

To: Carlos TAVARES
CESR's Chairman
CESR, 11-13 avenue de Friedland -
75008 PARIS FRANCE

To: Mr. Emil PAULIS
Director
European Commission
Directorate G – Financial Services
Policy and Financial Markets
European Commission
B – 1049 Bruxelles/Brussels
BELGIUM

To: Mr. Elemér TERTAK
Director, European Commission
Directorate H – Financial Institutions
European Commission
B – 1049 Bruxelles/Brussels
BELGIUM

To: Mr. Giuseppe Vegas
President
CONSOB
Via G.B.Martini 3 – 00198 Rome
ITALY

This letter is to notify to You a position shared by a group of academics, consumers associations, unions and other representatives of investors' interests concerning the proposals expressed in the consultation paper "*CESR's level 3 guidelines on the selection and presentation of performance scenarios in the Key Investor Information document (KII) for structured UCITS*", published last 20 July 2010, as a part of the implementation process (level 3 guidelines) of the revised UCITS Directive (2009/65/EU).

The above mentioned group - whose views are quite similar to those submitted by several participants to the consultation process - wants to express disappointment for the choice made by the CESR to implement the *performance scenarios* of article 78, par. 3 (c) of the level 1 UCITS Directive according to a *what-if* solution instead that by means of the so-called *probabilistic table*.

Since we are conscious that transparency is the main topic of this century, particularly with respect to retail investors, we see this choice is a significant and unexpected backward step. It is in fact the main goal of regulation to provide retail investors with adequate information on the key characteristics of financial products and the associated risks and costs so that they can be effectively supported in the

selection of solutions that best suit their needs. This selection cannot avoid a probability judgement from any individual, and each of them, independently from her education, country and social condition would always ask the same question: **what are the risks** I am going to bear with this investment, with respect to a safer one? The probabilistic table provides a direct answer to this question, and answering this question must be mandatory for any financial institution proposing an investment.

The choice of dismissing the *probability table* as mandatory disclosure is an unforgiveable setback for the following reasons:

- 1) **what-if is a marketing tool and it is not a transparency tool:** what-if analysis is based on a particular evolution of the market and as such it is completely arbitrary, and subject to manipulation and distortion. As such, it may be an important marketing tool, but cannot be confused with transparency;
- 2) **scenarios can only be stated in terms of probability:** transparency has to do with helping retailers to make clear the probability of success of their investments, while a *what-if* scenario provides a representation of a single state of the world out of an infinity of other possible ones, and as such has zero probability; collecting all scenarios and distinguishing among good, bad and fair necessarily leads to the probability table. Without this additional piece of information on probabilities the *what-if* would only favour investors' confusion and misunderstanding since their natural interpretation would be to consider each of the three outlined *what-if* scenarios as exhausting all possibilities and having the same probability, which is clearly false;
- 3) **comparison of different products can only be done in terms of probability:** in a *what-if* disclosure, every product is evaluated (and not measured) in a different scenario and cannot be compared across different asset classes and products unless all possible scenarios are collected (and measured) in a *probability table*;
- 4) **probabilistic comparison across products must rely on a common reference, the safest financial investment:** the probabilistic table provides a representation focused on four main performance scenarios (negative return and positive return respectively below, in line and above the risk-free asset) each one identified by the associated probability and by a value which synthesizes the returns achievable in that scenario. In this way investors get a fair comprehension of the performances attainable by the product, both in terms of capital preservation and of chances of earning more than from the riskless asset;
- 5) **financial products are designed using probability:** any asset manager and structurer address the same basic question as retail investors do: how much am I likely to perform better than other products? Differently from retail investors, they must be endowed with technical tools and skills to provide an answer. So, *disclosing* this information must be mandatory from a regulatory point of view because *having* this information is mandatory from a deontological point of view. Moreover, given the in-house availability of the said tools and skills, issuers can provide consumers with this key information without any additional burden with respect to their usual pricing and risk management activities.

Given these arguments, which are grounded on the basic principles of finance, we ask:

- 1) Why was the *what-if* approach presented in the consultation document as the only viable solution to implement level 1 provisions?
- 2) Is the dismissal of the probability table as mandatory disclosure in favour of the *what-if* approach consistent with the preferences of retail investors? We are aware of studies requested by the European Commission on the effectiveness of different forms of disclosure to consumers. How do the results of these studies fit with the proposal made in the consultation paper?
- 3) Where and when were the arguments in favour of the *probability table* expressed by the respondents to past consultations on the KII contrasted? Why have they only been dismissed with no argument?

If any decision will be taken without answering these questions we are afraid we will have to conclude that the struggle for transparency will remain on the exclusive domain of academics and consumers' associations. We want to be confident that this will not be the outcome. Therefore, on behalf of investors' protection, we believe that it is necessary, as suggested by some participants to the consultation process, to start with **a new consumer test** focused on the effectiveness of the *probabilistic table* approach versus the *what-if scenarios*.

Moreover, it is our opinion that the final guidelines which will be published by the CESR in this matter should not be allowed to weaken the level of investors' safeguard which has been reached by the virtuous solutions based on probabilistic approaches adopted by some member countries, including Italy.

In this perspective, if at the European level there would remain a huge discrepancy among the several regulators and stake-holders about what approach should be pursued, we firmly believe that, in the light of the prior task of investors' protection, the better solution should be to endow each competent authority with the power to apply its disclosure regime on performance scenarios to all structured Ucits marketed inside its borders irrespective of the country where these products are issued.

Indeed, even if this solution could appear a violation of the maximum harmonization principle, nobody could disregard that the blind pursuit of this latter principle at the cost of a weakened investors' safeguard would be fully equivalent to miss the opportunity of achieving a Pareto optimum, which, by definition, will improve the position of some consumers without additional damages for the others.

We would appreciate your immediate attention on this matter.

Best regards.

Prof. Emilio Barone, LUISS University in Roma, emilio.barone@luiss.it
Prof. Giovanni Barone Adesi, University of Lugano, giovanni.baroneadesi@usi.ch
Prof.ssa Marida Bertocchi, University of Bergamo, marida.bertocchi@unibg.it
Prof. Paolo Brandimarte, Politecnico di Torino, paolo.brandimarte@polito.it
Dott.ssa Susanna Camusso, Segretario Generale CGIL, segreteria.camusso@cgil.it
Prof. Rosella Castellano, University of Macerata, castellano@unimc.it
Prof. Riccardo Cesari, University of Bologna, riccardo.cesari@unibo.it

Prof. Umberto Cherubini, University of Bologna, umberto.cherubini@unibo.it
Prof. Francesco Corielli, Bocconi University, francesco.corielli@unibocconi.it
Prof. Jaksa Cvitanic, California Institute of Technology, cvitanic@hss.caltech.edu
Prof. Carlo D'Adda, University of Bologna, carlo.dadda@unibo.it
Dr. Marco De Andreis, Crusoe Association, marco.deandreis@gmail.com
Prof.ssa Rita D'Ecclesia, University of Roma-La Sapienza, rita.decclesia@uniroma1.it
Prof. Gianluca Fusai, Bocconi University, gianluca.fusai@unibocconi.it
Prof. Gino Gandolfi, University of Parma, gino.gandolfi@unipr.it
Prof. Helyette Geman, Birkbeck, University of London, h.geman@bbk.ac.uk
Prof. Luigi Guiso, European University Institute, luigi.guiso@eui.eu
Dr. Elio Lannutti, Adusbef, eliolannutti@adusbef.it
Dr. Alfredo Macchiati, Crusoe Association, a.macchiati@gmail.com
Prof. Franco Molinari, University of Trento, franco.molinari@unitn.it
Prof. Sabrina Mulinacci, University of Bologna, sabrina.mulinacci@unibo.it
Prof. Marco Pagano, University of Napoli-Federico II, marco.pagano@unina.it
Prof. Avv. Ugo Patroni Griffi, University of Bari-Aldo Moro, ugo@patronigriffi.com
Dott. Giannina Puddu, Assofinance, info@assofinance.eu
Prof. Svetlozar Rachev, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, rachev@kit.edu
Prof. Andrea Roncoroni, ESSEC Business School Paris – Singapore, roncoroni@essec.fr
Prof. Filippo Sartori, University of Trento, filippo.sartori@unitn.it
Prof. Mikhail Smirnov, Columbia University, smirnov@math.columbia.edu
Prof. Emeritus Giorgio Szego, University of Roma – La Sapienza, gsz.jbf@fastwebnet.it
Prof. Roberto Tasca, University of Bologna, roberto.tasca@unibo.it
Dr. Rosario Trefiletti, Federconsumatori, r.trefiletti@federconsumatori.it
Prof. Emeritus Dr. Oldrich Alfons Vasicek, independent consultant, oldrich.vasicek@gmail.com
Prof. Zvi Wiener, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, mwiener@mscc.huji.ac.il
Prof. Stefano Zamagni, University of Bologna, stefano.zamagni@unibo.it

31st January 2011

Response to the Consultation by Commission Services on legislative steps for the Packaged Retail Investment Products initiative

We are a group of academics, consumers associations, unions and other representatives of investors' interests who want to express a common view about the forthcoming disclosure regulation that will be introduced by the European Commission for packaged retail investment products at the end of the legislative process started with the Commission Communication of April 30th 2009.

