbf{i})$ at time k. In particular, for local immunization we require that $P(\mathbf{i})$ have the "same duration" as $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$, and be "more convex," on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$. For global immunization, we also require duration and convexity relationships on other yield curve vectors. The concepts of "same duration" and "more convex" will be made precise below, but will be seen to be natural generalizations of the classical notions to this multivariate context.

III. DIRECTIONAL IMMUNIZATION

A. General Results

This section presents general results on directional immunization. For local immunization, it is sufficient for $P(\mathbf{i})$ to have the same directional duration as $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$ and greater directional convexity.

Proposition 1

Let $P(\mathbf{i})$, $\mathbf{i}_0$ and $\mathbf{N} \neq \mathbf{0}$ be given, and assume there exists $k \geq 0$ so that on $\mathbf{i}_0$:

$$D_N(P) = D_N(Z_k), \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$C_N(P) > C_N(Z_k). \tag{3.2}$$

Then $P(\mathbf{i})$ is locally immunized at time k in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$ on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$.

Proof

Applying Corollary A.4 from the Appendix to $P_k(\mathbf{i})$ in (2.11), we have from (3.1) and (3.2) that on $\mathbf{i}_0$:

$$D_N(P_k) = 0, \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$C_N(P_k) > 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Consequently, the respective directional derivatives of $P_k(\mathbf{i})$ satisfy the conditions of (2.15) and (2.16) on $\mathbf{i}_0$, since $P(\mathbf{i}_0)>0$ by assumption, and the result follows. □

For global immunization in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$, we require a convexity constraint on all feasible yield vectors $\mathbf{i}=\mathbf{i}_0+t\mathbf{N}$.

Proposition 2

Let $P(\mathbf{i})$, $\mathbf{i}_0$ and $\mathbf{N}\neq\mathbf{0}$ be given, and assume that there exists $k\geq 0$ so that on $\mathbf{i}_0$:

$$D_N(P) = D_N(Z_k), \tag{3.5}$$

and for all feasible yield curve vectors $\mathbf{i}=\mathbf{i}_0+t\mathbf{N}$:

$$C_N(P) > C_N(Z_k) + 2D_N(Z_k)\,[D_N(P) - D_N(Z_k)]. \tag{3.6}$$

Then $P(\mathbf{i})$ is globally immunized at time k in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$ on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$.

Proof

From Corollary A.4, (3.5) implies (3.3), while (3.6) implies that: (3.7)

$$C_N(P_k) > 0$$

for all feasible yield curve vectors $\mathbf{i}=\mathbf{i}_0+t\mathbf{N}$. Hence, the result follows. □

In the classical Redington model of $\mathbf{N}=(1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ and $\mathbf{i}_0$ flat, $i_j=i_0$ for all j, the conditions for local immunization reduce to familiar statements. Here, $Z_k(i_0)=v_0^k$, and using (2.7) through (2.10), Condition (3.1) becomes:

$$D(P) = kv_0, \tag{3.8}$$

from which k is uniquely determined, given i_0, by:

$$k = (1 + i_0)D(P) = D^M(P), \tag{3.9}$$

where $D^M(P)$ denotes the Macaulay duration of $P(i)$ on i_0.

Similarly, the convexity constraint in (3.2) becomes:

$$C(P) > k(k + 1)v_0^2, \tag{3.10}$$

which by (3.9) is equivalent to:

$$C(P) > D^M(P)[D^M(P) + 1]v_0^2. \tag{3.11}$$

When the cash flows underlying $P(i)$ are fixed and positive, (3.11) is always satisfied, and immunization is ensured for k satisfying (3.9). The convexity constraint in (3.10) can also be expressed in terms of the *inertia* of $P(i)$ on i_0 (see (4.10) below and Bierwag [2] for details). For more details and results from general spot rate and forward rate models, see Reitano [26].

The convexity constraints in (3.2) and (3.6) can also be expressed in terms of the directional derivatives of the directional duration functions. Specifically, because:

$$d_N D_N(P) = D_N^2(P) - C_N(P), \tag{3.12}$$

we can rewrite (3.2) as:

$$d_N D_N(P) < d_N D_N(Z_k), \tag*{(3.2)'}$$

while (3.6) can be expressed:

$$d_N D_N(P) < d_N D_N(Z_k) + [D_N(P) - D_N(Z_k)]^2. \tag*{(3.6)'}$$

For fixed $\mathbf{N} \neq \mathbf{0}$, the pair $(k, \mathbf{i}_0)$ of the above propositions gives rise to a *duration window* $[k, P_k(\mathbf{i}_0)]$, as defined in Bierwag [2]. Specifically, consider the graph of $y = P_x(\mathbf{i})$ in the xy-plane for each feasible $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{i}_0 + s\mathbf{N}$. All such graphs will equal or exceed the value $P_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$ when $x = k$ in the case of global immunization, while all graphs with $|s| < r$ will have this property in the local immunization case. That is, each will pass through a window at $x = k$ with lower bound equal to $P_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$. Consequently, the value $P_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$ also gives rise to the minimum annualized return on investment over the interval $[0, k]$.

It is natural to inquire into the existence of other such duration windows. That is, given $\mathbf{i}_t = \mathbf{i}_0 + t\mathbf{N}$, does there exist $k = k(t)$ so that $P(\mathbf{i})$ is immunized at time $k(t)$ on $\mathbf{i}_t$? We next consider all such pairs, $[k(t), \mathbf{i}_t]$, and the associated duration windows, as forming an *immunization boundary*.

Definition 4

Given $P(\mathbf{i})$ and $\mathbf{N} \neq \mathbf{0}$, let $\mathbf{i}_t = \mathbf{i}_0 + t\mathbf{N}$ denote the yield vector on which $P(\mathbf{i})$ is locally (globally) immunized in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$ at time $k = k(t)$, if such a k exists. The *local (global) immunization boundary* for $P(\mathbf{i})$, in the direction of N, denoted $IB_N(P)$, is defined:

$$IB_N(P) = \{(k, P_k(\mathbf{i}_t)) \mid k = k(t)\}. \quad \square \tag{3.13}$$

The immunization boundary then has the same property as does the duration window, yet over a range of forward times k. That is, the collection of graphs $y=P_x(\mathbf{i})$ for $\mathbf{i}=\mathbf{i}_0+s\mathbf{N}$ will be minimized at each such time $k(t)$ on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_t$ in the global case and for more limited ranges of yield values in the local immunization case. Therefore, $P_k(\mathbf{i}_t)$ reflects the minimum portfolio value in this sense at each such time $k(t)$ and consequently gives rise to the minimum annualized return on investment, $i(k)$, over every such interval $[0,k]$:

$$i(k) = [P_k(\mathbf{i}_t)/P(\mathbf{i}_0)]^{1/k} - 1, \tag{3.14}$$

where $k=k(t)$ and $\mathbf{i}_0$ is the initial yield vector. For $t=0$, the minimum return given in (3.14) equals the annualized return on the k-period zero-coupon bond, $Z_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$, due to (2.11). Below, this return is denoted by $j(k)$.

In the classical model of $\mathbf{N}=(1, 1, ..., 1)$ and flat $\mathbf{i}_0$, the local immunization boundary always exists when cash flows are fixed and positive. This is due to the fact that, given i_t, $k(\mathrm{t})$ is given by (3.9), and we have:

$$IB_N(P) = \{(k, (1 + i_t)^k P(i_t)) \mid k(t) = D^M(P,i_t)\}. \tag{3.15}$$

Consequently, the minimum return on investment in this case is given by:

$$i(k) = (1 + i_t)\,[P(i_t)/P(i_0)]^{1/k} - 1, \tag{3.16}$$

where i_0 is the initial yield value.

B. Returns on Investment: $\mathrm{I_k(i)}$

As noted above, the immunization boundary gives rise to the minimum annualized return on investment, $i(k)$, over every period $[0, k]$ for which a yield vector exists so that $P(\mathbf{i})$ is immunized at time k. However, the actual return on investment over $[0, k]$ is in fact a random variable, $I_k(\mathbf{i})$, the value of which depends on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}$. As before, we assume that the initial yield vector is $\mathbf{i}_0$, that this value changes to $\mathbf{i}$ immediately after time 0, and that it evolves according to the forward yield curve structure implied by $\mathbf{i}$ throughout the period.

As in (3.14), which provides the minimum value of $I_k(\mathbf{i})$ for each k on the immunization boundary, we have for all k:

$$I_k(\mathbf{i}) = [P_k(\mathbf{i})/P(\mathbf{i}_0)]^{1/k} - 1, \tag{3.17}$$

where $\mathbf{i}=\mathbf{i}_0+t\mathbf{N}$. Following Babcock [1], we seek an approximation for $I_k(\mathbf{i})$, where the approximation reflects the dependency on t. To this end, let $\phi(t)$ denote the right-hand side of (3.17), considered as a function of t. The first-order Taylor series approximation is then $\phi(t)=\phi(0)+\phi'(0)t$.

By substitution, we have that $\phi(0) = j(k)$, where $j(k)$ is the annualized return on the zero-coupon bond, $Z_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$, as noted above. To evaluate $\phi'(0)$, note that:

$$d_t P_k(\mathbf{i})|_{t=0} = d_N P_k(\mathbf{i}_0) = -P_k(\mathbf{i}_0) D_N(P_k).$$

Consequently, we obtain the following approximation, in which all directional durations are evaluated on $\mathbf{i}_0$:

$$\begin{aligned} I_k(\mathbf{i}_0 + t\mathbf{N}) &\approx j(k) - [1 + j(k)]\, D_N(P_k)\, t/k \\ &= j(k) + [1 + j(k)]\, [D_N(Z_k) - D_N(P)] t/k. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

If $P(\mathbf{i})$ is immunized at time k, it is clear from (3.3) that the above linear approximation reduces to: $I_k(\mathbf{i}) \approx j(k)$. In this context, however, $j(k) = i(k)$, the minimum value of $I_k(\mathbf{i})$ over this period. Consequently, it is clear that the above formula is somewhat crude in this special case.

Taking the second derivative of $\phi(t)$, we obtain the following generalization of (3.18), where all durations are evaluated on $\mathbf{i}_0$:

$$\begin{aligned} I_k(\mathbf{i}_0 + t\mathbf{N}) \approx j(k) &- [1 + j(k)]\, D_N(P_k)\, t/k \\ &+ [1 + j(k)]\, [C_N(P_k) + (k - 1)\, D_N^2(P_k)/k]\, t^2/2k. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

When $P(\mathbf{i})$ is immunized at time k, we see from (3.3) that the second-order bracketed term in (3.19) equals $C_N(P_k)$, which is positive by (3.4), and hence $I_k(\mathbf{i}) > j(k) = i(k)$ as expected.

For more general values of k, the linear term in (3.18) and (3.19) will be non-zero. Specifically, if $P(\mathbf{i})$ is longer than $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$ on $\mathbf{i}_0$ in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$, that is, $D_N(P) > D_N(Z_k)$, then $D_N(P_k)$ will be positive and $I_k(\mathbf{i})$ will decrease with increases in the yield vector in this direction. That is, the capital loss due to the increase in yields will not be made up by reinvestment gains over the period $[0, k]$. Similarly, $I_k(\mathbf{i})$ will increase with decreases in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$. On the other hand, if $P(\mathbf{i})$ is shorter than $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$ on $\mathbf{i}_0$ in this direction, then $I_k(\mathbf{i})$ will increase with yield increases in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$, because then reinvestment gains will overcome initial capital losses.

