Optimal Asset Allocation for Pension Funds Under Mortality Risk During the Accumulation and Decumulation Phases

Paolo BATTOCCHIO
IRES, Université Catholique de Louvain

Francesco MENONCIN
IRES, Université Catholique de Louvain

Olivier SCAILLET
HEC-Université de Genève and FAME

Research Paper N° 66
January 2003

FAME - International Center for Financial Asset Management and Engineering

UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE

INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR
FINANCIAL ASSET MANAGEMENT AND ENGINEERING

RESEARCH PAPER SERIES

The International Center for Financial Asset Management and Engineering (FAME) is a private foundation created in 1996 at the initiative of 21 leading partners of the finance and technology community together with three Universities of the Lake Geneva Region (Universities of Geneva, University of Lausanne and the Graduate Institute of International Studies).

Fame is about *research*, *doctoral training*, and *executive education* with "interfacing" activities such as the FAME lectures, the Research Day/Annual Meeting, and the Research Paper Series.

The *FAME Research Paper Series* includes three types of contributions:

- First, it reports on the research carried out at FAME by students and research fellows.
- Second, it includes research work contributed by Swiss academics and practitioners interested in a wider dissemination of their ideas, in practitioners' circles in particular.
- Finally, prominent international contributions of particular interest to our constituency are included as well on a regular basis.

FAME will strive to promote the research work in finance carried out in the three partner Universities. These papers are distributed with a 'double' identification: the FAME logo and the logo of the corresponding partner institution. With this policy, we want to underline the vital lifeline existing between FAME and the Universities, while simultaneously fostering a wider recognition of the strength of the academic community supporting FAME and enriching the Lemanic region.

Each contribution is preceded by an Executive Summary of two to three pages explaining in non-technical terms the question asked, discussing its relevance and outlining the answer provided. We hope the series will be followed attentively by all academics and practitioners interested in the fields covered by our name.

I am delighted to serve as coordinator of the FAME Research Paper Series. Please contact me if you are interested in submitting a paper or for all suggestions concerning this matter.

Sincerely,

Prof. Martin Hoesli
University of Geneva, HEC
40 bd du Pont d'Arve
1211 Genève 4
Tel: +41 (022) 705 8122
Martin.Hoesli@hec.unige.ch

OPTIMAL ASSET ALLOCATION FOR PENSION FUNDS UNDER MORTALITY RISK DURING THE ACCUMULATION AND DECUMULATION PHASES

Paolo BATTOCCHIO
Francesco MENONCIN
Olivier SCAILLET

January 2003

Optimal asset allocation for pension funds under mortality risk during the accumulation and decumulation phases

Paolo Battocchio, Francesco Menoncin*, Olivier Scaillet†

January 2003

Abstract

In a financial market with one riskless asset and n risky assets following geometric Brownian motions, we solve the problem of a pension fund maximizing the expected CRRA utility of its terminal wealth. By considering a stochastic death time for a subscriber, we solve a unique problem for both accumulation and decumulation phases. We show that the optimal asset allocation during these two phases must be different. In particular, during the first phase the investment in the risky assets should decrease through time to meet future contractual pension payments while, during the second phase, the risky investment should increase through time because of closeness of death time. Our findings also suggest that it is not optimal to manage the two phases separately.

JEL: G23, G11. *MSC 2000*: 62P05, 91B28, 91B30, 91B70, 93E20.

Key words: pension fund, mortality risk, asset allocation.

*IRES, Université catholique de Louvain.

†HEC Geneve and FAME. The authors thank V. Young for helpful comments The third author gratefully acknowledges financial support from the Swiss National Science Foundation through the National Center of Competence: Financial Valuation and Risk Management. Part of this research was done when he was visiting THEMA and IRES.

Executive Summary

In this work we analyse optimal asset allocation by a pension fund which maximizes the expected utility of its final wealth. Unlike the analyses studying the problem of a non-actuarial institutional investor, the case of a pension fund requires the introduction of two new characteristics: (i) the different behaviour of the fund wealth during the accumulation and the decumulation phases (hereafter, APh and DPh, respectively), and (ii) the mortality risk.

During the APh, the fund wealth increases because of the contributions paid by the subscriber while, during the DPh, it decreases because of the pension paid by the fund. For the sake of simplicity, in our model we keep constant the contribution and pension rates and we compute a feasibility (equilibrium) condition on them for making it convenient to subscribe the contract both for a pension fund and for a worker.

We suppose there is no choice at the retirement date but to receive a pension until the death time. The death time is assumed to be stochastic. A closed form solution to the asset allocation problem is found when it is exponentially distributed while we give an approximated solution when it is distributed according to a Weibull random variable.

We find two different portfolio compositions during the APh and the DPh. More precisely, during the APh the investment in the risky assets should decrease through time for allowing the fund to guarantee the payment of the (constant) pension rate during the DPh. On the contrary, during the second phase when the pension is paid, the risky investment should increase through time. In fact, since the death of the subscriber becomes more and more likely, the remaining wealth can be invested in riskier and riskier portfolio allocation.

Finally, since the optimal asset allocation depends on the level of fund wealth, our model suggests that it is not optimal to manage the APh and the DPh separately. This is in agreement with conventional industry practice.

1 Introduction

In this work we analyse optimal asset allocation by a pension fund which maximizes the expected utility of its final wealth. Unlike the analyses studying the problem of a non-actuarial institutional investor (a general framework can be found in Menoncin, 2002), the case of a pension fund requires the introduction of two new characteristics: (i) the different behaviour of the fund wealth during the accumulation and the decumulation phases (hereafter, APh and DPh, respectively), and (ii) the mortality risk. We want to develop a set up aimed at finding out how and how much this mortality risk affects the optimal asset allocation.

The existing literature dealing with the asset allocation problem for a pension fund, completely neglects the mortality risk and partially takes into account the problem of distinguishing the accumulation and the decumulation phases. In particular, Boulier, Huang, and Taillard (2001), and Battocchio and Menoncin (2002) just deal with the investment problem during the APh while Blake, Cairns, and Dowd (2000) take into account only the distribution phase. Instead, the only literature explicitly taking into account the mortality risk problem is the actuarial literature (see, e.g., Young and Zariphopoulou, 2002a,b for optimal asset allocation under an exponentially distributed investment horizon).

