Article from:

Risks & Rewards

August 2013 – Issue 62

PRESENT VALUES, INVESTMENT RETURNS AND DISCOUNT RATES – PART 1

By Dimitry Mindlin

This is the first of a two-part article. The first provides the groundwork for exploring the different formulations of the discount rate, to support various sorts of objectives. It provides some useful rule of thumb for estimating quantiles in the distribution of discount rates and for relating geometric and arithmetic discount assumptions in a defined series of returns. The second part, to follow in early 2014, applies this approach to examples of a stochastic distribution of returns.

The concept of present value lies at the heart of finance in general and actuarial science in particular. The importance of the concept is universally recognized. Present values of various cash flows are extensively utilized in the pricing of financial instruments, funding of financial commitments, financial reporting, and other areas.

A typical funding problem involves a financial commitment (defined as a series of future payments) to be funded. A financial commitment is funded if all payments are made when they are due. A present value of a financial commitment is defined as the asset value required at the present to fund the commitment.

Traditionally, the calculation of a present value utilizes a discount rate—a deterministic return assumption that represents investment returns. If the investment return and the commitment are certain, then the discount rate is equal to the investment return and the present value is equal to the sum of all payments discounted by the compounded discount rates. The asset value that is equal to this present value and invested in the portfolio that generates the investment return will fund the commitment with certainty.

In practice, however, perfectly certain future financial commitments and investment returns rarely exist. While the calculation of the present value is straightforward when returns and commitments are certain, uncertainties in the commitments and returns make the calculation of the present value anything but straightforward. When investment returns are uncertain, a single discount rate cannot encompass the entire spectrum of investment returns, hence the selection of a discount rate is a challenge. In general, the asset value required to fund an uncertain financial commitment via investing in risky assets—the present value of the commitment—is uncertain (stochastic).[1]

While the analysis of present values is vital to the process of funding financial commitments, uncertain (stochastic) present values are outside of the scope of this paper. This paper assumes that a present value is certain (deterministic)—a present value is assumed to be a number, not a random variable in this paper. The desire to have a deterministic present value requires a set of assumptions that "assume away" all the uncertainties in the funding problem.

In particular, it is generally necessary to assume that all future payments are perfectly known at the present. The next step is to select a proper measurement of investment returns that serves as the discount rate for present value calculations. This step—the selection of the discount rate—is the main subject of this paper.

One of the main messages of this paper is the selection of the discount rate depends on the objective of the calculation. Different objectives may necessitate different discount rates. The paper defines investment returns and specifies their relationships with present and future values. The key measurements of investment returns are defined in the context of return series and, after a concise discussion of capital market assumptions, in the context of return distributions. The paper concludes with several examples of investment objectives and the discount rates associated with these objectives.

1. INVESTMENT RETURNS

This section discusses one of the most important concepts in finance—investment returns.

Let us define the investment return for a portfolio of assets with known asset values at the beginning and the end of a time period. If *PV* is the asset value invested in portfolio *P* at the beginning of a time period, and *FV* is the value of the portfolio at the end of the period, then the portfolio return R_P for the period is defined as

$$R_P = \frac{FV - PV}{PV}$$

(1.1)

Thus, given the beginning and ending values, portfolio return is defined (retrospectively) as the ratio of the investment gain over the beginning value. Definition (1.1) establishes a relationship between portfolio return R_P and asset values *PV* and *FV*.

Simple transformations of definition (1.1) produce the following formula:

$$FV = PV\left(1 + R_P\right)$$

(1.2)

Formula (1.2) allows a forward-looking (prospective) calculation of the end-of-period asset value *FV*. The formula is usually used when the asset value at the present *PV* and portfolio return R_P are known (this explains the notation: *PV* stands for "Present Value"; *FV* stands for "Future Value").

While definition (1.1) and formula (1.2) are mathematically equivalent, they utilize portfolio return R_P in fundamentally different ways. The return in definition (1.1) is certain, as it is used retrospectively as a measurement of portfolio performance. In contrast, the return in formula (1.2) is used prospectively to calculate the future value of the portfolio, and it may or may not be certain.

When a portfolio contains risky assets, the portfolio return is uncertain by definition. Most institutional and individual investors endeavor to fund their financial commitments by virtue of investing in risky assets. The distribution of uncertain portfolio return is usually analyzed using a set of forward-looking capital market assumptions that include expected returns, risks, and correlations between various asset classes. Later sections discuss capital market assumptions in more detail.