In all cases, the second-order adjustment in (3.19) will be independent of the sign of the yield curve movement, reflecting only the magnitude of t. In general, however, the sign of this adjustment will depend on k.

Naturally, either of the above approximations can be used to estimate the mean and variance of $I_k(\mathbf{i})$, given an assumption about the probability density of t. For example, from (3.18), we obtain:

$$E[I_k(\mathbf{i}_0 + t\mathbf{N})] \approx j(k) - [1 + j(k)]\, D_N(P_k) E(t)/k, \tag{3.20}$$

$$\mathrm{Var}[I_k(\mathbf{i}_0 + t\mathbf{N})] \approx [1 + j(k)]^2\, D_N^2(P_k)\, \mathrm{Var}(t)/k^2. \tag{3.21}$$

IV. ASSET/LIABILITY MANAGEMENT

In this section, we translate the above immunization methodology and results to an asset/liability management setting. To this end, we consider two objective functions:

$$S(\mathbf{i}) = A(\mathbf{i}) - L(\mathbf{i}), \tag{4.1}$$

$$R(\mathbf{i}) = [A(\mathbf{i}) - L(\mathbf{i})]/A(\mathbf{i}), \tag{4.2}$$

where $A(\mathbf{i})$ and $L(\mathbf{i})$ denote the market values of assets and liabilities, respectively. Immunization in the context of (4.1) then provides a floor for the value of surplus at time k, while use of the objective function in (4.2) provides a floor for the ratio of surplus to assets, or net worth asset ratio, or simply, surplus ratio.

A. Immunization of Surplus

Let r^s denote the surplus ratio on the current yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$; that is,

$$r^s = R(\mathbf{i}_0) = [A(\mathbf{i}_0) - L(\mathbf{i}_0)]/A(\mathbf{i}_0). \tag{4.3}$$

Proposition 3

Let $S(\mathbf{i})=A(\mathbf{i})-L(\mathbf{i})$, $\mathbf{i}_0$ and $\mathbf{N}\neq\mathbf{0}$ be given. Assume that there exists $k\geq 0$ so that on $\mathbf{i}_0$:

$$D_N(A) = (1 - r^s)D_N(L) + r^s D_N(Z_k), \tag{4.4}$$

$$C_N(A) > (1 - r^s)C_N(L) + r^s C_N(Z_k). \tag{4.5}$$

Then $S(\mathbf{i})$ is locally immunized at time k in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$ on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$.

Proof

Consider first the case in which $r^s>0$. By Proposition 1, we require on $\mathbf{i}_0$:

$$D_N(S) = D_N(Z_k). \tag{4.6}$$

However, by Corollary A.1,

$$D_N(S) = D_N(A)/r^s - D_N(L)(1 - r^s)/r^s,$$

and (4.6) follows from (4.4). An identical argument demonstrates that (4.5) is equivalent to $C_N(S) > C_N(Z_k)$ on $\mathbf{i}_0$.

For the case $r^s = 0$, we work directly with the directional derivatives of $S_k(\mathbf{i})$, with the goal that (2.15) and (2.16) be satisfied. The resulting conditions on the directional derivatives of $A(\mathbf{i})$ and $L(\mathbf{i})$ are then equivalent to the conditions in (4.4) and (4.5) with $r^s = 0$. □

When $r^s = 0$, Conditions (4.4) and (4.5) imply that $S(\mathbf{i})$ is locally immunized at all times $k \geq 0$ in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$ on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$. Consequently, the local immunization boundary is given by (3.13) with $\mathbf{i}_t = \mathbf{i}_0$ for all $k \geq 0$. However, since $r^s = 0$, we have that $S_k(\mathbf{i}_0) = 0$ for all k, and hence,

$$IB_N(S) = \{(k, 0) : k \geq 0\}. \tag{4.7}$$

For $r^s > 0$, we see that the directional duration of assets required for immunization reflects both the directional durations of liabilities and the zero-coupon bond, $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$, corresponding to the immunization horizon k. In some applications, k may be chosen small or equal to zero, providing short-term immunization as part of an active management strategy.

For $k = 0$, the above conditions become:

$$D_N(A) = (1 - r^s)D_N(L), \tag{4.8}$$

$$C_N(A) > (1 - r^s)C_N(L). \tag{4.9}$$

When $\mathbf{N} = (1, \ldots, 1)$, the parallel shift direction vector, and the yield curve $\mathbf{i}_0$ is flat, the above conditions are equivalent to those in Bierwag [2], stated in terms of Macaulay durations and the portfolio inertias I_A. This is because in this case:

$$(1 + i)^2 C(A) = I_A + D^M(D^M - 1), \tag{4.10}$$

and similarly for liabilities. In this special case, it is clear from (4.4) and (4.5) that immunization at time $k > 0$ requires more asset duration and convexity as k increases, because then $D_N(Z_k) = kv$ is an increasing function of k, as is $C_N(Z_k) = k(k+1)v^2$.

More generally, k can be chosen to be consistent with the planning cycle of the organization. For example, $k = 1$ would be an initial immunization target consistent with stabilizing income over a one-period interval, where income is defined as the change in net worth. In such a strategy, the value of k would be decreased over the period consistent with the targeting of values to a fixed calendar date, such as December 31. Similarly, larger values of k can be chosen to reflect a multiyear business plan or the maturity period of the last liability flow. This last assignment would then be consistent with immunizing pricing margins over the life of a block of liabilities.

As noted in Section IIB, however, the assumption that $\mathbf{i}_0$ shifts to $\mathbf{i}$ immediately after time 0 and remains fixed during $[0, k]$ effectively precludes the use of the above results as part of a passive management strategy, that is, a strategy whereby the portfolio is structured at time 0 and effectively left alone during the period, except perhaps for the reinvestment of maturing cash flows. As noted there, passive management is possible in theory in the special case of fixed cash flows if the planning horizon, k, is less than the time of the first cash flow. However, even in this case immunization could fail under a local immunization strategy if the yield curve shift during the period is too great.

B. Immunization of the Surplus Ratio

In this section, we investigate the immunization of the net worth asset ratio, $R(\mathbf{i})=[A(\mathbf{i})-L(\mathbf{i})]/A(\mathbf{i})$. Since $R(\mathbf{i})$ is not a price function, its forward value at time k, $R_k(\mathbf{i})$, is not given by (2.11). However, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} R_k(\mathbf{i}) &= [A_k(\mathbf{i}) - L_k(\mathbf{i})]/A_k(\mathbf{i}) \\ &= R(\mathbf{i}), \end{aligned}$$

because the forward values of $A(\mathbf{i})$ and $L(\mathbf{i})$ satisfy (2.11). Consequently, immunizing $R(\mathbf{i})$ at time 0 ensures its immunization at all times $k \geq 0$.

Proposition 4

Let $R(\mathbf{i})$ be defined as above, and let $\mathbf{i}_0$ and $\mathbf{N} \neq \mathbf{0}$ be given. Assume that on $\mathbf{i}_0$:

$$D_N(A) = D_N(L), \tag{4.11}$$

$$C_N(A) > C_N(L). \tag{4.12}$$

Then $R(\mathbf{i})$ is locally immunized at all times $k \geq 0$ in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$ on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$.

Proof

Assume that $R(\mathbf{i}_0)=r^s>0$. We then have from Corollaries A.4 and A.1:

$$D_N(R) = D_N(A - L) - D_N(A)$$
$$= c[D_N(A) - D_N(L)],$$

where $c = L(\mathbf{i}_0)/S(\mathbf{i}_0)$. Consequently, (2.15) is satisfied due to (4.11). Similarly:

$$C_N(R) = c[C_N(A) - C_N(L)] - 2cD_N(A)\,[D_N(A) - D_N(L)],$$

and (2.16) is satisfied due to (4.11) and (4.12).

For $r^s = 0$, we proceed as in Proposition 3, working directly with the directional derivatives of $R(\mathbf{i})$. □

When $\mathbf{N} = (1, \ldots, 1)$ and the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$ is flat, the above conditions reduce to those in Bierwag [2] expressed in terms of Macaulay durations and inertias due to (4.10). Also, for general $\mathbf{N}$, the local immunization boundary in (3.13) is given with $\mathbf{i}_t = \mathbf{i}_0$ for all $k \geq 0$, and hence, $R_k(\mathbf{i}_t) = r^s$; that is,

$$IB_N(R) = \{(k, r^s) \mid k \geq 0\}. \tag{4.13}$$

We leave it to the reader to generalize Propositions 3 and 4 to the case of global immunization in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$.

C. An Example

The significance of Propositions 3 and 4 is the theoretical dependence of the condition of immunization on the direction vector, $\mathbf{N}$, assumed in the duration and convexity estimates. In the classical model, $\mathbf{N} = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ is commonly assumed.

In theory, the satisfaction of Conditions (4.4) and (4.5), or (4.11) and (4.12) for a given $\mathbf{N}$, does not ensure their satisfaction for other values of $\mathbf{N}$. The following example illustrates that this observation is also true in practice and demonstrates how surplus immunization may fail due to actual yield curve shifts not encompassed by the model's specification for $\mathbf{N}$. For other examples that relate to surplus and the net worth asset ratio and illustrate the same conclusion, see Reitano [29].

Assume that the yield curve is given by $\mathbf{i}_0 = (0.075, 0.090, 0.100)$, representing bond yields at time 0.5, 5, and 10 years, respectively. For all valuations below, we assume that bond yields at other maturities are derived by linear interpolation and that spot yields are developed from these values by the usual procedure. That is, they are derived so as to price the bonds implied by the bond yield curve to par. In practice, more pivotal points or yield curve drivers would be used in the valuation model. For example, maturities of 1, 3, and 7 years would often be added to the bond yield curve, but we use this model for simplicity.

Assets are to be composed of a mix of a 10-year, 12 percent coupon bond, and a 6-month pure discount position, such as commercial paper. Based on the above yield curve, this bond has a market value of 112.80 per 100 of par and a duration of 6.151, while the commercial paper has a market value of 96.39 per 100 and a duration of 0.482. To be consistent with the partial duration basis below, these duration values reflect sensitivity to parallel shifts in the bond yield curve and were calculated by using a forward difference approximation to the derivative with a difference of 5 b.p. (see Reitano [24, 25, 28] for more detail).

The liability is a $100-million 5-year zero-coupon bond, such as a 5-year guaranteed investment contract (GIC), with a current market value of $63.97 million and duration of 4.855. Available assets total $71.08 million, and hence $S(\mathbf{i}_0)$ = $7.11 million and $r^s = 0.10$ for a 10 percent net worth asset ratio.