The only work, at least at our knowledge, which considers both the mortality risk and the difference between the APh and the DPh is the paper by Charupat and Milevsky (2002). They analyse the interaction between financial risk, mortality risk, and consumption towards the end of the life cycle. Their main result is that for constant relative risk aversion (CRRA) preferences and geometric Brownian motion dynamics, the optimal asset allocation during the DPh is identical to the APh, which is the classical Merton's (1971) solution. Nevertheless, they solve two different problems: (i) they maximize, for the fund manager, the expected utility of fund terminal wealth during the APh, and (ii) they find, for the consumer-investor, the optimal consumption-portfolio during the DPh. In their setting it is up to the consumer to choose how to allocate his

wealth after the accumulation phase.

In this paper, instead, we want to present the case of a pension fund which manages the investor's wealth during both phases. Thus, during the APh, the fund wealth increases because of the contributions paid by the subscriber while, during the DPh, it decreases because of the pension paid by the fund. Thus, we suppose there is no choice at the retirement date but to receive a pension until the death time denoted by τ. Here, we suppose τ to be stochastic and, in particular, we find a closed form solution to the asset allocation problem when it is exponentially distributed while we show an approximated solution when it is distributed according to a Weibull random variable.

Even if we take into account the simple framework after Charupat and Milevsky (2002) with geometric Brownian motion and a CRRA utility function, we show that their result is not robust. In fact, after solving a unique problem for the optimal asset allocation during the whole life of the fund, we find two different portfolio compositions during the APh and the DPh. More precisely, we find that during the APh the amount of wealth invested in the risky assets must decrease through time while, after the retirement date, it must (rapidly) increase.

As we have already highlighted, the risk aversion of the pension fund we take into account is described by a CRRA utility function. Nevertheless, in order to take into account the engagement of the fund to provide the subscriber with a (constant) pension rate, we use the so-called "state-dependent" preferences (see, e.g. Merton, 1990, Section 6.4). In particular, we suppose that during the APh the fund can obtain some utility only from the "new" wealth it is able to create thanks to its investment strategy, without obtaining any utility from the contributions paid by the subscriber. In fact, these contributions will have to be paid back to the subscriber as pensions.

For the sake of simplicity, in our model we keep constant the contribution and the pension rates and we compute a feasibility (equilibrium) condition on them for making it convenient to subscribe the contract both for a pension fund and for a worker. This equilibrium condition has already been used in the literature

about the pension funds (see, e.g. Josa-Fombellida and Rincón-Zapatero, 2001).

Through this work we consider agents trading continuously in a frictionless, arbitrage-free market. Furthermore, we do not need the hypothesis of completeness for the financial market.

The paper is structured as follows. The framework is outlined in Section 2. First we describe the financial market. Then we compute the feasibility condition on the contribution and pension rates when the death time follows a Weibull distribution. Eventually we present the state-dependent utility underlying the financial decision problem. In Section 3 we compute the optimal portfolio and discuss the main practical implications of our results for the management of a pension fund. Section 4 concludes.

2 The model

We consider a financial market where there exist n risky assets and one riskless asset paying a constant interest rate r, whose dynamics are described by:

$$\underset{n\times 1}{dS} = \underset{n\times n}{I_S}\left(\underset{n\times 1}{\mu dt} + \underset{n\times k}{\Sigma'}\,\underset{k\times 1}{dW}\right), \quad dG = Grdt,$$

where I_S is a square diagonal matrix containing the elements of vector S and W is a $k-$dimensional Wiener process. Both μ and Σ are supposed to be constant. The fund wealth process R is then equal to

$$R = \theta' S + \theta_0 G,$$

where θ and θ_0 are the number of risky asset and the number of riskless asset held, respectively. Its associated SDE is simply:

$$dR = \theta' dS + \theta_0 dG + d\theta' \left(S + dS\right) + Gd\theta_0.$$

The self-financing condition implies that the two last terms must be equated to zero or, when consumption is considered, must finance the consumption rate. In the case of a pension fund, the self-financing condition must ensure that the

changes in portfolio composition (the two last terms) must: (i) be financed by the subscribers' contributions rate $u(t)$ during the accumulation phase, and (ii) finance the pension rate $v(t)$ paid to the subscribers during the decumulation phase. For the sake of simplicity, in what follows we suppose both u and v to be constant.

Let T indicate the (deterministic) date at which the subscriber retires, and let

$$\phi(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t \leq T, \\ 0, & \text{if } t > T. \end{cases}$$

Accordingly, the dynamic budget constraint can be written as

$$dR = (Rr + w'M + k)\,dt + w'\Sigma' dW, \tag{1}$$

where[1]

$$\begin{aligned} M &\equiv (\mu - r\mathbf{1}), \quad w \equiv I_S\theta, \\ k &= u\phi - v(1-\phi), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

and $\mathbf{1}$ is a vector of 1s.

In Charupat and Milevsky (2002) each dollar of new income flowing into the fund (u) is allocated separately and treated as a new problem. Thus, they completely neglect the role of u during the APh and they solve for $u = 0$. In our approach, instead, we treat u as a planned flow which the fund manager can rely on. Furthermore, as Merton (1990, Section 5.7) underlines, it is not necessary to treat the new financial flows (u) as they could be borrowed against, since the investor behaves "as if" this would be true.

2.1 The feasibility condition

The constant level of the contribution and the pension rates (u and v respectively) cannot be both freely chosen by the fund. Here, we take into account the case of a pension fund letting its subscribers choose the (constant) contribution rate (u) they prefer. The (constant) pension rate (v) is accordingly

chosen. In particular, we know that, at time $t = 0$, from the point of view of the subscriber (pension fund), the expected present value of all pensions cannot be lower (higher) than the expected present value of all payments. Thus, we just equate the expected present value of pensions and payments by putting

$$\mathbb{E}_0^\tau \left[\int_0^\tau k(s) e^{-rs} ds \right] = 0.$$

This condition can be transformed into a condition on the ratio v/u by substituting the expression for k in (2):

$$\frac{u}{v} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_0^\tau \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-rs} ds \right]}{\mathbb{E}_0^\tau \left[\int_0^\tau \phi(s) e^{-rs} ds \right]} - 1.$$