On December 4th 2010 we sent a letter to the Commission and to the CESR expressing our shared position about the use of the *what if* approach to implement the performance scenarios required for structured UCITs by article 78, par. 3 (c) of the level 1 UCITs IV Directive (i.e. Directive n. 2009/65/EC).

In that letter (see **Annex I**) we highlighted the inadequacy of the *what if* as transparency tool since it provides a partial representation of the potential returns of a structured product. We also pointed out that the natural use of the *what if* is inside advertising pamphlets, while its unavoidable arbitrariness makes it unacceptable in a document (like the KIID for UCITs or the forthcoming KIID for PRIPs) aimed at providing "*sufficient information for the average retail investor to make an informed investment decision*", as stated in the Consultative Document on PRIPs published by the Commission on November 26th 2010.

For the above arguments and **on behalf of investors' protection**, we asked to postpone any final decision on the matter to a new *consumers test* comparing the *what if* approach against a probabilistic table where the prospective performances of the products are synthesized in four events (negative return and positive return respective below, in line or above the return from a risk-free asset), each one with a return indicator and the probability level. In the previous two tests on this matter (in October 2008 and in June 2009) consumers expressed their strong preference for the probabilistic table.

On December 20th 2010, the CESR published its final guidelines (Ref. CESR/10-1318) where the *what if* solution was confirmed. Even if we can comprehend the costs of starting a new *consumer test* and of delaying an important legislative process, we believe that the outstanding prominence of the ultimate good that this regulation should preserve, namely the savings of retail investors of any member State, would have deserved a last effort to ensure the efficacy of the regulatory provisions on transparency.

In the awareness of the importance of this matter (also to create the premises for a new, solid and well-balanced working of financial markets) and hoping that our contribution will be appreciated by the Commission, we decided to participate with this new letter to the mentioned Consultation of November 26th 2010 on pre-contractual disclosure for PRIPs.

The success of this new regulation depends, first of all, on the clear definition of its scope. We agree with the Commission (see footnote 11 of the Consultative Document) that every product with a multi-dimensional risk exposure should be classified as *packaged*.

This immediately clarifies that only standard shares do not present elements of packaging, while the uncertainty which characterizes the value of whatever non-equity product is always due to two or more risk factors [**Ans. to Q. 1-5**]. For instance, this is the case of UCITs (which by definition invest in a multiplicity of assets) and of structured bonds. But it is also the case of plain vanilla bonds. Indeed, any bond is an obligation to pay back the investors an amount which is variable depending on: (1) the credit worthiness of the issuer and (2) the movements of the yield curve [**Ans. to Q. 8**].

We therefore believe that the scope of the PRIPs regulation should explicitly include any product which exhibits the mentioned packaging features.

The second cornerstone of the PRIPs initiative will be the contents of the KIID. We read on the Consultative Document that the KIID developed for UCITs will be a benchmark also for transparency on packaged

products. However, our opinion is that the PRIPs regulation is too important (also given the variety of products comprised in its scope) to disregard some serious drawbacks of the KIID for mutual funds [**Ans. to Q. 34**].

In the UCITs KIID, the risks of the investment are conveyed to investors through a synthetic risk indicator, based on returns' volatility. We agree that, in general terms, volatility is a straightforward indicator of the riskiness of a product, but *per se* it is just a statistic whose values can be very different depending on the sampling period of the returns and on the number of past observations used. For UCITs, the synthetic indicator is based on the volatility of the weekly returns of the last five years.

Five years is a very long period in the perspective of volatility estimation. As a consequence the resulting volatility would be not representative of the current riskiness of PRIP at the subscription date, and it would be rather a quite general information. In addition, volatility of weekly returns exhibits smaller fluctuations than volatility of daily returns. The combination of these two effects typically results in an indication which is not up to date and, hence, not useful to investors interested in the true risk exposure of a product.

As envisaged at page 23 of the Consultative Document, we propose a re-calibration of the risk-ratings to ensure the meaningfulness and the comparability of this key information for the new universe of PRIPs. In particular, we believe that a valid calibration should lay on robust quantitative methodologies based on forward looking simulations of the potential daily returns of a product over its time horizon [**Ans. to Q. 36**].

In order to improve comparability, for many PRIPs information on risks should also be supplemented by that on potential performances [**Ans. to Q. 37**]. Indeed, risk and reward are always strongly connected, that's why information on performances should be given for any PRIP with a well-defined maturity as part of the informative set needed by investors [**Ans. to Q. 40-41**].

We confirm our view that performance information should not be offered through the *what-if* approach. Out of an infinity of possible results of the investment, this approach considers three elementary outcomes, selected at the convenience of the issuer. As witnessed by several studies and by tests on large samples of individuals, this representation fosters biased beliefs, since the three elementary scenarios are perceived as exhaustive of all performances achievable by a product and they are also considered as having the same 33% probability of occurring.

Both these beliefs are clearly false. The probabilistic approach is a much better alternative to concretely support investors, as it encompasses the entire probability distribution of the product's final performances and summarizes it in four events of paramount importance for any investor: experiencing a loss (negative return), or getting back the amount invested plus a return below, above or in line with the risk-free alternative.

Information on probabilistic performance scenarios should be supplemented by the breakdown of the product price at inception. The fair value of the PRIP at the issue date will be the discounted expected value of the final probability distribution under the risk-neutral measure. In this way the investor will be immediately aware that any gap between price and fair value is a cost he is paying, either explicitly or not [**Ans. to Q. 38-39**].

Beside the above information, the logic of risks representation behind the transparency on PRIPs and the relevance of investors' liquidity preferences in affecting their investment decisions suggest to include, as further information item inside the KIID for PRIPs, an indication of the time horizon of the investment as currently prescribed by some national regulators (see hereafter for a concrete example) [**Ans. to Q. 26**].

Indeed, every retail individual who is evaluating where to invest his savings wants to know how long he has to wait before getting back its money or maximizing its potential returns. It is a legitimate question which should be answered inside the KIID, and proper methodologies should be used by product manufacturers to determine the time horizon of a product in an objective way and consistently with its costs and level of risk. Moreover, the availability of this information directly from the issuer/manufacturer would make easier the

adequacy tests which – according to MiFID discipline – distributors must conduct with a special attention to the correct matching between the time horizon of the product and the holding period of any single investor.

We all hope that our comments and suggestions could help the Commission to finalize transparency requirements on PRIPs which would be both objective and useful to retail investors in comparing the various products on a fair basis and in selecting those which better suit their needs.

The KIID on PRIPs is a big opportunity to move definitely towards a new transparency regulation which really puts at the first place the needs of retail investors and requires issuers to provide clear answers to few key questions:

1. How volatile is this product?
2. How much can I lose in absolute terms and relatively to the risk-free alternative? With what probability?
3. How long should I keep it before to disinvest without losses?

In Italy, since a few years the Securities and Exchange Commission (CONSOB) has adopted a risk-based approach to transparency which answers the above questions for many investment products other than equity. For instance, about the time horizon of the investment, CONSOB requires issuers/product manufacturers to consider the distribution of the first passage times of the theoretical value of a product for a barrier corresponding to the price paid by the investors and to give investors a clear indication of the year by which the investment will have repaid at least the costs incurred.