We seek to apply Proposition 3 to immunize surplus from parallel shifts at time $k = 1/2$, the time of the first cash flow. First, the duration of assets must satisfy (4.4) and hence must equal 4.418. A calculation based on Proposition A.1 shows that about 31 percent of assets needs to be invested in commercial paper, purchasing a par value of $22.54 million, while the remainder is to be invested in the bond, purchasing $43.75 million par. The asset portfolio then has a duration of 4.418, producing a surplus duration of 0.482, the same as the duration of $Z_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$ for $k = 1/2$. Consequently, (4.6) and hence (4.4) are satisfied. In addition, because the convexity of the bond, commercial paper, and GIC equal 52.48, 0.46, and 25.95, respectively, the convexity of surplus equals 132.25. Since this value exceeds the convexity of $Z_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$ of 0.46, (4.5) is also satisfied.

Consequently, Proposition 3 assures that this portfolio is locally immunized at time $k = 1/2$ against parallel shifts from the initial yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0 = (0.075, 0.090, 0.100)$. For $k = 1/2$, the forward value of surplus, $S_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$, equals $7.37 million, which then provides the minimum value of $S_k(\mathbf{i})$, for $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{i}_0 + t\mathbf{N}$, $\mathbf{N} = (1, 1, 1)$, and small t. In addition, by (3.14) the minimum annualized half-year return on surplus, $i(k)$, is the return on $Z_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$ of 7.64 percent, the annual equivalent of 7.50 percent.

Using (3.19), we estimate the actual half-year return on surplus for $\mathbf{N} = (1, 1, 1)$:

$$I_k(\mathbf{i}_0 + t\mathbf{N}) \approx 0.0764 + 1.0764(131.77t^2), \quad k = 1/2, \tag{4.14}$$

while for $S_k(\mathbf{i})$, the corresponding Taylor series is:

$$S_k(\mathbf{i}_0 + t\mathbf{N}) \approx 7.37[1 + \tfrac{1}{2} \cdot 131.77t^2]. \tag{4.15}$$

A calculation then produces the following results:

t	$S_k(\mathbf{i})$	$S_k^e(\mathbf{i})$	$I_k(\mathbf{i})$	$I_k^e(\mathbf{i})$
−0.02	7.59	7.57	14.1%	13.3%
−0.01	7.43	7.42	9.2	9.1
−0.005	7.39	7.39	8.0	8.0
0	7.37	7.37	7.6	7.6
0.005	7.38	7.39	8.0	8.0
0.01	7.42	7.42	8.9	9.1
0.02	7.55	7.57	12.7	13.3

In this table, S_k and I_k represent exact values, S_k^e and I_k^e estimates using (4.14) and (4.15). The above values demonstrate that immunization at time $k=1/2$ will be successful if yield curve shifts are parallel. In addition, it illustrates the degree of accuracy of the above approximations in this case.

For nonparallel shifts $\mathbf{N}$, the conclusions can be significantly different. Consider first the duration value. By construction, $D_N(S_k)=D_N(S)-D_N(Z_k)=0$ for $\mathbf{N}=(1, 1, 1)$. However, calculating the partial durations of $S_k(\mathbf{i}_0)$ and using (2.7), we have that in general on $\mathbf{i}_0$, for $N=(n_1, n_2, n_3)$:

$$D_N(S_k) = 5.26n_1 - 46.21n_2 + 40.95n_3. \tag{4.16}$$

To evaluate the potential range of directional durations in (4.16), a restriction must first be put on the length of $\mathbf{N}$ because $D_N(S_k)$ is proportional to $|\mathbf{N}|$. Because we seek to compare the resulting values to that produced by $\mathbf{N}=(1, 1, 1)$, which has a length of $\sqrt{3}$, we restrict $|\mathbf{N}|$ to equal $\sqrt{3}$ for consistency. A calculation then produces (see Reitano [24, 28]):

$$-107.33 \leq D_N(S_k) \leq 107.33, \quad |\mathbf{N}| = \sqrt{3}. \tag{4.17}$$

The boundary points in (4.17) equal $\pm\sqrt{3}|\mathbf{D}(S_k)|$ and are achieved when $\mathbf{N}$ is proportional to $\mathbf{D}(S_k)$. For example, a simple calculation shows that $\mathbf{N}=(0.147, -1.292, 1.145)$ has length $\sqrt{3}$ (approximately), equals 2.8 percent of $\mathbf{D}(S_k)$, and produces $D_N(S_k)\approx 107.33$.

Consequently, while $D_N(S_k)=0$ for $\mathbf{N}=(1, 1, 1)$, nonparallel shifts expose this portfolio to significant duration risk. To analyze convexity, we require the total convexity matrix $\mathbf{C}(S_k)$. When $D_N(S_k)=0$, $C_N(S_k)=C_N(S)-C_N(Z_k)$

by Corollary A.4. In general, however, we must include the duration terms, producing:

$$\begin{aligned} C_N(S_k) = {} & 9.03n_1^2 - 162.73n_2^2 + 167.76n_3^2 \\ & - 67.10n_1n_2 + 25.72n_1n_3 + 159.10n_2n_3 \\ & - 0.9636n_1 \, D_N(S_k). \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

As noted above, $C_N(S_k) = C_N(S) - C_N(Z_k) = 131.77$ when $\mathbf{N} = (1, 1, 1)$. For other $\mathbf{N}$ with $|\mathbf{N}| = \sqrt{3}$, we use the result that (see Reitano [28]):

$$3\lambda^m \leq C_N(S_k) \leq 3\lambda^M, \qquad |\mathbf{N}| = \sqrt{3} \tag{4.19}$$

where λ^m, λ^M represent the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of the total convexity matrix, $\mathbf{C}(S_k)$, given in Proposition A.4:

$$\mathbf{C}(S_k) = \begin{pmatrix} 3.97 & -11.29 & -6.87 \\ -11.29 & -162.73 & 79.55 \\ -6.87 & 79.55 & 167.76 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.20}$$

A calculation then produces eigenvalues of -181.4, 4.0 and 186.4, and (4.19) becomes:

$$-544.2 \leq C_N(S_k) \leq 559.2. \tag{4.21}$$

Consequently, the estimate $C_N(S_k) = 131.77$ for $\mathbf{N} = (1, 1, 1)$ understates the potential magnitude of the convexity factor. More importantly, it disguises its potential sign, because it is often tacitly assumed that the convexity adjustment for such a portfolio is always positive.

By utilizing monthly Treasury yield data for the period August 1984 to June 1990, 65 sample values were produced for yield change vectors, $\mathbf{N}$, representing overlapping 6-month yield curve shifts.

Actual values of $D_N(S_k)$ using (4.16) ranged from -0.153 to 0.148, while actual values of $C_N(S_k)$ using (4.18) ranged from -0.007 to 0.148. Normalizing all values of $\mathbf{N}$ so that $|\mathbf{N}| = \sqrt{3}$, we obtained the following values for this period:

$$\begin{aligned} -15.75 &\leq D_N(S_k) \leq 40.17, \\ -217.11 &\leq C_N(S_k) \leq 447.51. \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

Consequently, this sample period produced 6-month yield curve shifts that demonstrated significantly different normalized values of D_N and C_N compared with the respective values for $\mathbf{N} = (1, 1, 1)$ of 0 and 131.77. These observed ranges can be compared to the theoretical ranges in (4.17) and (4.21). In the case of C_N, values close to the theoretical maximum were observed. See Table 1 for the distribution of results.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF DIRECTIONAL DURATIONS AND CONVEXITIES
PERCENTILES FOR 65 OVERLAPPING 6-MONTH PERIODS
AUGUST 1984 TO JUNE 1990

	Actual		Normalized $\|N\| = \sqrt{3}$	
Percentile	$D_N(S_k)$	$C_N(S_k)$	$D_N(S_k)$	$C_N(S_k)$
0.02	−0.153	−0.007	−15.75	−217.11
0.10	−0.105	−0.003	−11.20	−48.89
0.20	−0.069	−0.001	−7.67	−8.79
0.30	−0.056	0.001	−5.13	30.87
0.40	−0.035	0.003	−3.27	62.96
0.48*			0	
0.50	0.009	0.006	1.91	90.59
0.59*				131.77
0.60	0.034	0.008	4.86	139.96
0.70	0.048	0.014	5.73	188.48
0.80	0.068	0.021	7.31	238.98
0.90	0.094	0.043	11.60	283.49
1.00	0.148	0.148	40.17	447.51

*Values for $\mathbf{N} = (1, 1, 1)$.

Utilizing the actual values of $\mathbf{N}$, $S_k(\mathbf{i})$ and $I_k(\mathbf{i})$ can be estimated using the calculated duration and convexity values. For this purpose, we use (3.19) and the following generalization of (4.15):

$$S_k(\mathbf{i}_0 + t\mathbf{N}) \approx S_k(\mathbf{i}_0)\,[1 - D_N(S_k)t + \tfrac{1}{2}C_N(S_k)t^2]. \tag{4.23}$$

The ranges produced were:

$$\begin{aligned} 6.32 &\leq S_k^e(\mathbf{i}) \leq 8.68, \\ -0.208 &\leq I_k^e(\mathbf{i}) \leq 0.482. \end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

Table 2 displays the distribution of estimated results and shows that immunization was unsuccessful in more than 50 percent of the periods observed. Table 3 displays a comparison of actual and estimated values over 11 nonoverlapping 6-month periods and shows immunization failing in 6 of the 11 periods. Note the proximity of actual and estimated values on Table 3, indicating the extent to which this portfolio's risk characteristics were captured by $\mathbf{D}(S_k)$ and $\mathbf{C}(S_k)$.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED PERIOD RETURNS AND PERIOD-END VALUES PERCENTILES FOR 65 OVERLAPPING 6-MONTH PERIODS AUGUST 1984 TO JUNE 1990

Percentile	$I_k^e(\mathrm{i})$	$S_k^e(\mathrm{i})$
0.02	−20.818%	$6.3182
0.10	−11.853	6.6701
0.20	−7.536	6.8349
0.30	−1.971	7.0357
0.40	1.156	7.1470
0.50	4.869	7.2778
0.53*	7.641	7.3743
0.60	14.035	7.5908
0.70	22.025	7.8523
0.80	29.105	8.0772
0.90	33.165	8.2126
1.00	48.190	8.6773

*Expected values on initial yield curve, i_0 = (0.075, 0.09, 0.10).

TABLE 3

ACTUAL VERSUS ESTIMATED VALUES NONOVERLAPPING 6-MONTH PERIODS AUGUST 1984 TO JUNE 1990

6 mos. beginning	$S_k(\mathrm{i})$	$S_k^e(\mathrm{i})$	$I_k(\mathrm{i})$	$I_k^e(\mathrm{i})$
1/1/85*	$6.9558	$6.9471	−4.230%	−4.337%
7/1/85*	7.2915	7.2834	5.239	5.056
1/1/86	8.6943	8.6773	49.625	48.190
7/1/86*	6.4331	6.4340	−18.084	−18.089
1/1/87	7.9502	7.9589	25.110	25.227
7/1/87*	7.1163	7.1178	0.240	0.299
1/1/88*	7.3425	7.3421	6.714	6.704
7/1/88	8.1939	8.1936	32.899	32.951
1/1/89*	7.0121	7.0064	−2.674	−2.744
7/1/89	7.4207	7.4201	8.999	8.981
1/1/90	7.5890	7.5908	13.999	14.036

*Immunization unsuccessful: $S_k(\mathrm{i}_0)$ = $7.37, $I_k(\mathrm{i}_0)$ = 7.64%.