Now, since we can write

$$\int_0^\tau e^{-rs} ds = \frac{1 - e^{-r\tau}}{r},$$

$$\int_0^\tau \phi(s) e^{-rs} ds = \begin{cases} \int_0^\tau \phi(s) e^{-rs} ds = \int_0^\tau e^{-rs} ds = \frac{1-e^{-r\tau}}{r}, & \tau < T, \\ \int_0^\tau \phi(s) e^{-rs} ds = \int_0^T e^{-rs} ds = \frac{1-e^{-rT}}{r}, & \tau \geq T, \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E}_0^\tau \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-rs} ds \right] = \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r} \mathbb{E}_0^\tau \left[e^{-r\tau} \right],$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0^\tau \left[\int_0^\tau \phi(s) e^{-rs} ds \right] &= \int_0^T \frac{1 - e^{-r\tau}}{r} f(\tau) d\tau + \int_T^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-rT}}{r} f(\tau) d\tau \\ &= \frac{1}{r} \mathbb{P}(\tau < T) - \frac{1}{r} \int_0^T e^{-r\tau} f(\tau) d\tau + \frac{1 - e^{-rT}}{r} \mathbb{P}(\tau \geq T) \\ &= \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r} \int_0^T e^{-r\tau} f(\tau) d\tau - \frac{1}{r} e^{-rT} \mathbb{P}(\tau \geq T), \end{aligned}$$

and a feasible ratio u/v can finally be written under the following form where $\mathbb{I}_A$ is the indicator function for the event A.

Definition 1 *A pair of contribution and pension rates (u, v) is said to be feasible if*

$$\frac{u}{v} = \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}_0^\tau [e^{-r\tau}]}{1 - \mathbb{E}_0^\tau [e^{-r\tau} \mathbb{I}_{\tau<T}] - e^{-rT} \mathbb{P}(\tau \geq T)} - 1, \qquad u, v > 0. \tag{3}$$

Let us remark that the event "death", happening in τ, can sometimes be affected by a series of explanatory variables. In particular, we are referring to the so-called "proportional hazard rate model" used in statistical analysis of transition data. Fortunately the form of the feasible ratio u/v remains unchanged, and we only need to compute the probability and expected values conditionally to the realization of the explanatory variables in (3) to accommodate this situation.

2.1.1 The Weibull distribution

Here, we explicitly compute the feasibility condition (3) by supposing that the death time τ follows the Weibull distribution, whose probability density function is given by

$$f(\tau) = \alpha\beta(\alpha\tau)^{\beta-1} e^{-(\alpha\tau)^{\beta}},$$

where $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 0$. The case of the exponential distribution turns out to be a particular case of the Weibull distribution when $\beta = 1$. The Weibull distribution represents one of the most widely used model in survival analysis. The expected time of death has the following form:[2]

$$\int_0^{\infty} \tau f(\tau)\, d\tau = \frac{1}{\alpha}\Gamma\left(\frac{1+\beta}{\beta}\right),$$

whose behaviour is shown in Fig. 1. We see that if parameter α belongs to $[0.01, 0.04]$ then the expected death time goes from a value close to 20 to a value close to 100 years. For the numerical simulations that follow we will always consider values of β belonging to $[1, 2]$.

[Fig. 1 here]

The probability that τ is greater than T is easy to compute:

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau \geq T) = \int_T^{\infty} \alpha\beta(\alpha\tau)^{\beta-1} e^{-(\alpha\tau)^{\beta}} d\tau = e^{-(\alpha T)^{\beta}},$$

while the expected value in the numerator of (3) is as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}_0^{\tau}\left[e^{-r\tau}\right] = \int_0^{\infty} e^{-r\tau}\alpha\beta(\alpha\tau)^{\beta-1} e^{-(\alpha\tau)^{\beta}} d\tau = \int_0^1 e^{-\frac{r}{\alpha}(-\ln y)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}} dy,$$

where we have used the change of variable $y = e^{-(\alpha\tau)^\beta}$. Since this integral does not admit an algebraic solution, we may propose an approximation. Indeed we know the exact solution for the exponential case, i.e. when $\beta = 1$, and we may then think of approximating the integral via a Taylor expansion around $\beta = 1$:

$$\mathbb{E}_0^\tau \left[e^{-r\tau}\right] \cong \beta\frac{\alpha}{r+\alpha} + (\beta-1)\frac{\alpha}{(r+\alpha)^2}\left(r\ln\frac{\alpha}{r+\alpha} - r\gamma - \alpha\right),$$

where γ is the Euler constant.[3] The first term of the above expression obviously coincides with the explicit solution given by the exponential case. Slightly more tedious computation are required for $\mathbb{E}_0^\tau \left[e^{-r\tau}\mathbb{I}_{\tau<T}\right]$:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T e^{-r\tau} f(\tau)\, d\tau \cong\ & \beta\alpha\frac{1-e^{-T(r+\alpha)}}{r+\alpha} + (\beta-1)\frac{\alpha}{(r+\alpha)^2}\left(r\ln\frac{\alpha}{r+\alpha} - r\gamma - \alpha\right) \\ & + (\beta-1)\frac{\alpha}{(r+\alpha)^2}e^{-(r+\alpha)T}\left(\ln(\alpha T)\left(-r + r\alpha T + \alpha^2 T\right) + \alpha\right) \\ & + (\beta-1)\frac{\alpha}{(r+\alpha)^2} r\int_{-\infty}^{-T(r+\alpha)} \frac{1}{x}e^x dx.\end{aligned}$$

Note that the integral of the last term can be neglected for sufficiently high values of T. Hence, after plugging these closed-form approximations into the feasible condition (3), we obtain the results presented in Table 1 for several values of α, β, T and r.

[Table 1 here]

Even if the approximation has been computed for β tending to 1, from Table 1 we can see that it remains good while β is far from 1. Furthermore, the approximated values seem to behave quite well even for closer time horizons ($T = 20$). Accordingly, we can easily show how the ratio u/v behaves with respect to the actuarial parameters α and β just by plotting the graphs of the approximated ratio. These graphs are shown in Fig. 2, where three different values of T and r are chosen. The first column of Fig. 2 shows the behaviour of u/v for $T \in \{20, 30, 50\}$, while the second column analyses how u/v changes for $r \in \{0.01, 0.03, 0.05\}$. The values of α and β belong to $[0.012, 0.016]$ and $[1, 2]$, respectively.

