Pricing and Hedging Strategies for Contingent Claims in an Incomplete Hybrid Emissions Market

Walid Mnif[†] Matt Davison^{†‡}

wmnif@uwo.ca

mdavison@uwo.ca

6th World Congress of the Bachelier Finance Society June 22-26, 2010

[†] Department of Applied Mathematics [‡] Department of Statistical & Actuarial Sciences University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.

Context

- Kyoto Protocol (1997): Emissions in developed countries
 - \triangleright Reduced
 - \triangleright Stabilized
- Regulator: Control their national emissions
 - ▷ Corporate: Additional risk
 - ▷ Consumer: Erosion in purchasing power
- Most implemented instruments policies:
 - \triangleright Emissions tax: Finland (1990), Sweden (1991), Quebec (2007),...
 - ▷ Cap-and-Trade Market: EU ETS (2005), WCI (2007), RGGI (2006),...

Cap-and-Trade Market Mechanism

- Ceiling for emissions
- Compliance period
- Market: price to comply with emission target
- Least cost: internal abatement or acquisition of allowances
- Trading between: Regulated emitters, Non-regulated emitters, Non-emitters

EU ETS Market



Figure 1: Futures prices for Dec 2009-14 from April 2008 to December 2009 (Source: Bloomberg)

EU ETS Market

- Auctioning up to 10% of total emissions in Phase II (Article 10 of the EU Directives)
- Point Carbon 2010 survey: 51% sold some surplus EUAs
- Short: power/heat sector
- Long: pulp/paper and cement/lime/glass sectors

Questions

- Is the cap-and-trade system the most cost effective policy instrument?
- Does it force emissions reductions?
- For which market design do price signals best describe the true cost of emitting a tonne of carbon?
- How can we protect regulated companies and consumers in the transition to a clean energy economy?
- Can we avoid carbon leakage?

Market Design

Hybrid system

- Removes the deficiencies of both the cap-and-trade and the carbon tax markets.
- Protects the economy by fixing a safety valve price.
- Special case: Cap-and-trade market.
- Baumol and Oates (1988), Weitzman (1974), Montero (2002), Roberts and Spence (1976), Prizer (2002), McKibbin and Wilcoxen (2002), Jacoby and Ellerman (2004)

Market Design

100% auctioning

- Eliminate windfall profits (Woerdman, Couwenberg and Nentjes, 2009).
- Incentives to innovate (Cramton and Kerr, 1998)
- Stable long-term price signal (Hepburn et al., 2006)
- Distribute % income to
 - $\triangleright\,$ final consumer as tax reduction
 - \triangleright avoid carbon leakage
 - ▷ invest in green projects

Market Design

Principle market players

Regulator

• Incomplete information: Abatement cost and emission quantity

• Sets:

- \triangleright Auctioning price P_0
- \triangleright Initial endowment N_0
- \triangleright Length of compliance periods
- \triangleright Penalty π

Emitter

- Abatement cost available
- Accurate emission prediction
- Avoid paying P_0
- Buy allowances $\leq N_0$

- Compliance dates T_1 and T_2 , $T_1 < T_2$
- Banking allowed: Do not affect market position at T_1
- Borrowing Forbidden
- Insufficient certificates at T_1 : Later delivery + Penalty π to pay at T_1
- Safety valve price P_{max}
- Adjust market parameters at time T_1^+



Define

- The discounted price process of the future contracts:
 - $\triangleright X_t^1$ matures at T_1
 - $\triangleright X_t^2$ matures at T_2
- No-arbitrage condition: $X_t^1 \leq \pi e^{-r(T_1-t)} + X_t^2$
- Stopping time au

$$\tau(\omega) = \min\{t/X_t^1(\omega) = P_{max}\}$$

•
$$T_1$$
-contingent claim: $H = f(X) \in L^2(P)$

•
$$\forall t \ge \tau(\omega), X_t^1 = P_{max}$$

•
$$\tau(\omega) < T_1$$

• $X_{T_1}^2 = P_{max} - \pi$
• $H(\omega) = f(P_{max})$

• $\tau(\omega) \ge T_1$

▷ Short:
$$X_{T_1}^2 < X_{T_1}^1$$

 $\Rightarrow H(\omega) = f(\min(X_{T_1}^1(\omega), \pi + X_{T_1}^2(\omega), P_{max})))$
▷ Not short: $X_{T_1}^2 \ge X_{T_1}^1$
 $\Rightarrow H(\omega) = f(X_{T_1}^1(\omega))$