In **Annex II** to this letter we considered an hypothetical PRIIP and we compared, in a table, its KIID filled respectively according to the level 3 UCITs IV measures (left column) and according to the mentioned CONSOB's approach (right column). It is a very useful example of the importance of choosing the right informative set and the proper solutions to produce and to represent it.

A similar example could enter in a *consumers test* that the Commission could perform before publishing its final provisions on pre-contractual disclosure for packaged products.

Moreover the organization of public seminars in which Academics and Regulators could present and compare different quantitative approaches for risk disclosure is of a paramount importance for crucial decisions such as those under discussion in this consultation.

The suggestions exposed in this letter, the proposed *consumers test* and public seminars, will give an important support to the Commission in order to set forth, in an effective way, the new transparency regulation on PRIPs.

We firmly believe that these are crucial steps to be enacted in order to fulfill the prior commitment of the Commission, of the ESMA and of any national regulator, i.e. to protect investors and restore their confidence in the financial system by endowing them with the best disclosure tools required to overcome the otherwise unavoidable informational asymmetries they suffer with respect to the subjects who have issued or designed the financial products.

Prof. Riccardo Cesari, University of Bologna, riccardo.cesari@unibo.it

Prof. Francesco Corielli, Bocconi University, francesco.corielli@unibocconi.it

Prof.ssa Rita D'Ecclesia, University of Roma-La Sapienza, rita.decclesia@uniroma1.it

Prof.ssa Rosella Castellano, University of Macerata, castellano@unimc.it

Dott. Nicola Benini, IfaConsulting srl, nicolabenini@ifaconsulting.eu

Prof. Svetlozar Rachev, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, rachev@kit.edu

Prof. Umberto Cherubini, University of Bologna, umberto.cherubini@unibo.it

Dott.ssa Susanna Camusso, Segretario Generale CGIL, segreteria.camusso@cgil.it

Prof.ssa Sabrina Mulinacci, University of Bologna, sabrina.mulinacci@unibo.it

Prof. Gino Gandolfi, University of Parma, gino.gandolfi@unipr.it

Prof. Avv. Ugo Patroni Griffi, University of Bari - Aldo Moro, ugo@patronigriffi.com
Prof. Gianluca Fusai, University of Piemonte Orientale, gianluca.fusai@eco.unipmn.it
Dott. Agostino Megale, Istituto di Studi Ricerca e Formazione – Lavoro, Assicurazione e Banche, presidente.isrf.lab@fisac.it
Prof. Filippo Sartori, University of Trento, filippo.sartori@unitn.it
Dott.ssa Giannina Puddu, Assofinance, info@assofinance.eu
Dott.ssa Francesca Biagini, LMU Munchen University, francesca.biagini@math.lmu.de
Prof. Carlo D’Adda, University of Bologna, carlo.dadda@unibo.it
Dott. Marco De Andreis, Crusoe Association, marco.deandreis@gmail.com
Prof. Mikhail Smirnov, Columbia University, smirnov@math.columbia.edu
Prof. Roberto Tasca, University of Bologna, roberto.tasca@unibo.it
Prof. Jaks Cvitanic, California Institute of Technology, cvitanic@hss.caltech.edu
Prof. Luigi Guiso, European University Institute, luigi.guiso@eui.eu
Prof. Sergio Scarlatti, University of Roma Tor Vergata, sergio.scarlatti@uniroma2.it
Prof. Emeritus Giorgio Szego, University of Roma – La Sapienza, gsz.jbf@fastwebnet.it
Prof.ssa Helyette Geman, Birkbeck, University of London, h.geman@bbk.ac.uk
Prof. Marco Pagano, University of Naples Federico II, marco.pagano@unina.it
Prof. Wolfgang Runggaldier, University of Padova, runggal@math.unipd.it
Prof. Emeritus Dr. Oldrich Alfons Vasicek, oldrich.vasicek@gmail.com
Prof. Zvi Wiener, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, mzwiener@mscc.huji.ac.il
Prof. Stefano Zamagni, University of Bologna, stefano.zamagni@unibo.it
Prof. Riccardo Ferretti, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, riccardo.ferretti@unimore.it
Prof. Giancarlo Giudici, Politecnico of Milano, giancarlo.giudici@polimi.it
Prof. Franco Molinari, University of Trento, franco.molinari@unitn.it
Prof.ssa Silvana Musti, University of Foggia, s.musti@unifg.it
Prof. Andrea Roncoroni, ESSEC Business School Paris – Singapore, roncoroni@essec.fr
Prof.ssa Giovanna Nicodano, University of Turin, giovanna.nicodano@unito.it
Prof.ssa Elena Stanghellini, University of Perugia, elena.stanghellini@stat.unipg.it
Dott.ssa Silvia Romagnoli, University of Bologna, silvia.romagnoli@unibo.it
Prof. Giovanni Zambruno, University of Milano Bicocca, giovanni.zambruno@unimib.it
Prof.ssa Luisa Anderloni, University of Milano, luisa.anderloni@unimi.it
Dott. Elio Lannutti, Adusbef, eliolannutti@adusbef.it
Dott. Rosario Trefiletti, Federconsumatori, r.trefiletti@federconsumatori.it
Prof.ssa Marida Bertocchi, University of Bergamo, marida.bertocchi@unibg.it
Prof. Paolo Brandimarte, Politecnico of Torino, paolo.brandimarte@polito.it
Prof. Carlo Scarpa, University of Brescia, cscarpa@eco.unibs.it
Prof. Michele Bagella, University of Roma Tor Vergata, bagella@uniroma2.it
Prof. Leonardo Becchetti, University of Roma Tor Vergata, becchetti@economia.uniroma2.it
Prof. Marco Bigelli, University of Bologna, marco.bigelli@unibo.it
Prof.ssa Costanza Torricelli, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, costanza.torricelli@unimore.it
Prof. Gustavo Piga, University of Roma Tor Vergata, gustavo.piga@uniroma2.it
Prof.ssa Gabriella Chiesa, University of Bologna, gabriella.chiesa@unibo.it
Prof. Claudio Gnesutta, University of Roma, claudio.gnesutta@libero.it
Dott. Giovanni Longo, University of Piemonte Orientale, giovanni.longo@eco.unipmn.it
Prof. Giuseppe Marotta, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, giuseppe.marotta@unimore.it
Prof. Massimiliano Marzo, University of Bologna, massimiliano.marzo@unibo.it
Prof.ssa Paola Musile Tanzi, University of Perugia, musile@unipg.it

ANNEX I

To: Carlos TAVARES
CESR's Chairman
CESR, 11-13 avenue de Friedland -
75008 PARIS FRANCE

To: Mr. Emil PAULIS
Director
European Commission
Directorate G – Financial Services
Policy and Financial Markets
European Commission
B – 1049 Bruxelles/Brussels
BELGIUM

To: Mr. Elemér TERTAK
Director, European Commission
Directorate H – Financial Institutions
European Commission
B – 1049 Bruxelles/Brussels
BELGIUM

To: Mr. Giuseppe Vegas
President
CONSOB
Via G.B.Martini 3 – 00198 Rome
ITALY

This letter is to notify to You a position shared by a group of academics, consumers associations, unions and other representatives of investors' interests concerning the proposals expressed in the consultation paper "*CESR's level 3 guidelines on the selection and presentation of performance scenarios in the Key Investor Information document (KII) for structured UCITS*", published last 20 July 2010, as a part of the implementation process (level 3 guidelines) of the revised UCITS Directive (2009/65/EU).

The above mentioned group - whose views are quite similar to those submitted by several participants to the consultation process - wants to express disappointment for the choice made by the CESR to implement the *performance scenarios* of article 78, par. 3 (c) of the level 1 UCITS Directive according to a *what-if* solution instead that by means of the so-called *probabilistic table*.

Since we are conscious that transparency is the main topic of this century, particularly with respect to retail investors, we see this choice is a significant and unexpected backward step. It is in fact the main goal of regulation to provide retail investors with adequate information on the key characteristics of financial products and the associated risks and costs so that they can be effectively supported in the

selection of solutions that best suit their needs. This selection cannot avoid a probability judgement from any individual, and each of them, independently from her education, country and social condition would always ask the same question: **what are the risks** I am going to bear with this investment, with respect to a safer one? The probabilistic table provides a direct answer to this question, and answering this question must be mandatory for any financial institution proposing an investment.