Recall that this portfolio was immunized against parallel shifts, with expected minimums: $S_k(\mathrm{i}_0)=7.37$, $I_k(\mathrm{i}_0)=0.076$. Consequently, parallel shift immunization assured immunization against nonparallel shifts neither in theory (Proposition 3) nor in practice (Tables 2 and 3). However, the above methodology provides a framework for measuring potential risk, as well as insight to conditions under which complete immunization would be assured.

V. NONDIRECTIONAL IMMUNIZATION

A. General Results

In this section, general results on nondirectional immunization are developed and seen to be natural generalizations of the Section III results. For local immunization, for example, we again require $P(\mathbf{i})$ to have the "same duration" as $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$ on $\mathbf{i}_0$ and be "more convex." Here, however, the constraints are stated in terms of the total duration vectors and total convexity matrices. We begin with a definition:

Definition 5

Let $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ be square matrices. We say that $\mathbf{A}$ *is more convex than* $\mathbf{B}$, denoted $\mathbf{A}>\mathbf{B}$, if $\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{B}$ is positive definite. That is, $\mathbf{x}^T(\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{B})\mathbf{x}>0$ for all $\mathbf{x}\neq\mathbf{0}$. □

For convenience, we will sometimes write $\mathbf{A}>\mathbf{0}$, which by Definition 5 means that $\mathbf{A}$ is positive definite.

The generalization of Proposition 1 is then:

Proposition 5

Let $P(\mathbf{i})$ and $\mathbf{i}_0$ be given and assume that there exists a $k\geq 0$ so that on $\mathbf{i}_0$:

$$\mathbf{D}(P) = \mathbf{D}(Z_k), \tag{5.1}$$

$$\mathbf{C}(P) > \mathbf{C}(Z_k). \tag{5.2}$$

Then $P(\mathbf{i})$ is locally immunized at time k on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$.

Proof

As for the proof of Proposition 1, we require the result of Proposition A.4 relating $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ for $P_k(\mathbf{i})$ to the respective values for $P(\mathbf{i})$ and $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$. In particular, from (A.13) we see that (5.1) assures that:

$$\mathbf{D}(P_k) = \mathbf{0}, \tag{5.3}$$

while (5.2) and (5.1) together imply that:

$$\mathbf{C}(P_k) > \mathbf{0}. \tag{5.4}$$

Recalling Conditions (2.17) and (2.18), we see that the above conclusions regarding $P_k(\mathbf{i})$ ensure that $\mathbf{i}_0$ is a local minimum, and the result follows. □

Clearly, the conditions of Proposition 5 are equivalent to assuming that Conditions (3.1) and (3.2) of Proposition 1 are satisfied for a fixed k, for all direction vectors $\mathbf{N}$. A similar statement holds for the generalization of Proposition 2, which we state without proof.

Proposition 6

Let $P(\mathbf{i})$ and $\mathbf{i}_0$ be given and assume that there exists a $k \geq 0$ so that on $\mathbf{i}_0$:

$$\mathbf{D}(P) = \mathbf{D}(Z_k), \tag{5.5}$$

and for all feasible $\mathbf{i}$:

$$\mathbf{C}(P) - \mathbf{C}(Z_k) > 2\mathbf{D}(Z_k)^T [\mathbf{D}(P) - \mathbf{D}(Z_k)]. \tag{5.6}$$

Then $P(\mathbf{i})$ is globally immunized at time k on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$. □

B. Returns on Investment: $\mathrm{I}_k(\mathbf{i})$

Defining $I_k(\mathbf{i})$ as in (3.17), we have the following counterpart to (3.18), which follows from (2.7):

$$I_k(\mathbf{i}) \approx j(k) - [1 + j(k)]\, \mathbf{D}(P_k)\cdot(\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{i}_0)/k. \tag{5.7}$$

The second-order term in (3.19) can be similarly expressed.

The earlier comments about the competition between capital gains and losses and reinvestment losses and gains apply here as well. Here, however, the concept of $P(\mathbf{i})$ being "longer" or "shorter" than $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$ refers to the sign of the inner product in (5.7) being positive or negative, respectively.

To generalize the moments of $I_k(\mathbf{i})$ in (3.20) and (3.21), we require the following notation. Let $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{i}_0)$ denote the vector mean, and $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{i}_0)$ denote the covariance matrix of $\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{i}_0$, reflecting the underlying density function of $\mathbf{i}$. Then:

$$E[I_k(\mathbf{i})] \approx j(k) - [1 + j(k)]\, \mathbf{D}(P_k)\cdot\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{i}_0)/k, \tag{5.8}$$

$$\mathrm{Var}[I_k(\mathbf{i})] \approx [1 + j(k)]^2\, \mathbf{D}(P_k)\, \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{i}_0)\, \mathbf{D}(P_k)^T/k^2, \tag{5.9}$$

where all total duration vectors are evaluated on $\mathbf{i}_0$.

C. Asset-Liability Management

For nondirectional immunization, the results of Section IV generalize in the natural way. We state the results without proof.

Proposition 7

Let $S(\mathbf{i})=A(\mathbf{i})-L(\mathbf{i})$ and $\mathbf{i}_0$ be given. Assume that there exists $k\geq 0$, so that on $\mathbf{i}_0$:

$$\mathbf{D}(A) = (1 - r^s)\mathbf{D}(L) + r^s\mathbf{D}(Z_k), \tag{5.10}$$

$$\mathbf{C}(A) > (1 - r^s)\mathbf{C}(L) + r^s\mathbf{C}(Z_k). \tag{5.11}$$

Then $S(\mathbf{i})$ is locally immunized at time k on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$. □

As for Proposition 3, the conclusion of Proposition 7 remains valid when $r^s=0$. Conditions (5.10) and (5.11) then imply local immunization for all $k\geq 0$. Also, in the same way that (4.4) of Proposition 3 implies that $D_M(S_k)=0$, (5.10) of Proposition 7 is equivalent to $\mathbf{D}(S_k)=\mathbf{0}$.

Returning to the above example, the durational constraint imposed by (5.10) to ensure complete immunization is that $\mathbf{D}(A)=(-0.354, 4.772, 0)$. This total duration vector is substantially different from that of the given assets of $\mathbf{D}(A)=(0.172, 0.152, 4.095)$.

Proposition 8

Let $R(\mathbf{i})$ be defined as in (3.16) and $\mathbf{i}_0$ be given. Assume that on $\mathbf{i}_0$:

$$\mathbf{D}(A) = \mathbf{D}(L), \tag{5.12}$$

$$\mathbf{C}(A) > \mathbf{C}(L). \tag{5.13}$$

Then $R(\mathbf{i})$ is locally immunized at all times $k\geq 0$ on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$. □

VI. YIELD VECTOR TRANSFORMATIONS

It is natural to inquire to what extent immunization, as developed above, depends on the underlying yield vector basis used. For example, if a portfolio is locally immunized at time k on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$, what can be said if the analysis was to be done using yield basis $\mathbf{j}_0$? A similar question arises for directional immunization. The next proposition shows that the property of local immunization is independent of the yield basis.

Here and throughout this section the yield curve basis is displayed as part of the duration and convexity notation to avoid confusion.

Proposition 9

Let $P(\mathbf{i})$ be a price function that satisfies Conditions (5.1) and (5.2) of Proposition 5 and hence is locally immunized at time k on the yield vector

$\mathbf{i}_0$. Let $\mathbf{A}:\mathbf{i}\rightarrow\mathbf{j}$ be a yield curve transformation, with a nonsingular Jacobian matrix, $\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})]$ at $\mathbf{i}_0$. Then $P(\mathbf{j}) \equiv P(\mathbf{A}^{-1}(\mathbf{j}))$ also satisfies these conditions on $\mathbf{j}_0 = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)$ and hence is also locally immunized at time k on the yield vector $\mathbf{j}_0$.

Proof

By Proposition A.5, we have:

$$\mathbf{D}(P_k;\, \mathbf{i}_0) = \mathbf{D}(P_k;\, \mathbf{j}_0)\, \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)],$$

and hence:

$$[\mathbf{D}(P;\, \mathbf{i}_0) - \mathbf{D}(Z_k;\, \mathbf{i}_0)] = [\mathbf{D}(P;\, \mathbf{j}_0) - \mathbf{D}(Z_k;\, \mathbf{j}_0)]\, \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)]. \quad (6.1)$$

Consequently, since $\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)]$ is nonsingular, $P(\mathbf{i})$ satisfies (5.1) on $\mathbf{i}_0$ if and only if it satisfies this constraint on $\mathbf{j}_0$.

Similarly, we have:

$$\mathbf{C}(P_k;\, \mathbf{i}_0) = \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)]^T\, \mathbf{C}(P_k;\, \mathbf{j}_0)\, \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)] - \mathbf{D}(P_k;\, \mathbf{j}_0)\, \mathbf{H}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)],$$

where $\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)]$ is the Hessian "matrix" of $\mathbf{A}$ at $\mathbf{i}_0$. Substituting for the total convexity matrixes using (A.14) and using the fact $\mathbf{D}(P_k;\, \mathbf{i}_0) = \mathbf{D}(P_k;\, \mathbf{j}_0) = \mathbf{0}$ by (6.1), we obtain:

$$\mathbf{C}(P;\, \mathbf{i}_0) - \mathbf{C}(Z_k;\, \mathbf{i}_0) = \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)]^T\, [\mathbf{C}(P;\, \mathbf{j}_0) - \mathbf{C}(Z_k;\, \mathbf{j}_0)]\, \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)]. \quad (6.2)$$

Consequently, since $\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)]$ is nonsingular, $\mathbf{C}(P)$ satisfies (5.2) on $\mathbf{i}_0$ if and only if it satisfies this constraint on $\mathbf{j}_0$. □

The implication of Proposition 9 is clear, namely, that k, the time to which $P(\mathbf{i})$ is immunized, is an invariant and intrinsic property of the portfolio. It does not depend on the yield curve basis chosen. For directional immunization, the situation is of necessity more yield curve dependent, because the direction vector $\mathbf{N}$ clearly reflects the yield curve basis. Transforming $\mathbf{N}$ by the Jacobian of the transformation provides a direction vector $\mathbf{M}$ for which immunization is possible, yet unfortunately not assured without additional constraints, as the following result demonstrates.

Proposition 10

Let $P(\mathbf{i})$ be a price function and $\mathbf{N} \neq \mathbf{0}$ a direction vector such that Conditions (3.1) and (3.2) of Proposition 1 are satisfied, and hence $P(\mathbf{i})$ is locally immunized at time k in the direction of $\mathbf{N}$ on the yield vector $\mathbf{i}_0$. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be given as above. Then $P(\mathbf{j})$ satisfies Condition (3.1) with $\mathbf{M}=\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)]\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{j}_0=\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)$. In addition, if $D_{\mathbf{M}'}(P;\mathbf{j}_0)\geq D_{\mathbf{M}'}(Z_k;\mathbf{j}_0)$, where $\mathbf{M}'=\mathbf{N}^T\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i}_0)]\mathbf{N}$, then $P(\mathbf{j})$ also satisfies Condition (3.2) and hence is also locally immunized at time k in the direction of $\mathbf{M}$ on the yield vector $\mathbf{j}_0$.