Effective payoff

$$H = \mathbb{I}_{\tau \ge T_{1}}$$

$$[\mathbb{I}_{X_{T_{1}}^{2} < X_{T_{1}}^{1}} f(\min(X_{T_{1}}^{1}, \pi + X_{T_{1}}^{2}, P_{max}))$$

$$+ \mathbb{I}_{X_{T_{1}}^{2} \ge X_{T_{1}}^{1}} f(X_{T_{1}}^{1})]$$

$$+ \mathbb{I}_{\tau < T_{1}} f(P_{max})$$

Example: $H := T_1$ -Call option at strike K written on X_t^1

- $f(X) = (X K)^+$
- Depends on $X_{T_1}^2$

Mean reversion Jump diffusion dynamic (Daskalakis et al., 2009)

- $dX_t^i = \theta_i dt + X_{t^-}^i (\mu_i dt + \sigma_{i1} dw_{1t} + \sigma_{i2} dw_{2t} + \varphi_{i1} dN_{1t} + \varphi_{i2} dN_{2t}), \quad X_0^i > 0, \quad \varphi_{i1} > -1$
- $(N_{1t}, N_{2t})'$: Poisson process with intensity $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2)'$
- $(w_{1t}, w_{2t})'$: independent Brownian motions

Probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P)

- Complete
- \mathcal{F}_0 is trivial and contains all nut sets of \mathcal{F}
- \mathcal{F}_t : P-augmented right continuous filtration generated by w_t and N_t , $\forall t \leq T_1$

Market incomplete

- Existence of intrinsic risk
- Equivalent martingale measure $\mathcal{M}^e(X) \neq \{\}$

Doob-Meyer Decomposition

- $X_t^i = X_0^{i*} + M_t^i + A_t^i, \quad i = 1..2$
- M_t^i : Local *P*-martingale
- A_t^i : predictable process with finite variation
- X_0^{i*} : \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable

Define

- Space of square integrable martingales: $\mathcal{M}^2(P)$
- Dynamic strategies: $\phi = (\xi_t, \eta_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$
- Portfolio value process: $V_t = \xi' \cdot X_t + \eta_t$
- Cumulative gains: $G_t(\xi) = \int_0^t \xi_s dX_s$
- Cumulative cost: $C_t = V_t G_t(\xi)$
- Risk: $R_t(\phi) = E((C_T(\phi) C_t(\phi))^2)$
- Optimality Equation: ϕ^* s.t. $R_t(\phi^*) \leq R_t(\phi)$ for all admissible ϕ

Föllmer-Schweizer Decomposition

where

- $H_0 \in \mathbb{R}$,
- $\xi^H \in \Theta$,
- $L^H \in \mathcal{M}^2(P)$ and $L^H \perp M^i$,
- $\Theta = \{(\xi)_t / \mathbb{R}^2 \text{predictable process}, \\ (E[\int_0^{T_1} \xi'_t d < M >_t \xi_t])^{1/2} < \infty, \text{ and } E[(\int_0^{T_1} |\xi'_t dA_t|)^2] < \infty\}.$

Let

$$\begin{split} \Sigma &= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma_{21} & \sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{11} & \varphi_{12} \\ \varphi_{21} & \varphi_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \Lambda &= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11}^2 + \sigma_{12}^2 & \sigma_{11}\sigma_{21} + \sigma_{12}\sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{11}\sigma_{21} + \sigma_{22}\sigma_{12} & \sigma_{21}^2 + \sigma_{22}^2 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \Xi &= \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{11}^2\nu_1 + \varphi_{12}^2\nu_2 & \varphi_{11}\varphi_{21}\nu_1 + \varphi_{12}\varphi_{22}\nu_2 \\ \varphi_{21}\varphi_{11}\nu_1 + \varphi_{22}\varphi_{12}\nu_2 & \varphi_{21}^2\nu_1 + \varphi_{22}^2\nu_2 \end{pmatrix}, \end{split}$$

$$\alpha = (\Lambda + \Xi)^{-1} (\mu + \Phi \nu).$$

Mean-variance tradeoff process Define

$$\widehat{\lambda}_t^i := \frac{1}{X_{t^-}^i} \alpha_i, \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2$$

$$\widehat{K}_t = \int_0^t \widehat{\lambda}'_s d < M >_s \widehat{\lambda}_s$$

 \widehat{K}_t Properties

- Deterministic
- Uniformly bounded in (t, ω)