The choice of dismissing the *probability table* as mandatory disclosure is an unforgiveable setback for the following reasons:

- 1) **what-if is a marketing tool and it is not a transparency tool:** what-if analysis is based on a particular evolution of the market and as such it is completely arbitrary, and subject to manipulation and distortion. As such, it may be an important marketing tool, but cannot be confused with transparency;
- 2) **scenarios can only be stated in terms of probability:** transparency has to do with helping retailers to make clear the probability of success of their investments, while a *what-if* scenario provides a representation of a single state of the world out of an infinity of other possible ones, and as such has zero probability; collecting all scenarios and distinguishing among good, bad and fair necessarily leads to the probability table. Without this additional piece of information on probabilities the *what-if* would only favour investors' confusion and misunderstanding since their natural interpretation would be to consider each of the three outlined *what-if* scenarios as exhausting all possibilities and having the same probability, which is clearly false;
- 3) **comparison of different products can only be done in terms of probability:** in a *what-if* disclosure, every product is evaluated (and not measured) in a different scenario and cannot be compared across different asset classes and products unless all possible scenarios are collected (and measured) in a *probability table*;
- 4) **probabilistic comparison across products must rely on a common reference, the safest financial investment:** the probabilistic table provides a representation focused on four main performance scenarios (negative return and positive return respectively below, in line and above the risk-free asset) each one identified by the associated probability and by a value which synthesizes the returns achievable in that scenario. In this way investors get a fair comprehension of the performances attainable by the product, both in terms of capital preservation and of chances of earning more than from the riskless asset;
- 5) **financial products are designed using probability:** any asset manager and structurer address the same basic question as retail investors do: how much am I likely to perform better than other products? Differently from retail investors, they must be endowed with technical tools and skills to provide an answer. So, *disclosing* this information must be mandatory from a regulatory point of view because *having* this information is mandatory from a deontological point of view. Moreover, given the in-house availability of the said tools and skills, issuers can provide consumers with this key information without any additional burden with respect to their usual pricing and risk management activities.

Given these arguments, which are grounded on the basic principles of finance, we ask:

- 1) Why was the *what-if* approach presented in the consultation document as the only viable solution to implement level 1 provisions?
- 2) Is the dismissal of the probability table as mandatory disclosure in favour of the *what-if* approach consistent with the preferences of retail investors? We are aware of studies requested by the European Commission on the effectiveness of different forms of disclosure to consumers. How do the results of these studies fit with the proposal made in the consultation paper?
- 3) Where and when were the arguments in favour of the *probability table* expressed by the respondents to past consultations on the KII contrasted? Why have they only been dismissed with no argument?

If any decision will be taken without answering these questions we are afraid we will have to conclude that the struggle for transparency will remain on the exclusive domain of academics and consumers' associations. We want to be confident that this will not be the outcome. Therefore, on behalf of investors' protection, we believe that it is necessary, as suggested by some participants to the consultation process, to start with **a new consumer test** focused on the effectiveness of the *probabilistic table* approach versus the *what-if scenarios*.

Moreover, it is our opinion that the final guidelines which will be published by the CESR in this matter should not be allowed to weaken the level of investors' safeguard which has been reached by the virtuous solutions based on probabilistic approaches adopted by some member countries, including Italy.

In this perspective, if at the European level there would remain a huge discrepancy among the several regulators and stake-holders about what approach should be pursued, we firmly believe that, in the light of the prior task of investors' protection, the better solution should be to endow each competent authority with the power to apply its disclosure regime on performance scenarios to all structured Ucits marketed inside its borders irrespective of the country where these products are issued.

Indeed, even if this solution could appear a violation of the maximum harmonization principle, nobody could disregard that the blind pursuit of this latter principle at the cost of a weakened investors' safeguard would be fully equivalent to miss the opportunity of achieving a Pareto optimum, which, by definition, will improve the position of some consumers without additional damages for the others.

We would appreciate your immediate attention on this matter.

Best regards.

Prof. Emilio Barone, LUISS University in Roma, emilio.barone@luiss.it
Prof. Giovanni Barone Adesi, University of Lugano, giovanni.baroneadesi@usi.ch
Prof.ssa Marida Bertocchi, University of Bergamo, marida.bertocchi@unibg.it
Prof. Paolo Brandimarte, Politecnico di Torino, paolo.brandimarte@polito.it
Dott.ssa Susanna Camusso, Segretario Generale CGIL, segreteria.camusso@cgil.it
Prof. Rosella Castellano, University of Macerata, castellano@unimc.it
Prof. Riccardo Cesari, University of Bologna, riccardo.cesari@unibo.it

Prof. Umberto Cherubini, University of Bologna, umberto.cherubini@unibo.it
Prof. Francesco Corielli, Bocconi University, francesco.corielli@unibocconi.it
Prof. Jaksa Cvitanic, California Institute of Technology, cvitanic@hss.caltech.edu
Prof. Carlo D'Adda, University of Bologna, carlo.dadda@unibo.it
Dr. Marco De Andreis, Crusoe Association, marco.deandreis@gmail.com
Prof.ssa Rita D'Ecclesia, University of Roma-La Sapienza, rita.decclesia@uniroma1.it
Prof. Gianluca Fusai, Bocconi University, gianluca.fusai@unibocconi.it
Prof. Gino Gandolfi, University of Parma, gino.gandolfi@unipr.it
Prof. Helyette Geman, Birkbeck, University of London, h.geman@bbk.ac.uk
Prof. Luigi Guiso, European University Institute, luigi.guiso@eui.eu
Dr. Elio Lannutti, Adusbef, eliolannutti@adusbef.it
Dr. Alfredo Macchiati, Crusoe Association, a.macchiati@gmail.com
Prof. Franco Molinari, University of Trento, franco.molinari@unitn.it
Prof. Sabrina Mulinacci, University of Bologna, sabrina.mulinacci@unibo.it
Prof. Marco Pagano, University of Napoli-Federico II, marco.pagano@unina.it
Prof. Avv. Ugo Patroni Griffi, University of Bari-Aldo Moro, ugo@patronigriffi.com
Dott. Giannina Puddu, Assofinance, info@assofinance.eu
Prof. Svetlozar Rachev, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, rachev@kit.edu
Prof. Andrea Roncoroni, ESSEC Business School Paris – Singapore, roncoroni@essec.fr
Prof. Filippo Sartori, University of Trento, filippo.sartori@unitn.it
Prof. Mikhail Smirnov, Columbia University, smirnov@math.columbia.edu
Prof. Emeritus Giorgio Szego, University of Roma – La Sapienza, gsz.jbf@fastwebnet.it
Prof. Roberto Tasca, University of Bologna, roberto.tasca@unibo.it
Dr. Rosario Trefiletti, Federconsumatori, r.trefiletti@federconsumatori.it
Prof. Emeritus Dr. Oldrich Alfons Vasicek, independent consultant, oldrich.vasicek@gmail.com
Prof. Zvi Wiener, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, mwiener@mscc.huji.ac.il
Prof. Stefano Zamagni, University of Bologna, stefano.zamagni@unibo.it

Response to the Consultation by the Board of the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) on the project and the work undertaken by the Working Group on Retail Structured Products of the Task Force on Unregulated Markets and Product.

We are a group of academics, consumers associations, unions and other representatives of investors' interests who want to express a common view about the issues regarding Retail Structured Products that have been raised in the consultation report.

On December 4th 2010 and January 31th 2011 we sent two different letters to the European Commission and to ESMA in response to two public consultations on "the selection and presentation of performance scenarios in the Key Investor Information document (KIID) for structured UCITS" and on "the legislative steps for the Packaged Retail Investment Products initiative", expressing in both contributions our shared position about the use of the scenario analysis/valuation matrix (also known as "what-if" analysis) approach to implement the performance scenarios in the KIID for structured UCITs and PRIPs.

In these letters we highlighted the inadequacy of the scenario analysis/valuation matrix as transparency tool ([issue 5 for consultation](#)), since it provides a partial representation of the potential returns of a structured product. We also pointed out that the natural use of the scenario analysis/valuation matrix is inside advertising pamphlets, while its unavoidable arbitrariness makes it unacceptable in a document (like the KIID for UCITs or the forthcoming KIID for PRIPs) aimed at providing "sufficient information for the average retail investor to make an informed investment decision", as stated in the Consultative Document on PRIPs published by the European Commission on November 26th 2010.