[Fig. 2 here]

In particular, we highlight the following results:

1. when the time horizon T is sufficiently far away, the ratio u/v is decreasing with respect to both α and β. What changes is just the level of u/v which inversely depends on the interest rate r. In fact, when the riskless interest rate increases (decreases) it is easier (more difficult) to meet future payments and the pension fund can ask for a lower (higher) contribution rate;

2. when the pension horizon T is small, the ratio u/v is still decreasing with respect to α and presents a maximum for a given value of β. For better understanding this result, we recall that the hazard function for a Weibull distribution is given by $\alpha\beta(\alpha\tau)^{\beta-1}$. So, when the hazard rate increases (i.e. a near death is more likely) the contribution rate can decrease and vice-versa. Furthermore, while the hazard function is always increasing in α,[4] it is increasing in β for $\beta < -(\ln(\alpha\tau))^{-1}$;[5]

3. the longer the pension horizon T the lower the ratio u/v. In fact, the pension fund can ask for lower (higher) contribution rates when these contributions are paid for a long (short) period of time;

4. the shape of u/v is not affected by the changes in r. The interest rate only affects the level of u/v without altering its behaviour with respect to the other parameters.

2.2 The objective function

Since a pension fund does not consider any consumption problem, then it is just supposed to maximize the expected utility of its final wealth. Thus, the optimization problem can be written as

$$\max_{w} \mathbb{E}_0^{\tau}\left[U\left(R\left(\tau\right),\tau\right)\right],$$

subject to the dynamic constraint (1) and where $U(\bullet)$ is an increasing and concave function. Since the mortality risk is assumed to be independent of the financial risk, we can write the maximization problem as follows:

$$\max_{w} \mathbb{E}_0 \left[\mathbb{E}_0^{\tau} \left[U\left(R\left(\tau\right), \tau\right) \right] \right] = \max_{w} \mathbb{E}_0 \left[\int_0^{\infty} f\left(t\right) U\left(R\left(t\right), t\right) dt \right], \tag{4}$$

under the same dynamic constraint (1).

Now, we need to define the utility function $U(\bullet)$. The most widely used utility function in the literature is the CRRA function of the form $U(R) = \frac{1}{\delta} R^{\delta}$. Here, we use such a function with a little modification due to the specific nature of the pension fund problem. When the pension fund receives the contributions, it cannot obtain any utility from them since it will have to pay them back as pensions. Thus, the argument of the utility function we consider here is the wealth R diminished by the received contributions (during the accumulation phase) and augmented by the paid pensions (during the decumulation phase). In fact, when the pensions are paid, the corresponding amounts of money are freed and the pension can obtain some utility from them.

Accordingly, we define the utility function as follows:

$$U\left(R, t\right) = \frac{1}{\delta} \left(R\left(t\right) - \int_0^t k\left(s\right) e^{-r(s-t)} ds \right)^{\delta},$$

where the function $k(s)$ is as in (2). This approach is widely used in the literature (see Merton, 1990, Section 6.4) and the utility function we have supposed is known as "state-dependent" utility. In order to have an increasing and concave utility function the parameter δ must be less than one.

3 The optimal portfolio

After what we have presented in the previous section, the asset allocation problem for a pension fund can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \max_w \mathbb{E}_0 \left[\int_0^\infty f(t) \frac{1}{\delta} \left(R(t) - \int_0^t k(s) e^{-r(s-t)} ds \right)^\delta dt \right], \\ \text{with} \quad dR = (Rr + w'M + k)\, dt + w'\Sigma' dW, \\ \text{and} \quad R(0) = R_0. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

The Hamiltonian for this problem is

$$\mathcal{H} = f(t) \frac{1}{\delta} \left(R(t) - \int_0^t k(s) e^{-r(s-t)} ds \right)^\delta + J_R (Rr + w'M + k) + \frac{1}{2} J_{RR} w'\Sigma'\Sigma w,$$

from which we have the set of first order conditions[6]

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial w} = J_R M + J_{RR}\Sigma'\Sigma w = 0 \Rightarrow w^* = -\frac{J_R}{J_{RR}} (\Sigma'\Sigma)^{-1} M,$$

where $J(R,t)$ is the value function solving the maximization problem and the subscripts indicate the partial derivatives of J. The HJB equation is

$$0 = J_t + f(t) \frac{1}{\delta} \left(R(t) - \int_0^t k(s) e^{-r(s-t)} ds \right)^\delta + J_R (Rr + k) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{J_R^2}{J_{RR}} \xi'\xi,$$

where $\xi \equiv \Sigma (\Sigma'\Sigma)^{-1} M$. For the value function, we try the form $J(R,t) = g(t) f(t) U(R,t)$ where $g(t)$ must be determined. So, after substituting this form into the HJB equation and carrying out some simplifications, we obtain that $g(t)$ must satisfy

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial f(t)}{\partial t} \frac{1}{f(t)} g(t) + 1 + r\delta g(t) + \frac{1}{2} g(t) \frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \xi'\xi = 0,$$

whose boundary condition must guarantee the convergence of $J(R,t)$ when t tends to infinity. The precise form of function $g(t)$ is not important for computing the optimal portfolio composition. The inverse of the Arrow-Pratt risk aversion index computed on $J(R,t)$, in fact, does not depend on $g(t)$. So, we can finally write what follows.

Proposition 2 *The optimal portfolio composition solving Problem (5) is given by*

$$w^* = w_R^* + w_u^* + w_v^*, \tag{6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
w_R^* &\equiv \frac{1}{1-\delta} R \left(\Sigma'\Sigma\right)^{-1} M, \\
w_u^* &\equiv -\frac{1}{1-\delta} u \left(\int_0^t \phi\left(s\right) e^{-r(s-t)} ds \right) \left(\Sigma'\Sigma\right)^{-1} M, \\
w_v^* &\equiv \frac{1}{1-\delta} v \left(\int_0^t \left(1-\phi\left(s\right)\right) e^{-r(s-t)} ds \right) \left(\Sigma'\Sigma\right)^{-1} M,
\end{aligned}$$

and u and v must verify (3).

The first component w_R^* depends on the wealth level but not (explicitly) on time, w_u^* depends on the contribution rate and w_v^* depends on the pension rate. We underline that the component we have called w_R^* coincides with Merton's portfolio.

It is interesting to stress that the actuarial risk enters the optimal portfolio via the link that exists between u and v in the feasible condition (3). When this link is not considered, as in Charupat and Milevsky (2002), the portfolio composition is independent of the mortality risk.

Furthermore, it is important to stress that the optimal portfolio allocation in (6) does depend on the wealth level $R(t)$. Thus, it is not optimal to manage the accumulation and the decumulation phases separately and our model suggests to commit the management of the whole investment period to the same institutional investor.