 $\Rightarrow \exists ! F-S Decomposition (Monat and Stricker, 1995)$

Minimal Martingale Measure \widehat{P} Density process

$$Z_t = \varepsilon \left(-\int_0^{\cdot} \widehat{\lambda}_s dM_s\right)_t, \quad 0 \le t \le T_1,$$

where

$$\varepsilon(X) = 1 + \int_0^t \varepsilon(X)_{s^-} dY_s, \quad 0 \le t \le T_1.$$

•
$$Z_t > 0$$
 if $\exists \delta / (\alpha \Phi)_i < 1 - \delta$ (Arai, 2004)

•
$$Z_t \in \mathcal{M}^2(P)$$
 (Choulli et al., 1998)

Under \widehat{P} ,

$$V_t = \widehat{E}[H|\mathfrak{F}_t]$$

Pricing Procedure

• Dynamics under \widehat{P}

$$dX_{t}^{i} = \theta_{i}dt + X_{t}^{i}((\mu_{i} - \sigma_{i1}(\alpha_{1}\sigma_{11} + \alpha_{2}\sigma_{21}) - \sigma_{i2}(\sigma_{12}\alpha_{1} + \sigma_{22}\alpha_{2}))dt + \sigma_{i1}dw_{1t}^{\widehat{P}} + \sigma_{i2}dw_{2t}^{\widehat{P}} + \varphi_{i1}dN_{1t}^{\widehat{P}} + \varphi_{i2}dN_{2t}^{\widehat{P}}), \quad X_{0}^{i} > 0$$

$$\triangleright (w_{1t}^{\widehat{P}}, w_{2t}^{\widehat{P}})': \widehat{P}\text{-standard Brownian motions} \triangleright N_t^{\widehat{P}} = (N_{1t}^{\widehat{P}}, N_{2t}^{\widehat{P}})': \text{Poisson process under } \widehat{P} \text{ with intensity} \nu^{\widehat{P}} = (\nu_1(1 - \alpha_1\varphi_{11})(1 - \alpha_2\varphi_{21}), \nu_2(1 - \alpha_1\varphi_{12})(1 - \alpha_2\varphi_{22}))' V_0 = \widehat{E}[H]$$

Pricing T_2 -contingent claim

- Market efficiency vs Structural adjustment at T_1^+
- Pricing under Larger filtration $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}} \supseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that $\forall t \leq T_1, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t = \mathcal{F}_t$
- Two period setting: $H = f(X_{T_2}^2)$
- Given H is attainable under $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$:

$$H = H_0 + \int_0^{T_2} \tilde{\xi}_s dX_s^2$$

where $\widetilde{\xi}$: $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ -measurable admissible strategy H_0 : $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_0$ -measurable

Pricing T_2 -contingent claim

• For $t < T_1$: $(\mathcal{F})_{t \ge 0}$ available \implies intrinsic risk for H



where $\xi_s : \mathcal{F}_s$ -measurable, $N_{T_2} \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Omega, F_{T_2}, P)$ and $N_t \perp M_t^2$

Pricing T_2 -contingent claim

• For $t < T_1$: $(\mathcal{F})_{t \ge 0}$ available \implies intrinsic risk for H



where $\xi_s : \mathcal{F}_s$ -measurable, $N_{T_2} \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Omega, F_{T_2}, P)$ and $N_t \perp M_t^2$

Concluding remarks

• Quadratic Hedging

$$\min E[(H - V_0 - \int_0^T \xi_s dX_s)^2]$$

• Get around incomplete information by Super-Hedging

Pricing and Hedging Strategies for Contingent Claims in an Incomplete Hybrid Emissions Market

Walid Mnif[†] Matt Davison^{†‡}

wmnif@uwo.ca

mdavison@uwo.ca

6th World Congress of the Bachelier Finance Society June 22-26, 2010

[†] Department of Applied Mathematics [‡] Department of Statistical & Actuarial Sciences University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.