We firmly believe that the main goal of regulation is to provide retail investors with adequate information on the key characteristics of financial products and the associated risks and costs so that they can be effectively supported in the selection of solutions that best suit their needs. This selection cannot avoid a probability judgement from any individual, and each of them, independently from her education, country and social condition would always ask the same question: what are the risks I am going to bear with this investment, with respect to a safer one? The proper disclosure of the probability distribution in a form easily understandable from a retail investor (e.g. a table) provides a direct answer to this question, and answering this question must be mandatory for any financial institution proposing an investment.

Moreover, the use of this powerful disclosure tool cannot be limited only to supposedly complex products, since the interaction between the complexity of a structured product and its risk is not linear. In fact, complexity can enhance returns introducing additional risk but also some relatively simple products may expose investors to high risk, like in the case of the default risk of the issuer associated to a zero coupon bond. An objective evaluation of the risks connected to simple products via the probability distribution is also needed, in order not to leave their assessment only to the investor's perceptions that can be distorted or even manipulated.

In this perspective, on behalf of investors' protection we want to share some technical considerations that clearly demonstrate the superiority of a probabilistic approach with respect to the simplistic scenario analysis/valuation matrix that, on the contrary, shows some serious drawbacks.

1. scenario analysis/valuation matrix is a marketing tool and it is not a transparency tool: scenario analysis is based on a particular evolution of the market and as such it is completely arbitrary, and

subject to manipulation and distortion. As such, it may be an important marketing tool, but cannot be confused with transparency;

2. scenarios can only be stated in terms of probability: transparency has to do with helping retailers to make clear the probability of success of their investments, while a scenario analysis/valuation matrix provides a representation of a single state of the world out of an infinity of other possible ones, and as such has zero probability; collecting all scenarios and distinguishing among good, bad and fair necessarily leads to a probability table. Without this additional piece of information on probabilities the scenario analysis/valuation matrix would only favour investors' confusion and misunderstanding since their natural interpretation would be to consider each of the three outlined "what-if" scenarios as exhausting all possibilities and having the same probability, which is clearly false;
3. comparison of different products can only be done in terms of probability: in a scenario disclosure, every product is evaluated (and not measured) in a different setting and cannot be compared across different asset classes and products unless all possible scenarios are collected (and measured) in a probability table;
4. probabilistic comparison across products in order also to be comprehensible needs a proper partition of the product implied probability distribution into some specific events. To conduct this partition the safest financial investment (i.e. the risk-free asset, *rfa*) – that at the present date in Europe can be identified in the Overnight Index Swap term structure (OIS) – is adopted. It allows to identify four main performance scenarios (negative return and positive return respectively below, in line and above the *rfa*) each one identified by the associated probability and by a value (i.e. the conditional expected return of each partition) which synthesizes the returns achievable in that scenario. 8 simple and understandable figures allows the investors to understand with what probability he will lose or gain (in this last case by focusing three growing gaining scenario, i.e. lower, in line and above the *rfa*) a certain amount of money in average. With these 8 indicators the probability distribution is partitioned in an adaptive way that is sensible to the changing markets condition and investors are allowed to get a fair comprehension of the performances and risks associated to the product;
5. financial products are designed using probability: any asset manager and structurer address the same basic question as retail investors do: how much am I likely to perform better than other products? Differently from retail investors, they must be endowed with technical tools and skills to provide an answer. So, disclosing this information must be mandatory from a regulatory point of view because sharing this information is mandatory from a deontological point of view. Moreover, given the in-house availability of the mentioned tools and skills, issuers can provide consumers with this key information without any additional burden with respect to their usual pricing and risk management activities.

For the above arguments, we confirm our view that performance information should not be offered through the scenario analysis/valuation matrix approach (issues 5 and 12 for consultation). Out of an infinity of possible results of the investment, this approach considers three elementary outcomes, selected at the convenience of the issuer. As witnessed by several studies and by tests on large samples of individuals, this representation fosters biased beliefs, since the three elementary scenarios are perceived as

exhaustive of all performances achievable by a product and they are also considered as having the same 33% probability of occurring.

Both these beliefs are clearly false. The probabilistic approach is a much better alternative to concretely support investors, as it encompasses the entire probability distribution of the product's final performances and summarizes it in four events of paramount importance for any investor: experiencing a loss (negative return), or getting back the amount invested plus a return below, above or in line with the risk-free.

Information on probabilistic performance scenarios should be supplemented by the breakdown of the product price at inception in order to highlight costs and fees ([issue 10 for consultation](#)). The fair value of the structured product at the issue date will be the discounted expected value of the final probability distribution under the risk-neutral measure ([issue 11 for consultation](#)). In this way the investor will be immediately aware that any gap between price and fair value is a cost he is paying, either explicitly or not.

Beside the above information, the logic of risks representation behind the transparency on structured products and the relevance of investors' liquidity preferences in affecting their investment decisions suggest to include, as further information item inside a short form or summary disclosure ([issue 9 for consultation](#)), an indication of the time horizon of the investment as currently prescribed by some national regulators (see hereafter for a concrete example).

Indeed, every retail individual who is evaluating where to invest his savings wants to know how long he has to wait before getting back its money or maximizing its potential returns. It is a legitimate question which should be answered inside the short form or summary disclosure, and proper methodologies should be used by product manufacturers to determine the time horizon of a product in an objective way and consistently with its costs and level of risk.

Historical information about the past performances of a structured products should carefully be avoided ([issue 13 for consultation](#)), since it clearly can be misleading for the investor; past information can be recovered inside a standardized synthetic risk indicator, based on returns' volatility. We agree that, in general terms, volatility is a straightforward indicator of the riskiness of a product, but per se it is just a statistic whose values can be very different depending on the sampling period of the returns and on the number of past observations used. We believe that a valid calibration of a standardized synthetic risk indicator based on volatility should lay on robust quantitative methodologies based on forward looking simulations of the potential daily returns of a product over its time horizon that can be regularly updated during the lifecycle of the product ([issue 8 for consultation](#)).

As partially mentioned in the consultation report, in Italy since a few years the Securities and Exchange Commission (CONSOB) has adopted a risk-based approach to transparency which answers the above questions for many investment products other than equity. For instance, about the time horizon of the investment, CONSOB requires issuers/product manufacturers to consider the distribution of the first passage times of the theoretical value of a product for a barrier corresponding to the price paid by the investors and to give investors a clear indication of the year by which the investment will have repaid at least the costs incurred.

In Annex I to this letter we considered an hypothetical structured product and we illustrate, in a table, a short form or summary disclosure filled according to the mentioned CONSOB's approach ([issue 9 for consultation](#)). It is a very useful example of the importance of choosing the right informative set and the proper solutions to produce and to represent it.

We all hope that our comments and suggestions could help the Working Group to finalize the project and the work undertaken on Retail Structured Products and to propose transparency requirements on structured products which would be both objective and useful to retail investors in comparing the various products on a fair basis and in selecting those which better suit their needs.

We firmly believe that these are crucial steps to be enacted in order to fulfil the prior commitment of any national regulator, i.e. to protect investors and restore their confidence in the financial system by endowing them with the best disclosure tools required to overcome the otherwise unavoidable informational asymmetries they suffer with respect to the subjects who have issued or designed the financial products.