The function $\phi(t)$ can be eliminated from (6) by considering separately the two following cases (in both cases w_R^* is the same):

1. $t \leq T$, we are in the APh and the components of the optimal portfolio are

$$w_u^* \equiv -\frac{1}{1-\delta} \frac{u}{r} \left(e^{rt} - 1\right) \left(\Sigma'\Sigma\right)^{-1} M, \tag{7}$$

$$w_v^* \equiv 0, \tag{8}$$

2. $t > T$, we are in the DPh and we have

$$w_u^* \equiv -\frac{1}{1-\delta}\frac{u}{r}e^{rt}\left(1-e^{-rT}\right)\left(\Sigma'\Sigma\right)^{-1}M, \tag{9}$$

$$w_v^* \equiv \frac{1}{1-\delta}\frac{v}{r}\left(e^{r(t-T)}-1\right)\left(\Sigma'\Sigma\right)^{-1}M. \tag{10}$$

All stated results can be easily traced back to Merton's model by putting $u = v = 0$. In this case $w_u^* = w_v^* = 0$. During the accumulation phase ($t \leq T$), it is easy to check that w_u^* in (7) contains only negative numbers. Indeed $\delta < 1$, $\Sigma'\Sigma > 0$ by construction, $M > 0$ to preclude arbitrage,[7] and $e^{rt} > 1$. Thus, the optimal portfolio during the accumulation phase contains less risky assets than the optimal portfolio in the Merton's case. Furthermore, we can see that the vector w_v^* contains only positive elements (we recall that during the decumulation phase $t > T$). So, the behaviour of the optimal portfolio can be summarized as in the following corollary.

Corollary 3 *During the accumulation phase ($t < T$) the amount of wealth invested in the risky assets decreases through time, while during the decumulation phase ($t > T$) it increases.*

The behaviour described in this corollary can be seen in Fig. 3 where we have plotted the following function which appears in (7)-(8) and (9)-(10):

$$\chi(t) = \begin{cases} -\frac{u}{r}\left(e^{rt}-1\right), & \text{if} \quad t \leq T \\ -\frac{u}{r}e^{rt}\left(1-e^{-rT}\right)+\frac{v}{r}\left(e^{r(t-T)}-1\right), & \text{if} \quad t > T \end{cases}$$

and where we have put $T = 30$, $r = 0.02$, and $u = 1$. While t is lower than the pension time T, the amount of money invested in the risky assets decreases. It begins increasing when t becomes higher than T. Furthermore, the higher the pension rate v, the sharper the increase in the risky profile of the optimal portfolio. The behaviour during the accumulation phase confirms the results after Boulier, Huang, and Taillard (2001) and Battocchio and Menoncin (2002).

[Fig. 3 here]

In the deterministic case, that is to say when the subscriber of the fund never dies (i.e. $\alpha \to 0$), then the feasibility condition becomes $v = u\left(e^{rT} - 1\right)$ and the optimal portfolio can be written as follows:

$$w^* = \frac{1}{1-\delta}\left(R - \frac{u}{r}\left(e^{r\min(t,T)} - 1\right)\right)\left(\Sigma'\Sigma\right)^{-1} M.$$

In this case, during the accumulation phase ($t < T$) the optimal portfolio has the same behaviour as in the case of a "mortal" subscriber. Instead, during the decumulation phase ($t > T$) the component $w_u^* + w_v^*$ of the optimal portfolio becomes constant through time and remains negative. This leads to a different behaviour than the one plotted in Fig. 3. In particular, since the subscriber never dies, we cannot increase the riskiness of the optimal portfolio after the date T.

4 Conclusion

In this paper we have solved the asset allocation problem for a pension fund. The structure of the financial market is as follows: (i) there are n risky assets, following geometric Brownian motions, (ii) there exists a riskless asset paying a constant interest rate, and (iii) the market is not necessarily complete. Furthermore, the fund is supposed to have a state-dependent CRRA utility function.

We analyse the portfolio problem during both the accumulation and the decumulation phases when the death time of the subscriber is a stochastic variable (following a Weibull distribution). The contribution and the pension rates are supposed to be constant.

We show that the optimal asset allocation during the accumulation phase (APh) is different from the one during the decumulation phase (DPh). In particular, during the APh the investment in the risky assets should decrease through time for allowing the fund to guarantee the payment of the (constant) pension rate during the DPh. Instead, during the second phase when the pension is paid, the risky investment should increase through time. In fact, since the

death of the subscriber becomes more and more likely, the remaining wealth can be invested in riskier and riskier portfolio allocation.

Finally, since the optimal asset allocation depends on the level of fund wealth, our model suggests that it is not optimal to manage the APh and the DPh separately. This is in agreement with conventional industry practice.

Notes

[1] We underline that $w \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ contains the amount of money invested in each risky asset.

[2] We indicate with $\Gamma(t)$ the Gamma function having the following form:

$$\Gamma(t) = \int_0^\infty e^{-x} x^{t-1} dx.$$

[3] We recall

$$\gamma = \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{n} \frac{1}{m} - \ln n \right).$$

[4] In fact, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \left(\alpha\beta(\alpha\tau)^{\beta-1} \right) = \beta^2 (\alpha\tau)^{\beta-1}.$$

[5] In fact, the derivative

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \left(\alpha\beta(\alpha\tau)^{\beta-1} \right) = \alpha(\alpha\tau)^{\beta-1} (1 + \beta \ln(\alpha\tau))$$

is positive when $\beta \ln(\alpha\tau) > -1$. Now, since $\alpha\tau$ is generally lower then 1, the inequality becomes $\beta < -(\ln(\alpha\tau))^{-1}$.

[6] The first order conditions are necessary and sufficient because the objective function is strictly concave in R.

[7] The returns of the risky assets must be greater than the riskless rate. If this was not true, all investors would buy the riskless asset.

References

[1] Blake, D., Cairns, A., Dowd, K. (2000). Pension Metrics II: stochastic pension plan design and utility-at-risk during the distribution phase. In Proceedings of the Fourth Annual BSI Gamma Foundation Conference on Global Asset Management, Rome, October 2000. BSI-Gamma. Working Paper 20.

[2] Battocchio, P., Menoncin, F. (2002). Optimal Pension Management under Stochastic Interst Rates, Wages, and Inflation. Discussion Paper, IRES, Université catholique de Louvain, 2002-21.

[3] Boulier, J.-F., Huang, S. J., Taillard, G. (2001). Optimal Management Under Stochastic Interest. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 28, 173-189.

[4] Charupat, N, Milevsky, M. (2002). Optimal asset allocation in life annuities: a note. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 30, 199-209.