Given the present value and portfolio return, formula (1.2) calculates the future value. However, many investors with future financial commitments to fund (e.g., retirement plans) face a different challenge. Future values—the commitments—are usually given, and the challenge is to calculate present values. A simple transformation of formula (1.2) produces the following formula:

$$PV = \frac{FV}{1 + R_P}$$

(1.3)

Formula (1.3) represents the concept of discounting procedure. Given a portfolio, formula (1.3) produces the asset value *PV* required to be invested in this portfolio at the present in order to accumulate future value *FV*. It must be emphasized that return R_P in (1.3) is generated by the actual portfolio *P*, as there is no discounting without investing. Any discounting procedure assumes that the assets are actually invested in a portfolio that generates the returns used in the procedure.

Formulas (1.2) and (1.3) are mathematically equivalent, and they utilize portfolio return in similar ways. Depending on the purpose of a calculation in (1.2) or (1.3), one may utilize either a particular measurement of return (e.g., the expected return or median return) or the full range of returns.[2] The desirable properties of the future value in (1.2) or present value in (1.3) would determine the right choice of the return assumption.

Future and present values are, in a certain sense, inverse of each other. It is informative to look at the analogy between

future and present values in the context of a funding problem, which would explicitly involve a future financial commitment to fund. Think of an investor that has \$$P$ at the present and has made a commitment to accumulate \$$F$ at the end of the period by means of investing in a portfolio that generates investment return R.

Similar to (1.2), the future value of \$$P$ is equal to

$$FV = P(1+R)$$ (1.4)

Similar to (1.3), the present value of \$$F$ is equal to

$$PV = \frac{F}{1+R}$$ (1.5)

The shortfall event is defined as failing to accumulate \$$F$ at the end of the period:

$$FV < F$$ (1.6)

The shortfall event can also be defined equivalently in terms of the present value as \$$P$ being insufficient to accumulate \$$F$ at the end of the period:

$$P < PV$$ (1.7)

In particular, the shortfall probability can be expressed in terms of future and present values:

$$\text{Shortfall Probability} = \Pr(FV < F) = \Pr(PV > P)$$
(1.8)

If the shortfall event happens, then the shortfall size can also be measured in terms of future and present values. The future shortfall $F - FV$ is the additional amount the investor will be required to contribute at the end of the period to fulfill the commitment. The present shortfall $PV - P$ is the additional amount the investor is required to contribute at the present to fulfill the commitment.

Clearly, there is a fundamental connection between future and present values. However, this connection goes only so far, as there are issues of great theoretical and practical importance that distinguish future and present values. As demonstrated in a later section, similar conditions imposed on future and present values lead to different discount rates.

Uncertain future values generated by the uncertainties of investment returns (and commitments) play no part in financial reporting. In contrast, various actuarial and accounting reports require calculations of present values, and these present values must be deterministic (under current accounting standards, at least). Therefore, there is a need for a deterministic discounting procedure.

Conventional calculations of deterministic present values usually utilize a single measurement of investment returns that serves as the discount rate. Since there are numerous measurements of investment returns, the challenge is to select the most appropriate measurement for a particular calculation. To clarify these issues, subsequent sections discuss various measurements of investment returns.

2. MEASUREMENTS OF INVESTMENT RETURNS: RETURN SERIES

This section discusses the key measurements of series of returns and relationships between these measurements. Given a series of returns $r_1,..., r_n$, it is desirable to have a measurement of the series—a single rate of return—that, in a certain sense, would reflect the properties of the series. The right measurement always depends on the objective of the measurement. The most popular measurement of a series of returns $r_1,..., r_n$ is its arithmetic average A defined as the average value of the series:

$$A = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} r_k$$
(2.1)

As any other measurement, the arithmetic average has its pros and cons. While the arithmetic average is an unbiased estimate of the return, the probability of achieving this value may be unsatisfactory. As a predictor of future returns, the arithmetic average may be too optimistic.

Another significant shortcoming of the arithmetic return is it does not "connect" the starting and ending asset values. The starting asset value multiplied by the compounded arithmetic return factor $(1 + A)$ is normally greater than the ending asset value.[3] Therefore, the arithmetic average is inappropriate if the objective is to "connect" the starting and ending asset values. The objective that leads to the arithmetic average as the right choice of discount rate is presented in Section 5.

Clearly, it would be desirable to "connect" the starting and ending asset values—to find a single rate of return that, given a series of returns and a starting asset value, generates the same future value as the series. This observation suggests the following important objective.

Objective 1: To "connect" the starting and ending asset values.