Prof. Kostas Andriosopoulos, Europe Business School Executive Director, Research Centre for Energy Management, kandriosopoulos@escpeurope.eu

Prof. Flavio Angelini, University of Perugia, angelini@unipg.it

Prof. Flavio Antonelli, University of L'Aquila – Associate Professor, antonf@dm.univaq.it

Prof. Amedeo Argentiero, University of Perugia – Assistant Professor, amedeo.argentiero@gmail.com

Dott. Luca Barone, Derivatives Specialist - Partner Sator Group SpA, luca.barone@haasalum.berkeley.edu

Dott. Antonella Basso, University Ca' Foscari Venezia – Department of Economics, basso@unive.it

Dott. Nicola Benini, Assofinance – Vicepresident, nicolabenini@ifaconsulting.eu

Prof. Marida Bertocchi, University of Bergamo - Full Professor in Mathematical Finance, marida@unibg.it

Avv. Francesco Bochicchio, Studio Legale Bochicchio, [studiobo chicchio@legalebo chicchio.it](mailto:studiobo chicchio@legalebochicchio.it)

Prof. Antonio Borghesi, University of Verona, Full Professor of Economics and Management of the Enterprises, aborghesi@vodafone.it

Dott. Salvatore Bragantini, Corriere della Sera – Journalist and Economist, sbragantini@gmail.com

Prof. Dr. Thilo Meyer-Brandis, Department of Mathematics at the LMU München, meyerbra@math.lmu.de

Dott.ssa Susanna Camusso, Segretario Generale CGIL, segreteria.camusso@cgil.it

Prof. Rosella Castellano, University of Macerata, Professor of Mathematical Finance, rosella.castellano@unimc.it

Prof. Filippo Cavazzuti, University of Bologna – Department of Economic Sciences, filippo.cavazzuti@alice.it

Prof. Roy Cerqueti, University of Macerata – Department of Economics and Law, roy.cerqueti@unimc.it

Prof. Riccardo Cesari, University of Bologna, riccardo.cesari@unibo.it

Prof. Umberto Cherubini, University of Bologna - Professor of Financial Mathematics, umberto.cherubini@unibo.it

Dott. Matteo Chiamenti, Bluerating – Journalist, chiamenti.matteo@gmail.com

Prof. Giorgio Consigli, University of Bergamo, giorgio.consigli@unibg.it

Dott. Andrea Consiglio, University of Palermo – Department of economic Sciences, andrea.consiglio@unipa.it

Prof. Francesco Corielli, Bocconi University, francesco.corielli@unibocconi.it

Prof. Jaks Cvitanic, EDHEC Business School and Caltech - Professor of Mathematical Finance, jaksa.cvitanic@edhec.edu

Prof. Carlo D'Adda, Università of Bologna, Professor Emeritus, carlo.dadda@unibo.it

Dott. Marco De Andreis, Agenzia delle Dogane – Director, marco.deandreis@gmail.com

Prof. Rita Laura D'Ecclesia, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy - Professore di Metodi Matematici per l'Economia e la Finanza, ritadec022@gmail.com

Dott. Giuseppe Dell'Erba, Sogei SPA – Buyer, raul.dellerba@libero.it

Prof. Victor Dragot, Bucharest University of Economic Studies - victordragota@yahoo.com

Dr. Jitka Dupacova, Charles University - Prague, Czech Republic, dupacova@karlin.mff.cuni.cz

Prof. Riccardo Ferretti, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia - Professor of Banking and Finance, riccardo.ferretti@unimore.it

Prof. Gianluca Fusai, Università degli studi del Piemonte Orientale, fusai@eco.unipmn.it

Prof. Gino Gandolfi, University of Parma - Prof. Ordinario di Economia degli Intermediari finanziari, gino.gandolfi@gmail.com

Prof. Hayette Gatfaoui, Rouen Business School - Associate Professor, hgatfaoui@gmail.com

Prof. Helyette Geman, Birkbeck, University of London - Professor of Finance, hgeman@hotmail.com

Prof. Donald Geman, Institute of Mathematical Statistics - Johns Hopkins University, geman@jhu.edu

Prof. Angelo Gilio, University "La Sapienza" of Roma, Ordinario di Probabilità e Statistica Matematica, angelo.gilio@sbai.uniroma1.it

Prof. Emilio Girino, Centro Universitario di Organizzazione Aziendale - Docente Dipartimento Finance, girino@ghidini-associati.it

Prof. Giancarlo Giudici, Politecnico di Milano - DIG School of Management - Professore associato di Finanza Aziendale, giancarlo.giudici@polimi.it

Prof. Maria Letizia Guerra, University of Bologna - Department of Mathematics, mletizia.guerra@unibo.it

Prof. Luigi Guiso, Einaudi Institute for Economics and Finance - Professor of Household Finance, luigi.guiso@eief.it

Dott. Francesco Gurrieri, Independent Financial Consultant, frangurrieri@yahoo.it

Dr. Melanie Houllier, Cass Business School, City University London, Melanie.Houllier.1@cass.city.ac.uk

Dott. Paolo Labombarda, University of Tor Vergata - Management Consultant, Lecturer, paololab@teletu.it

Dott. Elio Lannutti, Adusbef – President, lannutti.adusbef@gmail.com

Dott. Paola Leocani, Partner at Allen&Overy, Paola.Leocani@allenoverly.com

Prof. Daniele Maffei, University of Brescia - Ordinario di Diritto Privato, Maffei@denova.it

Prof. Mary Malliaris, Loyola University Chicago – Professor of Information Systems, Mmallia@luc.edu

Prof. Anastasios Malliaris, Loyola University Chicago - Professor of Economics and Finance, Tmallia@luc.edu

Prof. Raimondo Manca, Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza", raimondo.manca@uniroma1.it

Dott. Maddalena Manzi, Università degli Studi di Trieste, manzi.maddalena@gmail.com

Prof. Loretta Mastroeni, Università ROMA TRE - Department of Economics - Associate Professor of Mathematical Finance, lmastroeni@os.uniroma3.it

Dott. Benedetto Matarazzo, Università degli Studi di Catania - Dipartimento di Economia e Impresa, matarazz@unict.it

Dott. Agostino Megale, Presidente FISAC - CGIL, amegale@fisac.it

Dott. Fabio Mercurio, fabiomerc@gmail.com

Prof. Marcello Messori, Luiss University – Economist, mmessori@luiss.it

Prof. Franco Molinari, University of Trento-Italy - Full professor of financial mathematics, franco.molinari@unitn.it

Dott. Vittorio Moriggia, Università degli studi di Bergamo, vittorio.moriggia@unibg.it

Dott. Sabrina Mulinacci, University of Bologna, sabrina.mulinacci@unibo.it

Dott.ssa Silvana Musti, Università degli studi di foggia – Department of economics, silvana.musti@gmail.com

Prof. Giovanna Nicodano, University of Turin and CeRP-Collegio Carlo Alberto, giovanna.nicodano@carloalberto.org

Prof. Chiara Oldani, Luiss Guido Carli di Roma (Cattedra di Economia e Finanza Pubblica) - Università degli Studi della Tuscia di Viterbo (Cattedra di Economia Monetaria), coldani@unitus.it

Prof. Sergio Ortobelli Lozza, University of Bergamo - Department SAEMQ, sol@unibg.it

Marco Pagano, pagano56@gmail.com

Prof. Angelo Paletta, Università di Bologna - Professore di Economia aziendale, angelo.paletta@me.com

Prof. Avv. Ugo Patroni Griffi, University of Bari - Aldo Moro, ugo@patronigriffi.com

Prof. Cristian Pelizzari, Università degli Studi di Brescia - Assistant Professor of Mathematical Methods of Economics and Actuarial and Financial Sciences, pelizcri@eco.unibs.it

Prof. Alessandro Penati, Università Cattolica di Milano, alessandro.penati@mac.com

Prof. Gustavo Piga, University Tor Vergata, gustavo.piga@uniroma2.it

Dott.ssa Giannina Puddu, Assofinance - President, info@assofinance.eu

Prof. Svetlozar Rachev, Professor of Finance - College of Business, Stony - Brook University, svetlozar.rachev@stonybrook.edu

Dr. Handika Rangga, Macquarie University, rangga.handika@mq.edu.au

Mattia Roberi, University of Torino, roberi.mattia@gmail.com

Prof. Giorgio Rodano, Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza" - professore di economia, giorgio.rodano@gmail.com

Dott.ssa Silvia Romagnoli, University of Bologna, silvia.romagnoli@unibo.it

Prof. Andrea Roncoroni, ESSEC Business School - Professor of Finance, roncoroni@gmail.com

Avv. Marco Rossi, Rossi Rossi & Partners, marco.rossi@studiiorrp.it

Prof. Carlo Rovelli, University of Aix-Marseille - Centre de Physique Théorique, France, Full Professor, rovelli@cpt.univ-mrs.fr

Mirko Rubini, Consulente regionale della Regione Emilia Romagna, mirko.rubini@gmail.com

Prof. Enrico Saltari, Sapienza, Università di Roma - Professore Dipartimento di Economia e Diritto, Enrico.Saltari@uniroma1.it

Prof. Giuseppe G. Santorsola, Università Parthenope – Napoli - Professore Ordinario di Economia degli Intermediari Finanziari, santorsola@uniparthenope.it