[5] Josa-Fombellida, R., Rincón-Zapatero, J. P. (2001). Minimization of risks in pension funding by means of contributions and portfolio selection. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 29, 35-45.

[6] Menoncin, F. (2002). Optimal Portfolio and Background Risk: An Exact and an Approximated Solution. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 31, 249-265.

[7] Merton, R. C. (1971). Optimum Consumption and Portfolio Rules in a Continuous-Time Model. Journal of Economic Theory, 3, 373-413.

[8] Merton, R. C. (1990). Continuous-time finance. Blackwell, Cambridge, Mass.

[9] Young, V. R., Zariphopoulou, T. (2002a). Pricing Dynamic Insurance Risks Using the Principle of Equivalent Utility. Scandinavian Actuarial Journal, 4, 246-279.

[10] Young, V. R., Zariphopoulou T., (2002b). Pricing insurance via stochastic control: Optimal consumption and terminal wealth. Working paper, School of Business, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Figure 1: Expected time of death for the Weibull distribution



Figure 2: Feasible ratio $u/v|_{\beta\to 1}$



Figure 3: Behaviour of the function $\chi(t)$



.

Table 1: Approximation of the feasible ratio

r	α	β	T	u/v	$u/v\|_{\beta\to 1}$
0.02	0.01	1.5	50	0.2747	0.2826
0.02	0.01	1.5	30	0.6971	0.7376
0.02	0.01	1.5	20	1.2677	1.4399
0.02	0.01	1.3	50	0.2775	0.2863
0.02	0.01	1.7	50	0.2738	0.2769
0.02	0.01	1.9	50	0.2741	0.2693
0.02	0.005	1.5	50	0.4289	0.4236
0.02	0.008	1.5	50	0.3302	0.3343
0.02	0.02	1.5	50	0.1039	0.1051
0.01	0.01	1.5	50	0.5125	0.5801
0.03	0.01	1.5	50	0.1559	0.1555
0.04	0.01	1.5	50	0.0913	0.0898

RESEARCH PAPER SERIES

Extra copies of research papers are available to the public upon request. In order to obtain copies of past or future works, please contact our office at the following address: International Center FAME, 40 bd. du Pont d'Arve, Case Postale 3, 1211 Geneva 4. As well, please note that these works are available on our website ***www.fame.ch***, under the heading "Research" in PDF format for your consultation. We thank you for your continuing support and interest in FAME, and look forward to serving you in the future.

N° 65: Exploring for the Determinants of Credit Risk in Credit Default Swap Transaction Data: Is Fixed-Income Markets' Information Sufficient to Evaluate Credit
Daniel AUNON-NERIN, HEC-University of Lausanne and FAME; Didier COSSIN, HEC-University of Lausanne, FAME and IMD; Tomas HRICKO, HEC-University of Lausanne and FAME and Zhijiang HUANG, HEC-University of Lausanne and FAME; *December 2002*

N° 64: Dynamic Allocation of Treasury and Corporate Bond Portfolios
Roger WALDER, University of Lausanne, International Center FAME and Banque Cantonale Vaudoise; *December 2002*

N° 63: Understanding the Economic Value of Legal Covenants in Investment Contracts: A Real-Options Approach to Venture Equity Contracts
Didier COSSIN, HEC-University of Lausanne, FAME and IMD; Benoît LELEUX, IMD, Entela SALIASI, HEC-University of Lausanne and FAME; *October 2002*

N° 62: Integrated Market and Credit Risk Management of Fixed Income Portfolios
Roger WALDER, University of Lausanne, International Center FAME and Banque Cantonale Vaudoise; *November 2002*

N° 61: A Framework for Collateral Risk Control Determination
Daniel AUNON-NERIN, HEC-University of Lausanne and FAME; Didier COSSIN, HEC-University of Lausanne, FAME and IMD; Fernando GONZÁLEZ, European Central Bank and Zhijiang HUANG, HEC-University of Lausanne and FAME; *December 2002*

N° 60: Optimal Dynamic Trading Strategies with Risk Limits
Domenico CUOCO, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania; Hua HE, School of Management, Yale University and Sergei ISSAENKO, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania; *Winner of the 2002 FAME Research Prize*

N° 59: Implicit Forward Rents as Predictors of Future Rents
Peter ENGLUND, Stockholm Institute for Financial Research and Stockholm School of Economics; Åke GUNNELIN, Stockholm Institute for Financial Research; Martin HOESLI University of Geneva (HEC and FAME) and University of Aberdeen (Business School) and Bo SÖDERBERG, Royal Institute of Technology; *October 2002*

N° 58: Do Housing Submarkets Really Matter?
Steven C. BOURASSA, School of Urban and Public Affairs, University of Louisville; Martin HOESLI, University of Geneva (HEC and FAME) and University of Aberdeen (Business School) and Vincent S. PENG, AMP Henderson Global Investors; *November 2002*

N° 57: Nonparametric Estimation of Copulas for Time Series
Jean-David FERMANIAN, CDC Ixis Capital Markets and CREST and Olivier SCAILLET, HEC Genève and FAME, Université de Genève; *November 2002*

N° 56: Interactions Between Market and Credit Risk: Modeling the Joint Dynamics of Default-Free and Defaultable Bond Term Structures
Roger WALDER, University of Lausanne, International Center FAME and Banque Cantonale Vaudoise*; November 2002*

N° 55: Option Pricing With Discrete Rebalancing
Jean-Luc PRIGENT, THEMA, Université de Cergy-Pontoise; Olivier RENAULT, Financial Markets Group, London School of Economics and Olivier SCAILLET, HEC Genève and FAME, University of Geneva*; July 2002*

N° 54: The Determinants of Stock Returns in a Small Open Economy
Séverine CAUCHIE, HEC-University of Geneva, Martin HOESLI, University of Geneva (HEC and FAME) and University of Aberdeen (School of Business) and Dušan ISAKOV, HEC-University of Geneva and International Center FAME; *September 2002*

N° 53: Permanent and Transitory Factors Affecting the Dynamics of the Term Structure of Interest Rates
Christophe PÉRIGNON, Anderson School, UCLA and Christophe VILLA, ENSAI, CREST-LSM and CREREG-Axe Finance; *June 2002*

N° 52: Hedge Fund Diversification: How Much is Enough?
François-Serge LHABITANT, Thunderbird University, HEC-University of Lausanne and FAME; Michelle LEARNED, Thunderbird University; *July 2002*

N° 51: Cannibalization & Incentives in Venture Financing
Stefan ARPING, University of Lausanne; *May 2002*