The concept of geometric average is specifically designed to achieve this objective. If A_0 and A_n are the starting and ending asset values correspondingly, then, by definition,

$$ A_0 \left(1+r_1\right)\dots\left(1+r_n\right) = A_n \tag{2.2}$$

The geometric average G is defined as the single rate of return that generates the same future value as the series of returns. Namely, the starting asset value multiplied by the compounded return factor $(1 + G)^n$ is equal to the ending asset value:

$$ A_0 \left(1+G\right)^n = A_n \tag{2.3}$$

Combining (2.2) and (2.3), we get the standard definition of the geometric average G:

$$ G = -1 + \prod_{k=1}^{n} \left(1+r_k\right)^{1/n} \tag{2.4}$$

Let us rewrite formulas (1.2) and (1.3) in terms of present and future values. If A_n is a future payment and $r_1,\dots,r_n$ are the investment returns, then the present value of A_n is equal to the payment discounted by the geometric average:

$$ A_0 = \frac{A_n}{\left(1+r_1\right)\quad\left(1+r_n\right)} = \frac{A_n}{\left(1+G\right)^n} \tag{2.5}$$

Thus, the geometric average connects the starting and ending asset values (and the arithmetic average does not). Therefore, if the primary objective of discount rate selection is to connects the starting and ending asset values, then the geometric average should be used for the present value calculations.

To present certain relationships between arithmetic and geometric averages, let us define variance V as follows:[4]

$$ V = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(r_k - A\right)^2 \tag{2.6}$$

If $V = 0$, then all returns in the series are the same, and the arithmetic average is equal to the geometric average. Otherwise (if $V > 0$), the arithmetic average is greater than the geometric average $(A > G)$.[5]

There are several approximate relationships between arithmetic average A, geometric average G, and variance V. These relationships include the following relationships that are denoted (R1) – (R4) in this paper.

$$ G \approx A - V/2 \tag{R1}$$

$$ \left(1+G\right)^2 \approx \left(1+A\right)^2 - V \tag{R2}$$

$$ 1+G \approx \left(1+A\right)\exp[\,(\text{-}1/2)V(1+A)^{\text{-}2}] \tag{R3}$$

$$ 1+G \approx \left(1+A\right)\left(1+V\left(1+A\right)^{-2}\right)^{-1/2} \tag{R4}$$

These relationships produce different results, and some of them work better than the others in different situations. Relationship (R1) is the simplest, popularized in many publications, but usually sub-optimal and tends to underestimate the geometric return.[6] Relationships (R2) – (R4)

are slightly more complicated, but, in most cases, should be expected to produce better results than (R1).

The geometric average estimate generated by (R4) is always greater than the one generated by (R3), which in turn is always greater than the one generated by (R2).[7] Loosely speaking,

$$(R2) < (R3) < (R4)$$

In general, "inequality" (R1) < (R2) is not necessarily true, although it is true for most practical examples. If $A > V / 4$, then the geometric average estimate generated by (R1) is less than the one generated by (R2).[8]

There is some evidence to suggest that, for historical data, relationship (R4) should be expected to produce better results than (R1) – (R3). See Mindlin [2010] for more details regarding the derivations of (R1) – (R4) and their properties.

Example 2.1.

$n = 2$, $r_1 = -1\%$, $r_2 = 15\%$. Then arithmetic mean A, geometric mean G, and variance V are calculated as follows.

$$A = \frac{1}{2}\left(-1\% + 15\%\right) = 7.00\%$$

$$G = \sqrt{\left(1-1\%\right)\left(1+15\%\right)} - 1 = 6.70\%$$

$$V = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{2}\left(r_k - A\right)^2 = 0.64\%$$

Note that $(1+G)^2 = (1+A)^2 - V$, so formula (R2) is exact in this example.

Given $1 at the present, future value FV is

$$FV = 1 \cdot \left(1-1\%\right)\left(1+15\%\right) = 1.1385$$

If we apply arithmetic return A to $1 at the present for two years, we get

$$\left(1+7\%\right)^2 = 1.1449$$

which is greater than future value $FV = 1.1385$.

If we apply geometric return G to $1 at the present for two years, we get

$$\left(1+6.70\%\right)^2 = 1.1385$$

which is equal to future value FV, as expected.

Given $1 in two years, present value PV is

$$PV = \frac{1}{\left(1-1\%\right)\left(1+15\%\right)} = 0.8783$$

If we discount $1 in two years using geometric return G, we get

$$\frac{1}{\left(1+6.70\%\right)^2} = 0.8783$$

which is equal to present value PV, as expected.

If we discount $1 in two years using arithmetic return A, we get

$$\frac{1}{\left(1+7.00\%\right)^2} = 0.8734$$

which is less than present value $PV = 0.8783$.

3. CAPITAL MARKET ASSUMPTIONS AND PORTFOLIO RETURNS

This section introduces capital market assumptions for major asset classes and outlines basic steps for the estimation of portfolio returns.

It is assumed that the capital markets consist of n asset classes. The following notation is used throughout this section:

m_i mean (arithmetic) return;
s_i standard deviation of return;
c_{ij} correlation coefficient between asset classes i and j.

A portfolio is defined as a series of weights $\{w_i\}$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = 1$. Each weight w_i represents the fraction of the portfolio invested in the asset class i.

Portfolio mean return A and variance V are calculated as follows:

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i m_i \tag{3.1}$$

$$V = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} w_i w_j s_i s_j c_{ij} \tag{3.2}$$

Let us also define return factor as $1 + R$. It is common to assume that the return factor has lognormal distribution (which means $\ln(1 + R)$ has normal distribution). Under this assumption, parameters μ and σ of the lognormal distribution are calculated as follows:

$$\sigma^2 = \ln\left(1 + V(1+A)^{-2}\right) \tag{3.3}$$

Using σ calculated in (3.3), parameter μ of the lognormal distribution is calculated as follows:

$$\mu = \ln(1+A) - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 \tag{3.4}$$

Given parameters μ and σ, the Pth percentile of the return distribution is equal to the following:

$$R_P = \exp\left(\mu + \sigma\Phi^{-1}(P)\right) - 1 \tag{3.5}$$

where Φ is the standard normal distribution. In particular, if $P = 50\%$, then $\Phi^{-1}(P) = 0$. Therefore, the median of the return distribution under the lognormal return factor assumption is calculated as follows.

$$R_{0.5} = \exp(\mu) - 1 \tag{3.6}$$

Example 3.1.

Let us consider two uncorrelated asset classes with mean returns 8.00 percent and 6.00 percent and standard deviations 20.00 percent and 10.00 percent correspondingly. If a portfolio has 35 percent of the first class and 65 percent of the second class, its mean and variance are calculated as follows.

$$A = 8.00\% \cdot 35\% + 6.00\% \cdot 65\% = 6.70\%$$

$$V = (20.00\% \cdot 35\%)^2 + (10.00\% \cdot 65\%)^2 = 0.9125\%$$

It is interesting to note that the standard deviation of the portfolio is 9.55 percent ($= \sqrt{0.9125\%}$), which is lower than the standard deviations of the underlying asset classes (20.00 percent and 10.00 percent). Assuming that the return factor of this portfolio has lognormal distribution, the parameters of this distribution are

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\ln\left(1 + 0.9125\%/(1 + 6.70\%)^2\right)} = 0.0893$$

$$\mu = \ln(1 + 6.70\%) - \frac{0.0893^2}{2} = 0.0609$$

From (3.5), the median return for this portfolio is

$$R_{0.5} = \exp\left(0.0609 + 0.0893 \cdot \Phi^{-1}(0.5)\right) - 1 = 6.27\%$$

From (3.5), the 45th percentile for this portfolio is

$$R_{0.45} = \exp\left(0.0609 + 0.0893 \cdot \Phi^{-1}(0.45)\right) - 1 = 5.09\%$$

REFERENCES

DeFusco R. A., McLeavey D. W., Pinto J. E., Runkle, D. E. [2007]. *Quantitative Investment Analysis*, Wiley, 2nd Ed., 2007.

Siegel, J. J. [2008]. *Stocks for the Long Run*, McGraw-Hill, 4th Ed., 2008.

Bodie, Z., Kane, A., Marcus, A.J. [1999]. *Investments*, McGraw-Hill, 4th Ed., 1999.

Jordan, B. D., Miller T. W. [2008]. *Fundamentals of Investments*, McGraw-Hill, 4th Ed., 2008. Mindlin, D., [2009]. *The Case for Stochastic Present Values*, CDI Advisors Research, CDI

Advisors LLC, 2009, http://www.cdiadvisors.com/papers/CDITheCaseforStochast icPV.pdf.

Mindlin, D., [2010]. On the Relationship between Arithmetic and Geometric Returns, CDI Advisors Research, CDI Advisors LLC, 2010, http://www.cdiadvisors.com/papers/CDIArithmeticVsGeometric.pdf.

Pinto, J. E., Henry, E., Robinson, T. R., Stowe, J. D. [2010]. Equity Asset Valuation, Wiley, 2nd Ed., 2010.🜚

IMPORTANT INFORMATION

END NOTES

1. There are exceptions, e.g. an inflation-adjusted cash flow with a matching TIPS portfolio.
2. See Mindlin [2009] for more details.
3. That is as long as the returns in the series are not the same.
4. For the purposes of this paper, the concerns that the sample variance as defined in (2.6) is not an unbiased estimate are set aside.
5. This fact is a corollary of the Jencen's inequality.
6. For example, see Bodie [1999], p. 751, Jordan [2008], p. 25, Pinto [2010], p. 49., Siegel [2008], p. 22., DeFusco [2007], p 128, 155.
7. That is, obviously, as long as the returns in the series are not the same and V > 0.
8. Mindlin [2010] contains a simple example for which (R1) > (R2).

Dimitry Mindlin, ASA, MAAA, PhD, president, CDI Advisors LLC, dmindlin@cdiadvisors.com