PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT

Portfolio Constraints and the Fundamental Law of Active Management

Roger Clarke, Harindra de Silva & Steven Thorley

66 Cite this article   ↗ https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v58.n5.2468

Sample our
Law
Journals
>> Sign in here to start your access
to the latest two volumes for 14 days

📖 References   66 Citations   📊 Metrics   🖨 Reprints & Permissions   **Read this article**

Abstra...

Active p...   do not allow
manage...   rt positions
and turn...   her
constrai...   respect to
the benc...   e portfolio's
composi...   cilitate the
perfo...   generalized
version...   " and
provides...   agement to
add valu...   position of
performa...   e"
associat...   onships with
a Monte...   examples
based o...

We Care About Your Privacy

The expected value added in an actively managed portfolio depends on both the manager's forecasting skill and the manager's freedom to take appropriate positions in securities that reflect those forecasts. The "fundamental law of active management" gives the maximum expected value added for an actively managed portfolio based on the forecasting ability of the manager and the breadth of application. The fundamental law does not, however, address the impact of portfolio constraints on potential value added. Constraints such as no short sales and limits on security concentration impede the transfer of information into optimal portfolio positions and decrease the expected value added.

We generalize the fundamental law of active management to include a transfer coefficient as well as an information coefficient. The information coefficient measures the strength of the return-forecasting process, or signal, and the transfer coefficient measures the degree to which the signal is transferred into active portfolio weights. The transfer coefficient turns out to be a simple scaling factor in the generalized fundamental law and is an intuitive way to measure the extent to which constraints reduce the expected value of forecasting ability. In an ideal world without any constraints, a well-constructed portfolio has a transfer coefficient of 1.0 and the original form of the fundamental law applies. In practice, managers often work under constraints that produce transfer coefficients ranging from 0.3 to 0.8. The transfer coefficie   .8) of what is predic

Measurir   of the
transfer   -offs in
construc   ng error in a
long-onl   g-only
constrai   fer of
infor   is that the
long-o   ged
portfolio   The
combina   eads to
active m   framework
of the ge   impact on
portfolio   and multiple
constrai

In addition to the transfer coefficient's ex ante role, the transfer coefficient is also a critical parameter in reconciling realized performance with the realized success of return forecasting. We derive a decomposition of ex post active management performance based on the transfer coefficient and the realized information coefficient. The ex post performance decomposition indicates that only a fraction (the transfer coefficient squared) of the variation in realized performance, or tracking error, is attributable to variation in realized information coefficients. For example, if the portfolio has no constraints and the transfer coefficient is 1.0, variation in realized performance is wholly attributable to the success of the return-prediction process. If the transfer coefficient is 0.3, however, only 9 percent of performance variation is attributable to the success of the signal and the remaining 91 percent is attributable to constraint-induced "noise." Managers with low transfer coefficients will experience frequent periods when the signal works but performance is poor and periods when performance is good even though the return-forecasting process failed.

Andrew W. Lo
Financial Analysts Journal
Published online: 2 Jan 2019

View more