

A Roller Coaster: Energy Markets, Suboptimal Control and Pensions.



Image by Alex Brogan. License: CC 3.0

Paul Eisenberg

11/03/2020

This talk is based on joint work with David Baños (UiO), Fred Benth (UiO), Carmen Boados-Penas (UoL), Julia Eisenberg (TU Wien), Axel Helmert (msg life).

Contents

1 Energy Markets

2 Suboptimal Control

3 Pensions with No Guarantees?

Contents

1 Energy Markets

2 Suboptimal Control

3 Pensions with No Guarantees?



U.S. Air Force photo by Edward Aspera Jr. License: Public domain

Market structure


- ① Reserve markets (delivery in less than 2 hours)
- ② Intraday market (delivery in less than 24 hours but more than 2 hours)
- ③ Spot market (delivery in 1 day)
- ④ **Futures market** (delivery in 1 day up to 2 years)

In this talk we are focusing on futures market.

Some market features:

- ① Seasonality.
- ② High idiosyncratic risk.
- ③ Flow-commodity.
- ④ Difficult to store.

DE-Futures prices on 4th of March 2020



Model wish list

- 1 Model should incorporate seasonal effects. (Daily, weekly and yearly cycle)
- 2 Apart from seasonal affects: Markovian structure.
- 3 Clearly interpretable model factors.
- 4 Finite dimensionality (smaller dimension is better)
- 5 New contracts should be readily priceable in the model.
- 6 Arbitrage free.

Energy futures model

- $F_t(T_1, T_2)$ denotes the time t price of a futures with delivery in the time-interval $[T_1, T_2]$.

$$f_t(x) = f_t(0) + \int_0^t \beta_s(x) ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s(x) dW_s,$$

$$F_t(T_1, T_2) = \frac{1}{T_2 - T_1} \int_{T_1}^{T_2} f(t, y - t) dt,$$

- 1 σ_t, β_t can be chosen to be curves only depending on season and state.
- 2 New contracts can readily be priced.
- 3 From (NA) condition: β must have a specific structure:

$$\beta_t(x) = \partial_x f_t(x) + \sigma_t(x) \gamma_t$$

where γ has the same dimension as the driving Brownian motion (with $\gamma = 0$ under EMM).

Structural implication (FDR on vector space + NA)

- 1 If realised on a finite dimensional space V of curves, then one must have $\sigma_t, \beta_t \in V$ and V must be invariant under the derivative.
- 2 Spaces of functions which are invariant under the derivative have a basis of the form

$$x \mapsto \operatorname{Re}(p(x) \cdot e^{\alpha x})$$

where p is a complex polynomial and $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$.


Our choice of generating curves:

$$f_{n,\alpha} : x \mapsto \frac{x^n}{n!} e^{-\alpha x}$$

for some $\alpha \geq 0$ and $n = 0, 1, \dots, N$.

Allowed α : 0 or $\frac{1}{\text{contract length}}$.

With the second choice $f_{n,\alpha}$ has its maximum in n/α .



Statistical result

- 1 We use the curves $f_{n,\alpha}$ with $n = 0, 1$, $\alpha = 0, \frac{1}{\text{week}}, \frac{1}{\text{month}}, \frac{1}{\text{quarter}}, \frac{1}{\text{year}}$ (dimension= 10)
- 2 **Estimated volatility** is 99% on the curves:

$$f_{0, \frac{1}{\text{week}}}, \quad f_{1, \frac{1}{\text{week}}}, \quad f_{1, \frac{1}{\text{month}}}, \quad f_{1, \frac{1}{\text{quarter}}}, \quad f_{1, \frac{1}{\text{year}}}$$

with estimated correlations less than 10%.

- 3 The **model does still involve all curves** to capture the initial state and for dynamic reasons.
- 4 Possible seasonality in the volatility has been ignored so far.

Contents

1 Energy Markets

2 Suboptimal Control

3 Pensions with No Guarantees?

Stochastic optimal control

- 1 The goal of stochastic optimal control is to **maximise some quantity in expectation over** a class of processes (controlled process) which is parametrised by some other stochastic processes (the **control**).
- 2 A typical setup: c is prog. measurable process chosen with values in some interval $[a, b]$ and

$$dX_t^c = \beta(t, c_t, X_t^c)dt + \sigma(t, c_t, X_t^c)dW_t,$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T g(s, c_s, X_s^c) ds + f(X_T^c) \right] \rightarrow \text{Maximise over } c$$

g is called **running gain** and f is called **terminal gain**. A maximiser c^* of the above quantity is called an **optimal control**.