N° 50: What Factors Determine International Real Estate Security Returns?
Foort HAMELINK, Lombard Odier & Cie, Vrije Universiteit and FAME; Martin HOESLI, University of Geneva (HEC and FAME) and University of Aberdeen; *July 2002*

N° 49: Playing Hardball: Relationship Banking in the Age of Credit Derivatives
Stefan ARPING, University of Lausanne; *May 2002*

N° 48: A Geometric Approach to Multiperiod Mean Variance Optimization of Assets and Liabilities
Markus LEIPPOLD, Swiss Banking Institute, University of Zurich; Fabio TROJANI, Institute of Finance, University of Southern Switzerland; Paolo VANINI, Institute of Finance, University of Southern Switzerland; *April 2002*

N° 47: Why Does Implied Risk Aversion Smile?
Alexandre ZIEGLER, University of Lausanne and FAME; *May 2002*

N° 46: Optimal Investment With Default Risk
Yuanfeng HOU, Yale University; Xiangrong JIN, FAME and University of Lausanne; *March 2002*

N° 45: Market Dynamics Around Public Information Arrivals
Angelo RANALDO, UBS Asset Management; *February 2002*

N° 44: Nonparametric Tests for Positive Quadrant Dependence
Michel DENUIT, Université Catholique de Louvain, Olivier SCAILLET, HEC Genève and FAME, University of Geneva; *March 2002*

N° 43: Valuation of Sovereign Debt with Strategic Defaulting and Rescheduling
Michael WESTPHALEN, École des HEC, University of Lausanne and FAME; *February 2002*

N° 42: Liquidity and Credit Risk
Jan ERICSSON, McGill University and Olivier RENAULT, London School of Economics; *August 2001*

N° 41: Testing for Concordance Ordering
Ana C. CEBRIÁN, Universidad de Zaragoza, Michel DENUIT, Université Catholique de Louvain, Olivier SCAILLET, HEC Genève and FAME, University of Geneva; *March 2002*

N° 40: Immunization of Bond Portfolios: Some New Results
Olivier de La GRANDVILLE, University of Geneva; *February 2002*

N° 39: Weak Convergence of Hedging Strategies of Contingent Claims
Jean-Luc PRIGENT, Thema, Université de Cergy-Pontoise; Olivier SCAILLET, HEC Genève and FAME, University of Geneva; *January 2002*

N° 38: Indirect Estimation of the Parameters of Agent Based Models of Financial Markets
Manfred GILLI, University of Geneva; Peter WINKER, International University in Germany; *November 2001*

N° 37: How To Diversify Internationally? A comparison of conditional and unconditional asset allocation methods.
Laurent BARRAS, HEC-University of Geneva, International Center FAME; Dušan ISAKOV, HEC-University of Geneva, International Center FAME; *November 2001*

N° 36: Coping with Credit Risk
Henri LOUBERGÉ, University of Geneva, Harris SCHLESINGER, University of Alabama; *October 2001*

N° 35: Country, Sector or Style: What matters most when constructing Global Equity Portfolios? An empirical investigation from 1990-2001.
Foort HAMELINK, Lombard Odier & Cie and Vrije Universiteit; Hélène HARASTY, Lombard Odier & Cie; Pierre HILLION, Insead (Singapore), Academic Advisor to Lombard Odier & Cie; *October 2001*

N° 34: Variable Selection for Portfolio Choice
Yacine AÏT-SAHALIA, Princeton University & NBER, and Michael W. BRANDT, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania & NBER; *February 2001*
(Please note: The complete paper is available from the Journal of Finance 56, 1297-1351.)

N° 33: The Characteristics of Individual Analysts' Forecast in Europe
Guido BOLLIGER, University of Neuchâtel and FAME; *July 2001*

N° 32: Portfolio Diversification: Alive and Well in Euroland
Kpaté ADJAOUTE, HSBC Republic Bank (Suisse), SA and Jean-Pierre DANTHINE, University of Lausanne, CEPR and FAME; *July 2001*

N° 31: EMU and Portfolio Diversification Opportunities
Kpate ADJAOUTÉ, Morgan Stanley Capital International, Geneva and Jean-Pierre DANTHINE, University of Lausanne, CEPR and FAME; *April 2000*

N° 30: Serial and Parallel Krylov Methods for Implicit Finite Difference Schemes Arising in Multivariate Option Pricing
Manfred GILLI, University of Geneva, Evis KËLLEZI, University of Geneva and FAME, Giorgio PAULETTO, University of Geneva; *March 2001*

N° 29: Liquidation Risk
Alexandre ZIEGLER, HEC-University of Lausanne, Darrell DUFFIE, The Graduate School of Business, Stanford University; *April 2001*

N° 28: Defaultable Security Valuation and Model Risk
Aydin AKGUN, University of Lausanne and FAME; *March 2001*

N° 27: On Swiss Timing and Selectivity: in the Quest of Alpha
François-Serge LHABITANT, HEC-University of Lausanne and Thunderbird, The American Graduate School of International Management; *March 2001*

N° 26: Hedging Housing Risk
Peter ENGLUND, Stockholm School of Economics, Min HWANG and John M. QUIGLEY, University of California, Berkeley; *December 2000*

N° 25: An Incentive Problem in the Dynamic Theory of Banking
Ernst-Ludwig VON THADDEN, DEEP, University of Lausanne and CEPR; *December 2000*

N° 24: Assessing Market Risk for Hedge Funds and Hedge Funds Portfolios
François-Serge LHABITANT, Union Bancaire Privée and Thunderbird, the American Graduate School of International Management; *March 2001*

N° 23: On the Informational Content of Changing Risk for Dynamic Asset Allocation
Giovanni BARONE-ADESI, Patrick GAGLIARDINI and Fabio TROJANI, Università della Svizzera Italiana; *March 2000*

N° 22: The Long-run Performance of Seasoned Equity Offerings with Rights: Evidence From the Swiss Market
Michel DUBOIS and Pierre JEANNERET, University of Neuchatel; *January 2000*

N° 21: Optimal International Diversification: Theory and Practice from a Swiss Investor's Perspective
Foort HAMELINK, Tilburg University and Lombard Odier & Cie; *December 2000*

N° 20: A Heuristic Approach to Portfolio Optimization
Evis KËLLEZI; University of Geneva and FAME, Manfred GILLI, University of Geneva; *October 2000*

N° 19: Banking, Commerce, and Antitrust
Stefan Arping; University of Lausanne; *August 2000*

