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:
	- . Emissions tax: Finland (1990), Sweden (1991), Quebec (2007),...
	- \triangleright 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
	- \triangleright 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^+ 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: $X_t^1 \leq \pi e^{-r(T_1-t)} + X_t^2$
- $\bullet\,$ Stopping time τ

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

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

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

\n- \n
$$
\tau(\omega) < T_1
$$
\n
$$
\triangleright X_{T_1}^2 = P_{\text{max}} - \pi
$$
\n
$$
\triangleright H(\omega) = f(P_{\text{max}})
$$
\n
\n- \n
$$
\tau(\omega) \geq T_1
$$
\n
$$
\triangleright \text{Short: } X_{T_1}^2 < X_{T_1}^1
$$
\n
\n

$$
\Rightarrow H(\omega) = f(\min(X_{T_1}^1(\omega), \pi + X_{T_1}^2(\omega), P_{max}))
$$

\n
$$
\Rightarrow \text{Not short: } X_{T_1}^2 \ge X_{T_1}^1
$$

\n
$$
\Rightarrow H(\omega) = f(X_{T_1}^1(\omega))
$$

Effective payoff

$$
H = \mathbb{I}_{\tau \ge T_1}
$$

\n
$$
[\mathbb{I}_{X_{T_1}^2 < X_{T_1}^1} f(\min(X_{T_1}^1, \pi + X_{T_1}^2, P_{max}))
$$

\n
$$
+ \mathbb{I}_{X_{T_1}^2 \ge X_{T_1}^1} f(X_{T_1}^1)]
$$

\n
$$
+ \mathbb{I}_{\tau < T_1} f(P_{max})
$$

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

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

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

- $dX_t^i = \theta_i dt +$ $X_{t-}^{i}(\mu_{i}dt + \sigma_{i1}dw_{1t} + \sigma_{i2}dw_{2t} + \varphi_{i1}dN_{1t} + \varphi_{i2}dN_{2t}), \ X_{0}^{i} > 0, \ \ \varphi_{i1} > -1$
- $(N_{1t}, N_{2t})'$: 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

•
$$
X_t^i = X_0^{i*} + M_t^i + A_t^i
$$
, $i = 1..2$

- 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: $\phi = (\xi_t, \eta_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$
- 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

$$
C(\phi) \in \mathcal{M}^2(P), \quad C(\phi) \perp M^i \text{ under } P
$$

$$
\updownarrow
$$

$$
H = H_0 + \int_0^T \xi^H \cdot dX_t + L_T^H, P \quad a.s
$$

where

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

Let

$$
\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma_{21} & \sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{11} & \varphi_{12} \\ \varphi_{21} & \varphi_{22} \end{pmatrix},
$$

$$
\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11}^2 + \sigma_{12}^2 & \sigma_{11}\sigma_{21} + \sigma_{12}\sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{11}\sigma_{21} + \sigma_{22}\sigma_{12} & \sigma_{21}^2 + \sigma_{22}^2 \end{pmatrix},
$$

$$
\Xi = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{11}^2 \nu_1 + \varphi_{12}^2 \nu_2 & \varphi_{11}\varphi_{21}\nu_1 + \varphi_{12}\varphi_{22}\nu_2 \\ \varphi_{21}\varphi_{11}\nu_1 + \varphi_{22}\varphi_{12}\nu_2 & \varphi_{21}^2 \nu_1 + \varphi_{22}^2 \nu_2 \end{pmatrix},
$$

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

Mean-variance tradeoff process Define

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

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

K $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$ t Properties

- Deterministic
- Uniformly bounded in (t, ω)

⇒ ∃! F-S Decomposition (Monat and Stricker, 1995)

Minimal Martingale Measure P \mathbf{r} Density process

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

where

$$
\varepsilon(X)=1+\int_0^t\varepsilon(X)_s\text{-}dY_s,\;\;0\leq t\leq T_1.
$$

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

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

Under P \mathbf{r} ,

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

Pricing Procedure

• Dynamics under \widehat{P}

$$
dX_t^i = \theta_i dt + X_{t-}^i ((\mu_i - \sigma_{i1}(\alpha_1 \sigma_{11} + \alpha_2 \sigma_{21}) - \sigma_{i2}(\sigma_{12}\alpha_1 + \sigma_{22}\alpha_2))dt + \sigma_{i1} dw_{1t}^{\hat{P}} + \sigma_{i2} dw_{2t}^{\hat{P}} + \varphi_{i1} dN_{1t}^{\hat{P}} + \varphi_{i2} dN_{2t}^{\hat{P}}), \quad X_0^i > 0
$$

$$
\triangleright \ (w_{1t}^{\widehat{P}}, w_{2t}^{\widehat{P}})' : \widehat{P}
$$
-standard Brownian motions
\n
$$
\triangleright N_t^{\widehat{P}} = (N_{1t}^{\widehat{P}}, N_{2t}^{\widehat{P}})' : \text{Poisson process under } \widehat{P} \text{ with intensity}
$$

\n
$$
\nu^{\widehat{P}} = (\nu_1 (1 - \alpha_1 \varphi_{11})(1 - \alpha_2 \varphi_{21}), \nu_2 (1 - \alpha_1 \varphi_{12})(1 - \alpha_2 \varphi_{22}))'
$$

\n•
$$
V_0 = \widehat{E}[H]
$$

Pricing T_2 -contingent claim

- Market efficiency vs Structural adjustment at T_1^+ 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 $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$:

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

where $\widetilde{\xi}:$ $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}-\text{measurable admissible strategy}$ H₀: \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable

Pricing T_2 -contingent claim

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

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

Pricing T_2 -contingent claim

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

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

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.