Proof

Using Corollary A.5, we have:

$$D_N(P_k;\mathbf{i}_0) = D_M(P_k;\mathbf{j}_0), \tag{6.3}$$

and hence $P(\mathbf{j})$ satisfies Condition (3.1) with $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{j}_0$ if and only if $P(\mathbf{i})$ satisfies this condition with $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{i}_0$.

Using the corresponding result for directional convexities, and simplifying, we obtain:

$$C_N(P_k;\mathbf{i}_0) - C_N(Z_k;\mathbf{i}_0) = C_M(P_k;\mathbf{j}_0) - C_M(Z_k;\mathbf{j}_0) - D_{M'}(P_k;\mathbf{j}_0). \tag{6.4}$$

Consequently, if $P(\mathbf{i})$ satisfies (3.2) with $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{i}_0$, it does not necessarily follow that $P(\mathbf{j})$ satisfies this condition with $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{j}_0$ due to the last term on the right of (6.4). However, if $D_{M'}(P_k;\mathbf{j}_0)=D_{\mathbf{M}'}(P;\mathbf{j}_0)-D_{M'}(Z_k;\mathbf{j}_0)\geq 0$, local immunization in the direction of $\mathbf{M}$ is ensured. □

Results about global immunization can be treated similarly. Unfortunately, as in Proposition 10, while the duration results carry forward well, the convexity conditions are not preserved without additional constraints. For example, for global immunization, we require $\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})]$ to be nonsingular everywhere and $\mathbf{D}(P_k;\mathbf{j})\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})]$ to be positive definite for all $\mathbf{i}$. Details are left to the interested reader.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author gratefully acknowledges the technical assistance of Scott E. Navin in the development of this paper's examples.

REFERENCES

1. BABCOCK, G.C. "Duration as a Link between Yield and Value," *Journal of Portfolio Management* 10 (Summer 1984); Corrections, 11 (Fall 1984).
2. BIERWAG, G.O. *Duration Analysis: Managing Interest Rate Risk*. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1987.
3. BIERWAG, G.O. "Immunization, Duration and the Term Structure of Interest Rates," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 12 (December 1977): 725–42.

4. BIERWAG, G.O., KAUFMAN, G.C., AND TOEVS, A. "Bond Portfolio Immunization and Stochastic Process Risk," *Journal of Bank Research* 13, no. 4 (Winter 1983): 282–91.
5. BIERWAG, G.O., KAUFMAN, G.C., AND TOEVS, A. "Duration: Its Development and Use in Bond Portfolio Management," *Financial Analysts Journal* 39, no. 4 (July/August 1983): 15–35.
6. BIERWAG, G.O., KAUFMAN, G.C., AND TOEVS, A. "Immunization Strategies for Funding Multiple Liabilities," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 18 (March 1983): 113–24.
7. BIERWAG, G.O., KAUFMAN, G.C., AND TOEVS, A. "Recent Developments in Bond Portfolio Immunization Strategies." In *Innovations in Bond Portfolio Management: Duration Analysis and Immunization*, edited by G. Kaufman, G. Bierwag and A. Toevs. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1983.
8. BRENNAN, M.J., AND SCHWARTZ, E.S. "An Equilibrium Model of Bond Pricing and a Test of Market Efficiency," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 18 (September 1982): 301–30.
9. CHAMBERS, D.R., CARLETON, W.T., AND MCENALLY, R.W. "Immunizing Default-Free Bond Portfolios with a Duration Vector," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 23 (March 1988): 89–104.
10. CLANCY, R.P. "Options on Bonds and Applications to Product Pricing," *TSA* XXXVII (1985): 97–130.
11. FISHER, L., AND WEIL, R.L. "Coping with the Risk of Interest Rate Fluctuations: Returns to Bondholders from Naive and Optimal Strategies," *Journal of Business* 44 (October 1971): 408–31.
12. FONG, G., AND VASICEK, O. "A Risk Minimizing Strategy for Portfolio Immunization," *Journal of Finance* 39 (1984): 1541–46.
13. GROVE, M.A. "On 'Duration' and the Optimal Maturity Structure of the Balance Sheet," *Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science* 5 (Autumn 1974): 696–709.
14. HICKS, J.R. *Value and Capital*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.
15. HO, T.S.Y., AND LEE, S. "Term Structure Movements and Pricing Interest Rate Contingent Claims," *Journal of Finance* 41 (1986): 1011–29.
16. HO, T.S.Y. *Strategic Fixed Income Management*. Homewood, Ill.: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1990.
17. INGERSOLL, J., SKELTON, J., AND WEIL, R. "Duration Forty Years Later," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* XIII (November 1978): 627–50.
18. JACOB, D., LORD, G., AND TILLEY, J. "A Generalized Framework for Pricing Contingent Cash Flows," *Financial Management* 16, no. 3 (Autumn 1987): 5–14.
19. KAUFMAN, G.C. "Measuring and Managing Interest Rate Risk: A Primer," *Economic Perspective*, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, (January/February 1984): 16–19.

20. KHANG, C. "Bond Immunization When Short-Term Rates Fluctuate More Than Long-Term Rates," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* XIV (December 1979): 1085–90.
21. MACAULAY, F.R. *Some Theoretical Problems Suggested by the Movements of Interest Rates, Bond Yields, and Stock Prices in the U.S. Since 1856*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1938.
22. MILGROM, P.R. Discussion of: "The Interest Rate Assumptions and the Maturity Structure of the Assets of a Life Insurance Company," *TSA* XXIV (1972): 194–5.
23. REDINGTON, F.M. "Review of the Principle of Life Office Valuations," *Journal of the Institute of Actuaries* 18 (1952): 286–340.
24. REITANO, R.R. "A Multivariate Approach to Duration Analysis," *ARCH* 1989.2: 97–181.
25. REITANO, R.R. "Non-parallel Yield Curve Shifts and Durational Leverage," *Journal of Portfolio Management* 16 (Summer 1990): 62–7.
26. REITANO, R.R. "A Multivariate Approach to Immunization Theory," *ARCH* 1990.2: 261–312.
27. REITANO, R.R. "Non-parallel Yield Curve Shifts and Spread Leverage," *Journal of Portfolio Management* 17 (Spring 1991): 82–7.
28. REITANO, R.R. "Multivariate Duration Analysis," *TSA* XLIII (1991): 335–76.
29. REITANO, R.R. "Non-parallel Yield Curve Shifts and Immunization," *Journal of Portfolio Management* 18 (Spring 1992): 36–43.
30. SAMUELSON, P.A. "The Effect of Interest Rate Increases on the Banking System," *American Economic Review* 35 (March 1945): 16–27.
31. SHIU, E.S.W. "A Generalization of Redington's Theory of Immunization," *ARCH* 1986.2: 69–81.
32. SHIU, E.S.W. "Immunization of Multiple Liabilities," *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 7 (1988): 219–24.
33. STOCK, D., AND SIMONSON, D.G. "Tax-Adjusted Duration for Amortizing Debt Instrument," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 23 (September 1988): 313–27.
34. VANDERHOOF, I.T. "The Interest Rate Assumptions and the Maturity Structure of the Assets of a Life Insurance Company," *TSA* XXIV (1972): 157–92.

APPENDIX

Proposition A.1

Let $P(\mathbf{i})=P_1(\mathbf{i})+P_2(\mathbf{i})$. Then for $P_1(\mathbf{i})$, $P_2(\mathbf{i})$, $P(\mathbf{i})\neq 0$:

$$\mathbf{D}(P) = a_1\mathbf{D}(P_1) + a_2\mathbf{D}(P_2), \tag{A.1}$$

$$\mathbf{C}(P) = a_1\mathbf{C}(P_1) + a_2\mathbf{C}(P_2), \tag{A.2}$$

where $a_j=P_j(\mathbf{i})/P(\mathbf{i})$.

Proof

Let d_j denote differentiation with respect to i_j. Then:

$$d_jP = d_jP_1 + d_jP_2,$$

$$d_{jk}P = d_{jk}P_1 + d_{jk}P_2.$$

Dividing by $P(\mathbf{i})$ completes the proof. □

Corollary A.1

Let $P(\mathbf{i})=P_1(\mathbf{i})+P_2(\mathbf{i})$ and $\mathbf{N}\neq\mathbf{0}$ be given. Then for $P_1(\mathbf{i})$, $P_2(\mathbf{i})$, $P(\mathbf{i})\neq 0$:

$$\mathbf{D}_N(P) = a_1\mathbf{D}_N(P_1) + a_2\mathbf{D}_N(P_2), \tag{A.3}$$

$$\mathbf{C}_N(P) = a_1\mathbf{C}_N(P_1) + a_2\mathbf{C}_N(P_2), \tag{A.4}$$

where $a_j=P_j(\mathbf{i})/P(\mathbf{i})$.

Proof

Applying (2.7) and (2.8) to Proposition A.1, the result follows. □

Proposition A.2

Let $P(\mathbf{i})=P_1(\mathbf{i})\,P_2(\mathbf{i})$. Then for $P(\mathbf{i})\neq 0$:

$$\mathbf{D}(P) = \mathbf{D}(P_1) + \mathbf{D}(P_2), \tag{A.5}$$

$$\mathbf{C}(P) = \mathbf{C}(P_1) + \mathbf{C}(P_2) + \mathbf{D}(P_1)^T\mathbf{D}(P_2) + \mathbf{D}(P_2)^T\mathbf{D}(P_1), \tag{A.6}$$

where $\mathbf{D}^T$ is the column matrix transpose of the row matrix $\mathbf{D}$.

Proof

Let d_j be defined as above, then:

$$d_jP = P_1(d_jP_2) + (d_jP_1)P_2,$$

$$d_{jk}P = (d_{jk}P_1)P_2 + P_1(d_{jk}P_2) + (d_jP_1)(d_kP_2) + (d_jP_2)(d_kP_1).$$

Hence,

$$D_j(P) = D_j(P_1) + D_j(P_2),$$

$$C_{jk}(P) = C_{jk}(P_1) + C_{jk}(P_2) + D_j(P_1)D_k(P_2) + D_j(P_2)d_k(P_1). \quad \square$$

Corollary A.2

Let $P(\mathbf{i}) = P_1(\mathbf{i})P_2(\mathbf{i})$ and $\mathbf{N} \neq \mathbf{0}$ be given. Then for $P(\mathbf{i}) \neq 0$:

$$\mathbf{D}_N(P) = \mathbf{D}_N(P_1) + \mathbf{D}_N(P_2), \tag{A.7}$$

$$\mathbf{C}_N(P) = \mathbf{C}_N(P_1) + \mathbf{C}_N(P_2) + 2\mathbf{D}_N(P_1)\mathbf{D}_N(P_2). \tag{A.8}$$

Proof

Applying (2.7) and (2.8) to Proposition A.2, the result follows. $\square$

Proposition A.3

Let $P(\mathbf{i}) = 1/Q(\mathbf{i})$, $Q(\mathbf{i}) \neq 0$. Then:

$$\mathbf{D}(P) = -\mathbf{D}(Q), \tag{A.9}$$

$$\mathbf{C}(P) = -\mathbf{C}(Q) + 2\mathbf{D}(Q)^T\mathbf{D}(Q). \tag{A.10}$$

Proof

As above,

$$d_jP = -d_jQ/Q^2,$$

from which (A.9) follows. Similarly,

$$d_{jk}P = -d_{jk}Q/Q^2 + 2(d_jQ)\,(d_kQ)/Q^3,$$

from which (A.10) follows. $\square$

Corollary A.3

Let $P(\mathbf{i}) = 1/Q(\mathbf{i})$, $Q(\mathbf{i}) \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{N} \neq \mathbf{0}$ be given. Then:

$$D_N(P) = -D_N(Q), \tag{A.11}$$

$$C_N(P) = -C_N(Q) + 2D_N^2(Q). \tag{A.12}$$

Proof

Immediate. □

Proposition A.4

Let $P(\mathbf{i}) = P_1(\mathbf{i})/P_2(\mathbf{i})$, $P_2(\mathbf{i}) \neq 0$. Then for $P(\mathbf{i}) \neq 0$:

$$\mathbf{D}(P) = \mathbf{D}(P_1) - \mathbf{D}(P_2), \tag{A.13}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}(P) = {} & \mathbf{C}(P_1) - \mathbf{C}(P_2) + \mathbf{D}(P_2)^T[\mathbf{D}(P_2) - \mathbf{D}(P_1)] \\ & + [\mathbf{D}(P_2) - \mathbf{D}(P_1)]^T\mathbf{D}(P_2). \end{aligned} \tag{A.14}$$

Proof

Combining Propositions A.2 and A.3,

$$\mathbf{D}(P) = \mathbf{D}(P_1) + \mathbf{D}(1/P_2) = \mathbf{D}(P_1) - \mathbf{D}(P_2),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}(P) &= \mathbf{C}(P_1) + \mathbf{C}(1/P_2) + \mathbf{D}(P_1)^T\mathbf{D}(1/P_2) + \mathbf{D}(1/P_2)^T\mathbf{D}(P_1) \\ &= \mathbf{C}(P_1) - \mathbf{C}(P_2) + 2\mathbf{D}(P_2)^T\mathbf{D}(P_2) - \mathbf{D}(P_1)^T\mathbf{D}(P_2) \\ &\quad - \mathbf{D}(P_2)^T\mathbf{D}(P_1). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Corollary A.4

Let $P(\mathbf{i}) = P_1(\mathbf{i})/P_2(\mathbf{i})$, $P_2(\mathbf{i}) \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{N} \neq \mathbf{0}$ be given. Then for $P(\mathbf{i}) \neq 0$:

$$D_N(P) = D_N(P_1) - D_N(P_2), \tag{A.15}$$

$$C_N(P) = C_N(P_1) - C_N(P_2) + 2D_N(P_2)[D_N(P_2) - D_N(P_1)]. \tag{A.16}$$

Proof

Immediate. □

Proposition A.5

Let $\mathbf{A}:\mathbf{i}\rightarrow\mathbf{j}$ be a smooth transformation from $\mathbf{R}^m$ to $\mathbf{R}^n$. Let $Q(\mathbf{j})$ be a price function and define $P(\mathbf{i})=Q(\mathbf{Ai})$. Then:

$$\mathbf{D}(P;\mathbf{i}) = \mathbf{D}(Q;\mathbf{Ai})\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})], \tag{A.17}$$

$$\mathbf{C}(P;\mathbf{i}) = \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})]^T\mathbf{C}(Q;\mathbf{Ai})\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})] - \mathbf{D}(Q;\mathbf{Ai})\cdot\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})], \tag{A.18}$$

where $\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})]_{jk}=\partial A_j/\partial i_k$ is the $n \times m$ Jacobian matrix of $\mathbf{A}$, and $\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})]_{jkl} = \partial^2 A_j/\partial i_k \partial i_l$ is the $n \times m \times m$ Hessian 'matrix' of $\mathbf{A}$.

Proof

Applying the chain rule:

$$d_k P(\mathbf{i}) = \sum_j d_j Q(\mathbf{Ai})\, d_k A_j(\mathbf{i}) = \mathbf{dQ} \cdot d_k\mathbf{A},$$

from which (A.17) follows. Taking second derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{lk}P(\mathbf{i}) &= \sum_j \sum_i d_{ij}Q(\mathbf{Ai})\, d_l A_i(\mathbf{i})\, d_k A_j(\mathbf{i}) + \sum_j d_j Q\,(\mathbf{Ai})\, d_{lk}A_j(\mathbf{i}) \\ &= (d_l\mathbf{A})^T[\mathbf{d}^2\mathbf{Q}]\, d_k\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{dQ} \cdot d_{lk}\mathbf{A}, \end{aligned}$$

from which we obtain (A.18). □

Corollary A.5

Let $\mathbf{A}$, $Q(\mathbf{j})$ and $P(\mathbf{i})$ be as in Proposition A.5, and $\mathbf{N}\neq\mathbf{0}$ be a given direction vector in $\mathbf{R}^m$. Also, let $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{M}'$ be defined in $\mathbf{R}^n$ by:

$$\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{J}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})]\mathbf{N}, \tag{A.19}$$

$$\mathbf{M}' = \mathbf{N}^T\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})]\mathbf{N}. \tag{A.20}$$

Then:

$$D_N(P) = D_M(Q), \tag{A.21}$$

$$C_N(P) = C_M(Q) - D_{M'}(Q). \tag{A.22}$$

Proof

Using (2.7), (A.21) follows immediately from (A.17). Similarly, (2.8) makes the first term on the right of (A.22) clear from (A.18). For the second term, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathbf{N}^T\mathbf{D}(Q;\mathbf{Ai})\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})]\mathbf{N} &= \sum_j d_j Q(\mathbf{Ai}) \sum_{lk} d_{lk}\mathbf{A}_j(\mathbf{i})\, n_l n_k / Q(\mathbf{Ai}) \\ &= \mathbf{dQ} \cdot [\mathbf{N}^T\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{i})]\mathbf{N}]/Q(\mathbf{Ai}) \\ &= -\mathbf{D}(Q) \cdot \mathbf{M}' \\ &= -\, D_{M'}(Q). \ \square \end{aligned}$$

DISCUSSION OF PRECEDING PAPER

ELIAS S. W. SHIU:

Dr. Reitano is to be congratulated for publishing another paper on duration analysis and immunization. The paper is full of interesting mathematics.

A difficulty I have with this paper is the concept of nondirectional immunization, which I understand to mean immunization with respect to all (directions of) yield curve shifts. The existence of a nondirectionally immunized portfolio would imply the existence of a free lunch, violating the principle of no arbitrage. In the case of a locally immunized portfolio, any "small" shift in the term structure of interest rates would guarantee an increase in the value of the portfolio. A globally immunized portfolio is one for which any shift, whether small or large, in the term structure of interest rates would guarantee an increase of its value. I use the word "increase" instead of "non-decrease," because I see that (5.2), (5.6), (5.11), and (5.13) are strict inequalities. The existence of this inconsistency in the model arises from the assumption that the yield curve is a deterministic function of several variables.

Let us first consider the simplest situation: the case of a single liability cash flow. Let us assume that the current ($t=0$) yield curve is determined by the force-of-interest function $\delta(t)$, $t \geq 0$; that is, the present value ($t=0$) of each stream of fixed cash flows $\{C_t,\ t \geq 0\}$ is given by

$$\sum_{t \geq 0} C_t \exp\left[-\int_0^t \delta(s)\, ds\right].$$

In financial literature, $\{\delta(t),\ t \geq 0\}$ are called instantaneous forward rates. In the spirit of Dr. Reitano's zero-coupon bond notation, we write, for a force-of-interest function $\lambda(.)$ and a pair of non-negative numbers τ and t,

$$Z_{\tau,t}(\lambda) = \exp\left[-\int_\tau^t \lambda(s)\, ds\right]. \tag{D.1}$$

The symbol $Z_{\tau,t}(\lambda)$ represents the value at time τ of 1 payable at time t, evaluated with the force-of-interest function $\lambda(.)$. Note that, for $\tau > t$, the symbol also makes sense mathematically, and it may be interpreted as the accumulation of a unit amount from time t to time τ, with respect to $\lambda(.)$.

Suppose that an insurance company issues a k-period zone-coupon bond (or a k-period bullet guaranteed investment contract) with maturity value L. It receives the amount of $LZ_{0,k}(\delta)$ from a customer and invests it in an asset with fixed cash flows $\{A_t,\ t \geq 0\}$,

$$LZ_{0,k}(\delta) = \sum_{t \geq 0} A_t Z_{0,t}(\delta). \tag{D.2}$$

Now, suppose that the force-of-interest function changes from $\delta(.)$ to $\delta(.) + \epsilon(.)$. The liability value and asset value become

$$LZ_{0,k}(\delta + \epsilon)$$

and

$$\sum_{t \geq 0} A_t Z_{0,t}(\delta + \epsilon),$$

respectively. The question we want to ask is whether

$$LZ_{0,k}(\delta + \epsilon) \leq \sum_{t \geq 0} A_t Z_{0,t}(\delta + \epsilon), \tag{D.3}$$

can hold for each feasible interest-rate shock $\epsilon(.)$. Here, feasibility means that $\delta(t) + \epsilon(t)$ is never negative for all t. Inequality (D.3) is an inequality in terms of values at time 0. We can rewrite it as an inequality in terms of forward values at time k by dividing its two sides by $Z_{0,k}(\delta + \epsilon)$. Since

$$\frac{Z_{\tau,t}(\lambda)}{Z_{\tau,k}(\lambda)} = Z_{k,t}(\lambda), \tag{D.4}$$

(D.3) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{t \geq 0} A_t Z_{k,t}(\delta + \epsilon) \geq L = \sum_{t \geq 0} A_t Z_{k,t}(\delta). \tag{D.5}$$

Inequality (D.5) is essentially the same as (2.12) of the paper. If I understand Definition 3 of the paper correctly, local immunization means that (D.5) is true for all sufficiently "small" and feasible $\epsilon(.)$, while global immunization means that (D.5) holds for all feasible $\epsilon(.)$. As I demonstrate below, local or global immunization is only possible in the case of exact cash-flow matching; that is, the asset consists of a single cash flow of amount L, which is to be paid at time k. In other words, nondirectional immunization, or immunization in all directions, is essentially a vacuous concept. This is not surprising because nondirectional immunization means free lunches.

Before proceeding further, I would like to clarify that the mathematical framework for interest rate movement as described above is essentially the same as the one in the paper. However, Dr. Reitano and I differ in verbal interpretation. In this discussion the initial term structure of interest rates is described by the force-of-interest function or instantaneous forward-rate function $\delta(.)$; in the paper it is described by the finite-dimensional vector $\mathbf{i}_0$. There is an instantaneous interest rate shock and the forward-rate function becomes $\delta(.) + \epsilon(.)$; in the paper the new yield curve is determined by the vector $\mathbf{i}$. I would not, however, say that the new yield curve "remains fixed at this level throughout the period." In the model, the yield curve does change as time passes (unless we are dealing with a flat yield curve). For $\tau \geq 0$, let $\delta_\tau(.)$ denote the instantaneous forward-rate function at time τ. The model assumes

$$\delta_0(t) = \delta(t), \, t \geq 0,$$

and, for $0 < \tau \leq k$,

$$\delta_\tau(t) = \delta(t + \tau) + \epsilon(t + \tau), \, t \geq 0.$$

The last formula means that, after time 0, the yield curve movement is governed exactly by the so-called pure expectations hypothesis ([6], [8]). On the other hand, the statement that the yield curve "remains fixed at this level throughout the period" means that, for $0 < \tau \leq k$,

$$\delta_\tau(t) = \delta(t) + \epsilon(t), \, t \geq 0,$$

which I do not find to be the case when I examine the mathematics in the paper. Thus Dr. Reitano and I have essentially the same mathematical framework but different verbal interpretation.

Let us return to the question whether there can exist asset cash-flow streams for which (D.5) is true for all (small) $\epsilon(.)$. (We remind the readers that (D.3) is equivalent to (D.5), which in turn is equivalent to (2.12) of the paper.) Define

$$V(\lambda) = \sum_{t \geq 0} A_t Z_{k,t}(\lambda). \tag{D.6}$$

Inequality (D.5) is equivalent to

$$V(\delta + \epsilon) - V(\delta) \geq 0. \tag{D.7}$$

To simplify writing, put

$$a_t = A_t Z_{k,t}(\delta)$$

and

$$f(t) = Z_{k,t}(\epsilon).$$

Then

$$V(\delta + \epsilon) - V(\delta) = \sum_{t \geq 0} a_t [f(t) - 1]. \tag{D.8}$$

Let us assume that $\epsilon(.)$ is a differentiable function. (This is for technical convenience, and one may use the advanced mathematical method in [12].) Then the function $f(.)$ is twice differentiable. By Taylor's formula with remainder, there exists a point ξ_t between t and k such that

$$\begin{aligned} f(t) &= f(k) + (t - k)f'(k) + ½\,(t - k)^2 f''(\xi_t) \\ &= 1 - (t - k)\epsilon(k) + ½\,(t - k)^2 f''(\xi_t). \end{aligned} \tag{D.9}$$

Substituting (D.9) in (D.8) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &V(\delta + \epsilon) - V(\delta) \\ &\qquad = -\epsilon(k) \sum_{t \geq 0} (t - k)a_t + ½ \sum_{t \geq 0} f''(\xi_t)(t - k)^2 a_t. \end{aligned} \tag{D.10}$$

Since $\{(t - k)^2 a_t\}$ are non-negative numbers, there exists a positive number ξ such that

$$\sum_{t \geq 0} f''(\xi_t)(t - k)^2 a_t = f''(\xi) \sum_{t \geq 0} (t - k)^2 a_t. \tag{D.11}$$

It is easy to check that

$$f''(s) = f(s)\{[\epsilon(s)]^2 - \epsilon'(s)\}. \tag{D.12}$$

Hence (D.10) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} V(\delta + \epsilon) - V(\delta) = &-\epsilon(k) \sum_{t \geq 0} (t - k)a_t \\ &+ ½\, f(\xi)\{[\epsilon(\xi)]^2 - \epsilon'(\xi)\} \sum_{t \geq 0} (t - k)^2 a_t. \end{aligned} \tag{D.13}$$

Define

$$D = \frac{\sum_{t \geq 0} t a_t}{V(\delta)} \tag{D.14}$$

and

$$C = \frac{\sum_{t\geq 0} t^2 a_t}{V(\delta)}. \tag{D.15}$$

In the terminology of the paper, the quantities D and C are the directional duration and convexity, respectively, of the cash flows $\{A_t\}$ in the direction of the vector

$$\mathbf{N} = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)^T.$$

Note that, although each a_t depends on k, the quantities D and C do not depend on k. That is, for every τ,

$$D = \frac{\sum_{t\geq 0} tA_t Z_{\tau,t}(\delta)}{\sum_{t\geq 0} A_t Z_{\tau,t}(\delta)}$$

and

$$C = \frac{\sum_{t\geq 0} t^2 A_t Z_{\tau,t}(\delta)}{\sum_{t\geq 0} A_t Z_{\tau,t}(\delta)}.$$

On the first page of the paper, Dr. Reitano suggests that D was first developed by Fisher and Weil [3]; however, as I pointed out in an earlier discussion [18], Macaulay [9] also had this idea. For convenience, let us call D and C the parallel-shift duration and convexity, respectively. Analogous to the formula

$$\mathrm{Var}(X) = E(X^2) - [E(X)]^2,$$

define

$$M^2 = C - D^2. \tag{D.16}$$

(The quantity M^2 is the same as the inertia defined in Chapter 7 of Bierwag's book [1]. This term also appears in the paper. Fong and Vasicek ([4], [5]) introduced the notation M^2.)

Inequalities (D.3), (D.5) and (D.7) are equivalent to

$$\frac{V(\delta + \epsilon)}{V(\delta)} - 1 \geq 0. \tag{D.17}$$

It follows from (D.13), (D.14), (D.15), and (D.16) that

$$\frac{V(\delta + \epsilon)}{V(\delta)} - 1 = (k - D)\epsilon(k) + \tfrac{1}{2} f(\xi)\{[\epsilon(\xi)]^2 - \epsilon'(\xi)\}[M^2 + (D - k)^2]. \quad \text{(D.18)}$$

We now show that (D.17) cannot hold for all $\epsilon(.)$, unless the asset consists of a single cash flow of amount L, to be paid at time k; in this case, for each $\epsilon(.)$,

$$V(\delta + \epsilon) = V(\delta).$$

There are two cases: $k \neq D$ and $k = D$. If $k \neq D$, consider parallel shifts of the yield curve. Let η be a constant and

$$\epsilon(t) = \eta, \text{ for all } t.$$

Then (D.18) becomes

$$\frac{V(\delta + \epsilon)}{V(\delta)} - 1 = \eta\{(k - D) + \tfrac{1}{2}\, \eta e^{\eta(k-\xi)}[M^2 + (D - k)^2]\}. \quad \text{(D.19)}$$

For $|\eta|$ sufficiently small, the right-hand side of (D.19) is dominated by the term $\eta(k-D)$, which can be made negative by choosing η to be of the opposite sign of $(k-D)$. Then

$$V(\delta + \epsilon) < V(\delta).$$

Now, let us examine the second case, in which the parallel-shift duration of the asset is k,

$$D = k.$$

Here, (D.18) becomes

$$\frac{V(\delta + \epsilon)}{V(\delta)} - 1 = \tfrac{1}{2} f(\xi)\{[\epsilon(\xi)]^2 - \epsilon'(\xi)\}M^2. \quad \text{(D.20)}$$

If there is more than one asset cash flow, we have $M^2 > 0$. Consequently,

$$V(\delta + \epsilon) < V(\delta)$$

if and only if

$$[\epsilon(\xi)]^2 < \epsilon'(\xi). \quad \text{(D.21)}$$

Inequality (D.21) holds if the function $\epsilon(.)$ satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt}\frac{1}{\epsilon(t)} < -1 \qquad \text{for all } t.$$

Let me now explain in words why nondirectional immunization can only occur for the case of exact cash-flow matching. If the parallel-shift duration of the asset, D, is not the same as k, the portfolio is not protected against all parallel shifts. If $D=k$ and if the asset is not a single cash flow, then the asset has cash flows before and after time k. Now, consider a counterclockwise twist of the yield curve; that is, short interest rates go down and long interest rates go up. Because the asset cash flows occurring before time k are to be reinvested at lower interest rates and the asset cash flows due after time k depreciate in value because of higher interest rates, the portfolio loses value.

We have just treated the simple case of a single liability cash flow in detail, showing that nondirectional immunization is not possible except for exact cash-flow matching. The next question is whether the concept of nondirectional immunization is viable in the general case of multiple liability cash flows. In the case of a single liability, it follows from (D.19) that matching the parallel-shift duration of the asset with k is a necessary and sufficient condition for immunizing against all parallel yield-curve shifts. With $D=k$, Formula (D.19) becomes

$$\frac{V(\delta + \epsilon)}{V(\delta)} - 1 = \tfrac{1}{2}\,\eta^2 e^{\eta(D-\xi)} M^2. \tag{D.22}$$

For the general case of multiple liability cash flows, the matching of the parallel-shift duration of the asset with that of the liability is a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for immunization against parallel shifts. The mathematics is more complicated, and we refer the interested reader to [16] or [17]. A theorem in [17] states that, for immunizing a portfolio with n liability outflows against parallel yield-curve shifts, a necessary condition is that the asset cash flows can be partitioned into n streams, each with the same present value and parallel-shift duration as one of the n liability outflows. In other words, we need to immunize each liability outflow against parallel yield shifts separately. Using this result and refining the anticlockwise yield-curve twist argument given earlier, we can show that nondirectional immunization for multiple liability cash flows can only be achieved by means of exact cash-flow matching.

Let me present one more argument why a nondirectional immunized portfolio must be a perfectly cash-flow-matched portfolio. Consider a portfolio of assets and liabilities. Following the notation in Section II-B of the paper, let c_t denote the net cash flow of the portfolio to occur at time t, $t \geq 0$. (The net cash flows are the asset cash flows minus the liability cash flows.) The forward value of the portfolio at time k is

$$\sum_{k>t\geq 0} c_t[1 + r(t,k)]^{k-t} + \sum_{t\geq k} c_t[1 + r(k,t)]^{k-t}.$$

If the asset and liability cash flows are not exactly matched, there are some nonzero net cash flows. Let $\{s(.,.)\}$ be a set of feasible interest rates such that

$$s(t,k) \leq r(t,k), \text{ if } t < k \text{ and } c_t > 0,$$

$$s(t,k) \geq r(t,k), \text{ if } t < k \text{ and } c_t < 0,$$

$$s(t,k) \geq r(t,k), \text{ if } t > k \text{ and } c_t > 0,$$

and

$$s(t,k) \leq r(t,k), \text{ if } t > k \text{ and } c_t < 0.$$

Then

$$\sum_{k>t\geq 0} c_t[1 + r(t,k)]^{k-t} + \sum_{t\geq k} c_t[1 + r(k,t)]^{k-t}$$

$$\geq \sum_{k>t\geq 0} c_t[1 + s(t,k)]^{t-k} + \sum_{t\geq k} c_t[1 + s(k,t)]^{k-t},$$

where the inequality becomes a strict inequality when just one of the inequalities between $s(.,.)$ and $r(.,.)$ becomes a strict inequality.

The concept of nondirectional immunization is indeed a natural consequence of the assumption that the yield curve is a deterministic function of several variables. Perhaps it would be useful to spend some time examining this assumption. If we stretch the word "several" to mean "many," the concept of nondirectional immunization becomes the same as exact cash-flow matching. Equating the gradient of the portfolio-value function to the zero vector yields a system of equations, with the number of equations being the same as the number of variables. When there are many variables, the solution to the system of equations is exact matching. That is, each liability outflow is paired with an asset inflow.

The model becomes more interesting and potentially useful if the term "several variables" means "a few variables." Unfortunately, this implies the existence of a nontrivial nondirectionally immunized portfolio, which in turn implies the existence of a free lunch. It may help focus the issue by asking an explicit question. In Section C of *The Wall Street Journal*, there is a table entitled "Treasury Bonds, Notes & Bills." In the column under the heading "U.S. Treasury Strips," we can find the prices for zero-coupon bonds. The question is: Can one write down a function of several variables,

$$Z_k(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_m),$$

which gives the price of the zero-coupon bond of term k for all k? What are i_1, i_2, ..., and i_m? This paper seems to advocate using the "pivotal yield values for maturities 0.25, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 20, and 30 years" as the variables, but I cannot write down the function Z_k with these variables. The financial literature contains many papers trying to determine the term structure of interest rates from empirical data; see, for example, [2], [7], [10], [11], [13], [14], [15] and [19]. Unfortunately, none of these papers provided such a function. As the function $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$ appears repeatedly in the paper, it would certainly help me understand the practicality of the results by seeing some formulas for $Z_k(\mathbf{i})$.

Let me conclude this discussion with a comment on notation. The vectors in the paper are written as row vectors, but they are really used as column vectors. One sees definitions such as

$$\mathbf{N} = (1, \ldots, 1),$$

where the right-hand side is obviously a row vector; however, one then finds formulas such as

$$\mathbf{N}^T\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{i})\mathbf{N},$$

where N has to be a column vector. Also, the subscripts N, M and M′ should be in boldface; that is, D_N should be $D_{\mathbf{N}}$, C_M should be $C_{\mathbf{M}}$, d_N should be $d_{\mathbf{N}}$, and so on.

REFERENCES

1. Bierwag, G.O. *Duration Analysis: Managing Interest Rate Risk.* Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1987.
2. Chambers, D.R., Carleton, W.T., and Waldman, D.W. "A New Approach to Estimation of the Term Structure of Interest Rates," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 19 (1984): 233–52.

3. FISHER, L., AND WEIL, R.L. "Coping with the Risk of Interest-Rate Fluctuations: Returns to Bondholders from Naïve and Optimal Strategies," *Journal of Business* 44 (1971): 408–31.
4. FONG, H.G., AND VASICEK, O. "Returned Maximization for Immunized Portfolios." In *Innovations in Bond Portfolio Management: Duration Analysis and Immunization*, edited by G.G. Kaufman, G.O. Bierwag and A. Toevs. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1983, 227–38.
5. FONG, H.G., AND VASICEK, O. "A Risk Minimizing Strategy for Portfolio Immunization," *Journal of Finance* 39 (1984): 1541–46.
6. HICKS, J.R. *Value and Capital*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.
7. LITZENBERGER, R.H., AND ROLFO, J. "An International Study of Tax Effects on Government Bonds," *Journal of Finance* 39 (1984): 1–22.
8. LUTZ, F.A. "The Structure of Interest Rates," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 55 (1940–41): 36–63.
9. MACAULAY, F.R. *Some Theoretical Problems Suggested by the Movements of Interest Rates, Bond Yields and Stock Prices in the United States since 1856*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1938.
10. MCCULLOCH, J.H. "Measuring the Term Structure of Interest Rates," *Journal of Business* 44 (1971): 19–31.
11. MCCULLOCH, J.H. "The Tax-Adjusted Yield Curve," *Journal of Finance* 30 (1975): 811–30.
12. MONTRUCCHIO, L., AND PECCATI, L. "A Note on Shiu-Fisher-Weil Immunization Theorem," *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 10 (1991): 125–31.
13. NELSON, C.R., AND SIEGEL, A.F. "Parsimonious Modeling of Yield Curves," *Journal of Business* 60 (1987): 473–89.
14. SHEA, G.S. "Pitfalls in Smoothing Interest Rate Term Structure Data: Equilibrium Models and Spline Approximations," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 19 (1984): 253–69.
15. SHEA, G.S. "Interest Rate Term Structure Estimation with Exponential Splines: A Note," *Journal of Finance* 40 (1985): 319–25.
16. SHIU, E.S.W. "A Generalization of Redington's Theory of Immunization," *ARCH* 1986.2: 69–81.
17. SHIU, E.S.W. "Immunization of Multiple Liabilities," *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 7 (1988): 219–24.
18. SHIU, E.S.W. Discussion of "Multivariate Duration Analysis," *TSA* XLIII (1991): 377–81.
19. VASICEK, O.A., AND FONG, H.G. "Term Structure Modeling Using Exponential Splines," *Journal of Finance* 37 (1982): 339–48.

(AUTHOR'S REVIEW OF DISCUSSION)

ROBERT R. REITANO:

I thank Dr. Shiu for his discussion of my paper. Unfortunately, he continues the misconceptions articulated in his discussion of my paper on "Multivariate Duration Theory" (*TSA* XLIII (1991): 335–76), apparently unconvinced by the rebuttal in my author's review of his discussion (*TSA* XLIII (1991): 382–91), which he had the opportunity to review prior to his current comments.

His first misconception is that "the existence of a nondirectionally immunized portfolio would imply the existence of a free lunch, violating the principle of no (riskless) arbitrage." Though this issue is addressed in more detail in my prior author's review, it is easy to show the error in this conclusion. Basically, Dr. Shiu's argument ignores that "arbitrage" implies two trades: a trade to access a source of funds and a trade for the investment of these funds. His argument ignores the implications of the source of funds, in particular, their associated cost.

The existence of a portfolio that increases in value, no matter the direction of interest rates, does not really provide a free lunch unless one can borrow funds to invest at no cost (that is, with no interest rate charges). If an investor has a non-zero cost of funds, no free lunch exists until the profits on yield changes first offset the losses on the cost of the funds invested. Clearly, such a trade is not risk-free, and hence this is not a riskless arbitrage, because such a position can net a loss over any period.

Dr. Shiu's second misconception is that "local or global (nondirectional) immunization is only possible in the case of exact cash-flow matching" . . . and hence ". . . is essentially a vacuous concept." To justify this view, a lengthy analytic derivation is presented. Unfortunately, the price function model used in that derivation compelled the given result. Also, for this particular price function, the propositions in my paper make the derivation of his conclusion quite straightforward. Finally, his conclusion fails to generalize to other price function models.

To demonstrate these assertions, we first recall the price function model used. Dr. Shiu begins with a continuous forward rate structure, $\{\delta(t), t \geq 0\}$, which can then be used to calculate both the current and future values of a collection of fixed cash flows. His yield curve shift model: $\delta(t) \rightarrow \delta(t)+\epsilon(t)$, is constrained only by the condition that $\delta(t)+\epsilon(t)>0$ for $t \geq 0$.

Given a collection of cash flows $\{A_t, t=t_1, t_2, \ldots\}$, we discretize the yield curve to price 30 years of cash flows to the minute, say, with

$m=30\times 365\times 24\times 60$ and with $\mathbf{i}=(i_1, i_2, ..., i_m)$ equal to the corresponding spot rate vector in m dimensions consistent with the original yield curve. The price function can then be given by:

$$P_A(\mathbf{i}) = \sum A_t(1 + i_t)^{-t}.$$

It is not difficult to show that Dr. Shiu's yield curve shift model, $\delta(t)\rightarrow \delta(t)+\epsilon(t)$, translates to allowing $\mathbf{i}=(i_1, i_2, ..., i_m)$ to shift in any direction as a vector in this m dimensional space.

Since Dr. Shiu assumes $P_A(\mathbf{i})=P_L(\mathbf{i})$ initially, Proposition 7 of my paper states that a sufficient condition for immunization at time $k\geq 0$ is that $\mathbf{D}(A)=\mathbf{D}(L)$ and $\mathbf{C}(A)>\mathbf{C}(L)$, where total duration vectors and convexity matrices are calculated within the m dimensional model constructed above. However, for the price function given, $\mathbf{D}(A)=\mathbf{D}(L)$, if and only if $A_t=L_t$ for all t. Hence, it is true that if the yield curve model used is sufficiently fine to price fixed cash flows of all maturities and the shift model allows vector shifts in all directions in the associated spot rate vector space, then nondirectional immunization of fixed cash flows implies cash-flow matching.

However, this result clearly relies on the explicit model for $P(\mathbf{i})$, because this price function is uniquely characterized by its initial value and gradient, or equivalently, its initial value and total duration vector.

In general, however, it is far too much to hope that a more general price function is uniquely characterized by its initial value and total duration vector, or both of these and its total convexity matrix. Clearly, price functions of interest-sensitive cash flows do not fall within Dr. Shiu's result, nor do fixed cash-flow models with cruder discretizations of the yield curve structure.

For example, if one starts with Dr. Shiu's spot rate model, a yield curve of par bond yields can readily be constructed. Next, if one then selects several "yield curve drivers" among the resulting bond yields at, say, $t=0.5$, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 20, and 30 years, and assumes that yields at other maturities move in an interpolated way, the initial price, total duration vector and total convexity matrix in this 10-dimensional space clearly will not uniquely characterize a price function, not even a price function of fixed cash flows. That is, many fixed cash-flow price functions can be constructed with common initial price, total duration vector, and total convexity matrix.

In the limit of these yield curve simplifications, one obtains a single yield curve driver and the assumption that all other yields move by the same amount; that is, the Fisher-Weil or parallel shift model.

In general, the goal of the yield curve model chosen is to be finer than the Fisher-Weil model, which allows significant yield curve exposure, yet cruder than the Shiu model, which overconstrains the portfolio toward cash-flow matching. I believe that the bond yield curve and recommended yield curve drivers represent one such model, as does a variety of variations on this, such as Ho's spot rate model and key rates. The goal of my research has been to study the general properties of such models, to allow flexibility in their applications. Given this framework, only more empirical work will shed light on the yield curve models that provide the best balance between portfolio protection and management flexibility.

On the subject of my simple description of the yield curve shift from $\mathbf{i}_0$ to $\mathbf{i}$ in the paper's preprint, Dr. Shiu is quite right that my language was inaccurate and not reflective of the model used in the mathematical development or general discussion. Stating that the yield curve "remained fixed at level $\mathbf{i}$ throughout the immunization period" was a misleading way to state my actual assumption that no other changes in the yield curve took place other than the evolution of rates according to the forward structure implied by $\mathbf{i}$. I have hopefully clarified my language in the final printing.

On lighter subjects, Dr. Shiu comments that *The Wall Street Journal* table of U.S. Treasury Strips cannot be accurately reproduced by a simple model of a bond yield curve and the small number of yield curve drivers that I recommend. However, it is also the case that if one uses this strips curve, the universe of Treasury notes and bonds cannot be accurately priced either. The fact that a model has limitations does not invalidate its use.

Dr. Shiu is also concerned that the prices of zero-coupon bonds cannot be easily represented analytically as an explicit function of my yield curve drivers. Certainly, given any collection of yield curve drivers and an interpolation assumption, it is quite easy to calculate the implied price of zero-coupon bonds at all maturities using a computer. The fact that one cannot write down these prices as a simple function of the yield curve drivers should be no more troubling than one's inability to write down the formula for the price of a callable bond using the Ho-Lee model.

Finally, Dr. Shiu objects to my notational conventions. As in my paper, it is quite common in linear algebra texts to display vectors as row vectors, yet identify them with column vectors in matrix calculations. This saves numerous and unnecessary uses of the transpose symbol whenever a vector is identified. As for my decision to not use boldface subscripts, the convention here is less established so I opted for simplicity.

Again, let me thank Dr. Shiu for his stimulating discussion and his constructive comments about my description of the assumed yield curve shift.