N° 18: Extreme Value Theory for Tail-Related Risk Measures
Evis KËLLEZI; University of Geneva and FAME, Manfred GILLI, University of Geneva; *October 2000*

N° 17: International CAPM with Regime Switching GARCH Parameters
Lorenzo CAPIELLO, The Graduate Institute of International Studies; Tom A. FEARNLEY, The Graduate Institute of International Studies and FAME; *July 2000*

N° 16: Prospect Theory and Asset Prices
Nicholas BARBERIS, University of Chicago; Ming HUANG, Stanford University; Tano SANTOS, University of Chicago; *September 2000*

N° 15: Evolution of Market Uncertainty around Earnings Announcements
Dušan ISAKOV, University of Geneva and FAME; Christophe PÉRIGNON, HEC-University of Geneva and FAME; *June 2000*

N° 14: Credit Spread Specification and the Pricing of Spread Options
Nicolas MOUGEOT, IBFM-University of Lausanne and FAME; *May 2000*

N° 13: European Financial Markets After EMU: A First Assessment
Jean-Pierre DANTHINE, Ernst-Ludwig VON THADDEN, DEEP, Université de Lausanne and CEPR and Francesco GIAVAZZI, Università Bocconi, Milan, and CEPR; *March 2000*

N° 12: Do fixed income securities also show asymmetric effects in conditional second moments?
Lorenzo CAPIELLO, The Graduate Institute of International Studies; *January 2000*

N° 11: Dynamic Consumption and Portfolio Choice with Stochastic Volatility in Incomplete Markets
George CHACKO, Harvard University; Luis VICEIRA, Harvard University; *September 1999*

N° 10: Assessing Asset Pricing Anomalies
Michael J. BRENNAN, University of California, Los Angeles; Yihong XIA, University of Pennsylvania; *July 1999*

N° 9: Recovery Risk in Stock Returns
Aydin AKGUN, University of Lausanne & FAME; Rajna GIBSON, University of Lausanne; *July 1999*

N° 8: Option pricing and replication with transaction costs and dividends
Stylianos PERRAKIS, University of Ottawa; Jean LEFOLL, University of Geneva; *July1999*

N° 7: Optimal catastrophe insurance with multiple catastrophes
Henri LOUBERGÉ, University of Geneva; Harris SCHLESINGER, University of Alabama; *September 1999*

N° 6: Systematic patterns before and after large price changes: Evidence from high frequency data from the Paris Bourse
Foort HAMELINK, Tilburg University; *May 1999*

N° 5: Who Should Buy Long-Term Bonds?
John CAMPBELL, Harvard University; Luis VICEIRA, Harvard Business School; *October 1998*

N° 4: Capital Asset Pricing Model and Changes in Volatility
André Oliveira SANTOS, Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva; *September 1998*

N° 3: Real Options as a Tool in the Decision to Relocate: An Application to the Banking Industry
Pascal BOTTERON, HEC-University of Lausanne; *January 2000*

N° 2: Application of simple technical trading rules to Swiss stock prices: Is it profitable?
Dušan ISAKOV, HEC-Université de Genève; Marc HOLLISTEIN, Banque Cantonale de Genève; *January 1999*

N° 1: **Enhancing portfolio performance using option strategies: why beating the market is easy.**
François-Serge LHABITANT, HEC-University of Lausanne; *December 1998*

International Center FAME - Partner Institutions

The University of Geneva

The University of Geneva, originally known as the Academy of Geneva, was founded in 1559 by Jean Calvin and Theodore de Beze. In 1873, The Academy of Geneva became the University of Geneva with the creation of a medical school. The Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences was created in 1915. The university is now composed of seven faculties of science; medicine; arts; law; economic and social sciences; psychology; education, and theology. It also includes a school of translation and interpretation; an institute of architecture; seven interdisciplinary centers and six associated institutes.

More than 13'000 students, the majority being foreigners, are enrolled in the various programs from the licence to high-level doctorates. A staff of more than 2'500 persons (professors, lecturers and assistants) is dedicated to the transmission and advancement of scientific knowledge through teaching as well as fundamental and applied research. The University of Geneva has been able to preserve the ancient European tradition of an academic community located in the heart of the city. This favors not only interaction between students, but also their integration in the population and in their participation of the particularly rich artistic and cultural life. ***http://www.unige.ch***

The University of Lausanne

Founded as an academy in 1537, the University of Lausanne (UNIL) is a modern institution of higher education and advanced research. Together with the neighboring Federal Polytechnic Institute of Lausanne, it comprises vast facilities and extends its influence beyond the city and the canton into regional, national, and international spheres.

Lausanne is a comprehensive university composed of seven Schools and Faculties: religious studies; law; arts; social and political sciences; business; science and medicine. With its 9'000 students, it is a medium-sized institution able to foster contact between students and professors as well as to encourage interdisciplinary work. The five humanities faculties and the science faculty are situated on the shores of Lake Leman in the Dorigny plains, a magnificent area of forest and fields that may have inspired the landscape depicted in Brueghel the Elder's masterpiece, the Harvesters. The institutes and various centers of the School of Medicine are grouped around the hospitals in the center of Lausanne. The Institute of Biochemistry is located in Epalinges, in the northern hills overlooking the city. ***http://www.unil.ch***

The Graduate Institute of International Studies

The Graduate Institute of International Studies is a teaching and research institution devoted to the study of international relations at the graduate level. It was founded in 1927 by Professor William Rappard to contribute through scholarships to the experience of international co-operation which the establishment of the League of Nations in Geneva represented at that time. The Institute is a self-governing foundation closely connected with, but independent of, the University of Geneva.

The Institute attempts to be both international and pluridisciplinary. The subjects in its curriculum, the composition of its teaching staff and the diversity of origin of its student body, confer upon it its international character. Professors teaching at the Institute come from all regions of the world, and the approximately 650 students arrive from some 60 different countries. Its international character is further emphasized by the use of both English and French as working languages. Its pluralistic approach - which draws upon the methods of economics, history, law, and political science -reflects its aim to provide a broad approach and in-depth understanding of international relations in general. ***http://heiwww.unige.ch***

INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR
FINANCIAL ASSET MANAGEMENT AND ENGINEERING

40, Bd. du Pont d'Arve
PO Box, 1211 Geneva 4
Switzerland
Tel (++4122) 312 09 61
Fax (++4122) 312 10 26
http: //www.fame.ch
E-mail: admin@fame.ch

UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE

THE GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES