

Alternate Attribution

**Measuring What Managers Actually Do
to Differentiate Themselves from the Pack**

Mark R. David, CFA

Attribution Methodology: Have We Standardized Yet?

- Some clear preferences are forming
 - Arithmetic attribution effects
 - Daily calculation
 - Transaction-based contributions
 - Position-level granularity
 - Exact time-period linking

***Managers want attribution to support their story,
not produce residuals that distract from it.***

Attribution Methodology: Have We Standardized Yet?

- But strong market tides have drifted us away from a standard
 - Competition for assets → Differentiate investment process
 - Proliferation of derivatives
 - Increased sophistication of fixed income analysis
 - Liability-based investment
 - Hedge funds

Standardized attribution is not the objective of any manager with a proprietary investment process.

Brinson: If Anything Qualifies as a Standard...

- From papers in 1985 (with Fachler, JPM), and 1986 (with Beebower, & Hood, FAJ)
- Differentiates Sector Allocation from Issue Selection
- Understandably popular during the period when most equity management processes centered around these two activities
- See also:
 - Karnosky-Singer, for portfolios with an active multi-currency component
 - Lord, for a seminal fixed income framework

Factor-based Attribution – a Rebirth

- Historically based on systematic risk factor research
- Define factors
- Create factor indices
- Measure active exposure to each factor
- Attribute active return to relative exposure by factor
- Coming back into fashion with equity alpha processes based on factor models, especially long-short

Factor-based Attribution – Old Problems Persist

- Factor models specification subject to multicollinearity and over-specification
- Regression method highly dependent on estimation of inputs (factor exposures, correlations) – thus subject to estimation error, nonstationarity
- Results often criticized as:
 - low r-squared
 - non-intuitive
 - highly dependent on attribution period

Risk-adjusted Attribution

- Natural and welcome extension:
 - enhancing insight into risk
 - emphasizing information ratios
- Additively decomposes IR into “IR contributions”, by segment and attribution effect
- Extensible to any additive attribution methodology, not just Brinson
- In simplest form, does not require any additional data to implement!

Risk-Adjusted Attribution – Remaining Hurdles

- Key to the IR decomposition is the correlation of attribution effects to active return
- Subject to the all of the same estimation problems, and some new ones:
 - high estimation errors
 - by definition, data only exists since portfolio inception
 - nonstationarity of correlation
 - deliberate – strategy rotation
 - artifacts of changing managers, skills
- Demand and acceptance – likely to improve with time and education

Liability-Driven Attribution

- Benchmark defined as stream of liability flows
- Valuation of benchmark is tricky
 - Appropriate discount, key rate curve definitions
 - “Tail” issues
 - Liability stream re-adjustment
- Utility function is very steep on the downside
 - risk of shortfall
- Tremendous recent interest

Liability-Driven Attribution Challenges

- LDI techniques are rapidly increasing in sophistication; measurement & attribution methodologies need to keep up with:
 - measuring benchmark performance
 - curve positioning
 - spread bets
 - risk diffusion, shortfall minimization strategies
 - liability stream change anticipation strategies
 - short-term discount rate, actuarial
 - medium-term policy
 - long-term demographic

Strategy-based Attribution

- Return attributed to explicitly defined strategies:
 - sets of multiple positions which need not share any attribute other than membership in the strategy
- Equally applicable to absolute or benchmark-relative mandates
- Extremely simple, in concept, to calculate

Strategy-based Attribution – Implementation Gaps

- Nonetheless, quite difficult to implement in practice
 - Requires simple yet flexible strategy capture and maintenance interface
 - Need to separate the effects of strategy definition from subsequent implementation
 - Positions must not be netted
 - Neither do tax lots do the job
 - “Trade tagging” is a red herring
 - Real trades often netted across multiple accounts and strategies

Decision-based Attribution

- Attribute all return to individual manager decisions
- Capture each manager decision
- Fork portfolio
 - Actual portfolio resulting from decision implementation
 - Hypothetical portfolio supposing decision had not been implemented
- Compare actual portfolio performance to portfolio modeled without decision
- Attractive in concept...

Decision-based Attribution – Conceptually Flawed

- Nearly impossible to implement as the sole method in a dynamic environment
 - Decisions are not trades; thus dependent on manager identification of decisions
 - unreliable, onerous and game-able
 - Decisions are causally and serially interdependent
 - Unimplemented decision often ambiguous to specify
 - Exponential proliferation of model portfolios rapidly overwhelms data and computational resources
- Can be part of a tailored methodology, measuring impact of well-structured long-term decisions

Tailoring Attribution to the Proprietary Investment Process

- If a process is well-defined, measure the value added by each component or step
- Any of above methods may be used for a given step, if it appropriately measures value added
- Combining stepwise measures:
 - Additive – how much value is added by Step 2 over Step 1? (Works well for serial steps)
 - Subtractive – how much value is added by executing Step 3, compared to not executing it? (Works well for parallel steps)

Conclusions

- Start with the investment process
- Carry a toolbox of effective methods
- Apply appropriate methods to individual elements of the process
- Combine elements to measure and compare value added
- Create reports that support the manager's proprietary story and the way they tell it