Dr. Stavroula Sarri, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, stsarri@isc.tuc.gr

Prof. Filippo Sartori, Università degli Studi di Trento, sartori@dirittobancario.it

Prof. Pierre Six, Rouen Business School Assistant Professor in Finance - Economics and Finance Department, pierre.six@rouenbs.fr

Dr. João Soares, Lisbon University - Department of Engineering and Management - Instituto Superior Técnico, joaosoares@ist.utl.pt

Dott. Fabrizio Solari, segreteria nazionale CGIL, f.solari@cgil.it

Dr. David G. Stack, ESCP EUROPE - Research Centre for Energy Management; Managing Director, agrimax@aol.com

Prof. Silvana Stefani, University Milano Bicocca, silvana.stefani@unimib.it

Prof. Giorgio Szego, Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza", Professor Emeritus, gsz.jbf@fastwebnet.it

Prof. Roberto Tasca, Università di Bologna - Ordinario di Economia degli intermediari finanziari, roberto.tasca@unibo.it

Prof. Pietro Terna, Università di Torino - professore ordinario di Economia politica, pietro.terna@unito.it

Dott. Marco Tolotti, Department of Management Ca' Foscari University of Venice - Ph.D., tolotti@unive.it

Prof. Costanza Torricelli, Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia - Professor of Mathematical Finance, costanza.torricelli@unimore.it

Dott. Rosario Trefiletti, FEDERCONSUMATORI - Comitato di presidenza, r.trefiletti@federconsumatori.it

Dott. İbrahim Ünalmiş, Central Bank of Turkey - Communication and Foreign Relations Department, ibrahim.unalmis@tcmb.gov.tr

Prof. Vincenzo Urciuoli, Uniroma1 Sapienza (Docente) e Consiglio Nazionale Attuari (Vicepresidente), Vincenzo.Urciuoli@uniroma1.it

Prof. Giacomo Vaciago, Università Cattolica Milano, giacomo.vaciago@unicatt.it

Prof. Tiziano Vargiolu, Università di Padova - professore associato SSD MAT/06 - dipartimento di Matematica, vargiolu@math.unipd.it

Prof. Emeritus Dr. Oldrich Alfons Vasicek, oldrich.vasicek@gmail.com

Prof. Vincenzo Visco, NENS, vincenzo.visco@nens.it

Prof. Vlasios Voudouris, Centre for International Business and Sustainability - London Metropolitan Business School - London Metropolitan University CIBS Director, v.voudouris@londonmet.ac.uk

Prof. Zvi Wiener, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem – Head of Finance Department, mzwiener@mscc.huji.ac.il

Dr. Lucy Yueming Qiu, Arizona State University, yuemingq@gmail.com

Dott. Luca Zamagni, Axis Network Legale, zamagni@axis.it

Prof. Giovanni M. Zambruno, University Milano Bicocca, Full professor of Financial Mathematics, giovanni.zambruno@unimib.it

Prof. Stavros A. Zenios, University of Cyprus - Professor of finance and management science, zenios.stavros@ucy.ac.cy

Prof. Paola Zerilli, University of York - Department of Economics, paola.zerilli@york.ac.uk

Prof. Luigi Zingales, University of Chicago Booth School of Business - Robert C. Mc Cormack Professor of Entrepreneurship and Finance, Luigi.Zingales@chicagobooth.edu

Prof. Konstantinos Zopounidis, Technical University of Crete, Financial Engineering Laboratory, kostas@dpem.tuc.gr

ANNEX I

SHORT-FORM OR SUMMARY DISCLOSURE OF AN HYPOTHETICAL STRUCTURED PRODUCT

CONSOB RISK-BASED APPROACH

Product Description
The product has a floor of 80% and a cap of 120% of the amount invested. Its payoff depends on a formula linked to the return of a basket of three shares over the last 4 years.

Fund Structure:		Return-Target	
Investment Time Horizon:		4 Years	
Degree of Risk			
low	medium-low	medium	MEDIUM-HIGH
high	very high		
Unbundling of the price			
Bond component		88.13%	
Derivative component		6.92%	
Total financial value		95.05%	
Costs		4.95%	
Price		100%	
Table of probabilistic performance scenarios			
Scenario	Probability	Median Value (w.r.t. 100 €)	
The return is negative	42.3%	88 €	
The return is positive but lower than the return of the risk-free asset ¹	13.8%	103 €	
The return is positive and in line with the return of the risk-free asset	29.8%	115 €	
The return is positive and higher than the return of the risk-free asset	14.1%	119 €	

¹ The Overnight Index Swap (OIS) term structure is used to identify the risk-free thresholds.

Response to the Consultation by EBA, EIOPA and ESMA on the Discussion Paper (JC/DP/2014/02) on Key Information Documents for Packaged Retail and Insurance-based Investment Products (PRIIPs).

We are a group of academics, consumers associations, unions and other representatives of investors' interests who want to express a common view about the issues regarding Packaged Retail and Insurance-based Investment Products that have been raised in the consultation report.

On December 4th 2010 and January 31th 2011 we sent two different letters to the European Commission and to ESMA in response to two public consultations on “the selection and presentation of performance scenarios in the Key Investor Information document (KIID) for structured UCITS” and on “the legislative steps for the Packaged Retail Investment Products initiative”, expressing in both contributions our shared position about the use of the scenario analysis/valuation matrix (also known as “what-if” analysis) approach to implement the performance scenarios in the KIID for structured UCITS and PRIIPs. Also, on 17th June 2013 we submitted a public response to the IOSCO consultation on Retail Structured Products (CR05/13), highlighting our strong preference for the use of probability scenarios as a tool to properly inform the retail investor about the risks of the product.

In these letters we highlighted the inadequacy of the scenario analysis/valuation matrix as transparency tool (question 6 of consultation), since it provides a partial representation of the potential returns of a structured product. We also pointed out that the natural use of the scenario analysis/valuation matrix is inside advertising pamphlets, while its unavoidable arbitrariness makes it of little use in a document (like the KIID for UCITS and the forthcoming KIID for PRIIPs), especially if the final aim of the document is to provide “sufficient information for the average retail investor to make an informed investment decision”, (as previously stated in the Consultative Document on PRIIPs published by the European Commission on November 26th 2010).

With the present letter, we want to confirm again our reasoned opinion about the usefulness and validity of probability scenarios by responding concretely to the majority of the questions arisen in the discussion paper. As presented in the Annex, the probability scenarios can be supplemented by a couple of quantitative indicators related to the costs and the recommended holding period of the investment, that complete and enhance greatly the information conveyed to the retail investor.

We firmly believe that the main goal of regulation is to provide retail investors with adequate information on the key characteristics of financial products and the associated risks and costs so that they can be effectively supported in the selection of solutions that best suit their needs. This selection cannot avoid a probability judgement from any individual, and each of them, independently from her education, country and social condition would always ask the same question: what are the risks I am going to bear with this investment, with respect to a safer one (question 1 of consultation)? The proper disclosure of the probability distribution in a form that we consider easily understandable from a retail investor (e.g. a table) provides a direct answer to this question, and answering this question must be mandatory for any financial institution proposing an investment. Scenarios can only be stated in terms of probability: transparency has to do with helping retailers to make clear the probability of success of their investments, while a scenario analysis/valuation matrix provides a representation of a single state of the world out of an infinity of other

possible ones, and as such has zero probability; collecting all scenarios and distinguishing among good, bad and fair necessarily leads to a probability table ([question 6 of consultation](#)).

Comparison of different products can only be done in terms of probability: in a scenario disclosure, every product is evaluated (and not measured) in a different setting and cannot be compared across different asset classes and products unless all possible scenarios are collected (and measured) in a probability table.

Hence we confirm our view that performance information should not be offered through the scenario analysis/valuation matrix approach ([question 6 of consultation](#)). Out of an infinity of possible results of the investment, this approach considers three elementary outcomes, selected at the convenience of the issuer. As witnessed by several studies and by tests on large samples of individuals, this representation fosters biased beliefs, since the three elementary scenarios are perceived as exhaustive of all performances achievable by a product and they are also considered as having the same 33% probability of occurring.