Does it work well?

- 1 Optimal controls are in many examples impossible to find.
- 2 Numerics for stochastic optimal control is an active topic and typically yields convergent schemes with convergence rates but implicit error constants.
- 3 → If we choose for a numerical approach: When is a chosen control good? Or, if we simply take a reasonable appearing control, is it actually good?
- 4 → We actually need explicit error bounds for the error between a chosen control and the unknown optimal control.

Density and occupation estimates

Say

$$dX_t = \beta_t dt + \sigma dW_t$$

($\sigma > 0$ a constant) and $|\beta_t|$ bounded by C . Then X_t has density ρ_t and (a version of ρ satisfies)

$$\rho_t(x) \leq \frac{\varphi(a)}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 t}} + C\Phi(a)$$

where φ and Φ are the density and distribution function of the standard normal law and

$$a := C\sqrt{\sigma^2 t} - \frac{|x - X_0|}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 t}}$$

The expected local time $\eta_t(x)$ of X at level x has similar explicit bounds and these bounds do not require constant diffusion coefficient.

Estimating the error to unknown optimal control

- ① Control problem with T deterministic, σ constant and $\beta(t, c, x) \in [-1, 1]$.

$$dX_t^c = \beta(t, c_t, X_t^c)dt + \sigma dW_t, \quad \mathbb{E}[f(X_T^c)] \rightarrow \text{Maximise over } c$$

- ② Say $c_t = \gamma(t, X_t^c)$ is the **chosen control** and its **performance function** is given by

$$U(t, x) := \mathbb{E}_{(t,x)}[f(X_T^c)], \quad t \in [0, T].$$

- ③ One has $U(T, x) = f(x)$ and $U(t, X_t^c)$ is a martingale.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(X_T^{c^*})] &= U(0, X_0) + \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\dot{U}(t, X_t^{c^*}) + U'(t, X_t^{c^*})\beta_t^* + U''(t, X_t^{c^*})\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right] dt \\ &= U(0, X_0) + \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[U'(t, X_t^{c^*})(\beta_t^* - \beta(t, c_t, X_t^{c^*})) \right] dt \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(X_T^c)] + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} \max_{b \in \{1, -1\}} [U'(t, x)(b - \beta(t, x))] \alpha_t(x) dx dt \end{aligned}$$

Contents

1 Energy Markets

2 Suboptimal Control

3 Pensions with No Guarantees?

Risk factors impacting pension schemes

A pension scheme is a financial contract between a pension provider and the member(s) of the plan; established for the purpose of providing an income in retirement for the member(s).

Problems for insurance companies:

- ① Longevity risk (Creates stress to some pension schemes)
- ② Low interest rate environment. (Problem for guaranteed interest rate. Creates huge stress to private pension provider)

Some classical products

- ① PAYG (Typical state-pension. Defined benefits, sometimes defined contribution)
- ② Unit-linked (Contract between single person and insurance company)
- ③ Annuity pools (Only for retirement phase)


Our approach: Maximal with-profit


Features in the accumulation phase:


- ① Unit-linked type account
- ② Collective account
- ③ Exchange via a volatility smoothing mechanism

Features in the retirement phase:

- ① Annuity pool
- ② Smoothing mechanism







References

- 1 C. Boado-Penas, J. Eisenberg, P. Krühner. Maximising with-Profit Pensions without Guarantees, to appear.
- 2 C. Boado-Penas, J. Eisenberg, A. Helmert, P. Krühner. A New Approach for Satisfactory Pensions with no Guarantees, European Actuarial Journal, December 2019.
- 3 F. Benth, P. Krühner. Approximation of Forward Curve Models in Commodity Markets with Arbitrage-free Finite Dimensional Models, Finance and Stochastics, April 2018.
- 4 D. Baños, P. Krühner. Optimal Bounds for the Densities of Solutions of SDEs with Measurable and Path Dependent Drift Coefficients, Communications on Stochastic Analysis, October 2016.
- 5 F. Benth, P. Krühner. Derivatives Pricing in Energy Markets: an Infinite Dimensional Approach, SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics, September 2015.

Thank you for your attention!