Both these beliefs are clearly false. The probabilistic approach is a much better alternative to concretely support investors, as it encompasses the entire probability distribution of the product's final performances and summarizes it in a set of events (3 or 4, [question 11 of consultation](#)) – calculated on a time frame that is specific for each product and corresponds to the recommended holding period ([question 8 of consultation](#)) – of significant importance for any investor: for example experiencing a loss (negative return), or getting back the amount invested plus a return below, above or in line with the risk-free. To conduct this partition the safest financial investment (i.e. the risk-free asset, *rfa*) – that at the present date in Europe can be identified in the Overnight Index Swap term structure (OIS) – could be adopted. It allows to identify three to four main performance scenarios (negative return and positive return respectively below, in line and above the *rfa*) each one identified by the associated probability ([question 11 of consultation](#)) and by a value (i.e. the conditional expected return of each partition) which synthesizes the returns achievable in that scenario ([question 9 of consultation](#)). These are simple and understandable figures allows the investors to understand with what probability he will lose or gain (in this last case by focusing three growing gaining scenario, i.e. lower, in line and above the *rfa*) a certain amount of money in average. With these 8 indicators the probability distribution is partitioned in an adaptive way that is sensible to the changing markets condition and investors are allowed to get a fair comprehension of the performances and risks associated to the product. Anyway, the idea – reported in one the examples – of presenting probability in a number of frequencies ([question 13 of consultation](#)) can be considered a second-best option in conveying the necessary information to the investors in a graphical fashion.

The use of a proper partition of the probability distribution offers the most natural way to integrate market and credit risks, since it is built starting from the simulated trajectories of the value of the financial product, that obviously embed the initial and changing market conditions ([question 5 of consultation](#)).

Moreover, financial products are designed using probability: any asset manager and structurer address the same basic question as retail investors do: how much am I likely to perform better than other products? Differently from retail investors, they must be endowed with technical tools and skills to provide an answer. So, disclosing this information must be mandatory from a regulatory point of view because sharing this information is mandatory from a deontological point of view. Moreover, given the in-house availability of the mentioned tools and skills, issuers can provide consumers with this key information without any additional burden with respect to their usual pricing and risk management activities. Eventually, the reference to the risk-neutral measure used to calculate the fair price of the product should ensure also consistency across firms and products ([question 7 of consultation](#)).

Information on probabilistic performance scenarios should be supplemented by the breakdown of the product price at inception in order to highlight costs and fees (question 18 of consultation). Obviously the fair value of the structured product at the issue date will be the discounted expected value of the final probability distribution under the risk-neutral measure. In this way the investor will be immediately aware that any gap between price and fair value is a cost he is paying, either explicitly or not.

Beside the above information and the present regulation requirements, also the logic of risks representation behind the transparency on structured products and the relevance of investors' liquidity preferences in affecting their investment decisions suggest to include, as further information item inside a short form or summary disclosure, an indication of the recommended holding period of the investment; currently this indicator is prescribed by some national regulators (see in the Annex for a concrete example).

Historical information about the past performances of a structured products should carefully be avoided (question 6 of consultation), since it clearly can be misleading for the investor; past information can be recovered inside a standardized synthetic risk indicator, based on returns' volatility. We agree that, in general terms, volatility is a straightforward indicator of the riskiness of a product, but per se it is just a statistic whose values can be very different depending on the sampling period of the returns and on the number of past observations used. We believe that different valid calibrations of standardized synthetic risk indicators based on volatility could be laid on more robust quantitative methodologies based on forward looking simulations of the potential daily returns of a product over its recommended holding period.

Despite not mentioned in the consultation report, we want to remember that in Italy since a few years the Securities and Exchange Commission (CONSOB) has adopted a risk-based approach to transparency for insurance products as Index and Unit linked, which implements consistently a probability approach*.

In Annex I to this letter we considered an hypothetical PRIIP and we illustrate, in a table, a short form or summary disclosure filled according to the mentioned CONSOB's approach (question 13 of consultation). It is a very useful example of the importance of choosing the right informative set and the proper solutions to produce and to represent it.

We all hope that our comments and suggestions could help the regulatory Authorities to progress towards the draft Regulatory Technical Standards in the perspective to propose transparency requirements on PRIIPS which would be both objective and useful to retail investors in comparing the various products on a fair basis and in selecting those which better suit their needs.

We firmly believe that these could be crucial steps in the process of fulfilling the prior commitment of EU regulators, i.e. to protect investors and restore their confidence in the financial system by endowing them with the best disclosure tools required to overcome the otherwise unavoidable informational asymmetries they suffer with respect to the subjects who have issued or designed the financial products.

Dr. Alberto Aghemo – Fondazione Giacomo Matteotti – info@fondazionematteottiroma.org

Dr. Giuseppe Amari – Fondazione Giuseppe Di Vittorio – g.amari@fdv.cgil.it

* Technical details about this approach, that address the majority of the questions regarding the implementation of performance scenario via probability, can be found in Minenna M. (2011) "A Quantitative Framework to Assess the Risk-Reward Profile of Non-Equity Products", Risk Books.

Prof. Flavio Angelini – University of Perugia – flavio.angelini@unipg.it

Prof. Antonio Annibali – Dip. Memotef – Univ Sapienza Roma – antonio.annibali@uniroma1.it

Prof. Amedeo Argentiero – University of Perugia – amedeo.argentiero@gmail.com

Prof. Michele Bagella – Tor Vergata University, Rome – bagella@economia.uniroma2.it

Prof. Emilio Barone – LUISS, Rome – ebarone@luiss.it

Prof. Diana Barro – Ca' Foscari University Venice – d.barro@unive.it

Prof. Christopher Baum – Boston College – baum@bc.edu

Prof. Antonella Basso – Ca' Foscari University of Venice – basso@unive.it

Prof. Francesca Beccacece – Bocconi University, Milan – francesca.beccacece@unibocconi.it

Dr. Nicola Benini – ASSOFINANCE – nicolabenini@ifaconsulting.eu

Prof. Fred Espen Benth – University of Oslo – fredb@math.uio.no

Dr. Daniele Bernardi – DIAMAN SCF – daniele@diaman.it

Dr. Franco Berti – B&B consulting – f.beriti@bebconsulting.org

Prof. Marida Bertocchi – University of Bergamo – marida.bertocchi@unibg.it

Prof. Marco Bigelli – University of Bologna – marco.bigelli@unibo.it

Ing. Giuseppe Bivona – Independent – g_bivona@yahoo.it

Prof. Francesco Bochicchio – Studio Legale Bochicchio – studioboichicchio@legaleboichicchio.it

Dr. Salvatore Bragantini – Independent – sbragantini@gmail.com

Prof. Dr. Thilo Meyer-Brandis – University of Munich – t.meyer-brandis@web.de

Dr. Sandro Brunelli – University of Rome Tor Vergata – brunellisandro82@gmail.com

Dr. Susanna Camusso – CGIL – segreteria.camusso@cgil.it

Prof. Massimiliano Caporin – University of Padova – massimiliano.caporin@unipd.it

Dr. Antonio Castagna – Iason – antonio.castagna@iasonltd.com

Prof. Rosella Castellano – University of Macerata – castellano@unimc.it

Prof. Filippo Cavazzuti – University of Bologna – filippo.cavazzuti@unibo.it

Prof. Stefano Cenni – University of Bologna – stefano.cenni@unibo.it

Avv. Massimo Cerniglia – Studio Legale Cerniglia – segreteria@studiolegalecerniglia.it

Prof. Roy Cerqueti – University of Macerata – roy.cerqueti@unimc.it

Prof. Umberto Cherubini – University of Bologna – umberto.cherubini@unibo.it

Prof. Alain Chevalier – ESCP Europe – chevalierescp@gmail.com

Prof. Giuseppe Ciccarone – Sapienza University of Rome – giuseppe.ciccarone@uniroma1.it

Prof. Andrea Consiglio – University of Palermo – andrea.consiglio@unipa.it

Prof. Giorgio Consigli – University of Bergamo – giorgio.consigli@unibg.it

Prof. Cesare Conti – Bocconi University, Milan – cesare.conti@unibocconi.it

Prof. Francesco Corielli – Bocconi University, Milan – francesco.corielli@unibocconi.it

Prof. Jaks Cvitanic – Caltech – cvitanic@hss.caltech.edu

Prof. Carlo D’Adda – University of Bologna – carlo.dadda@unibo.it

Avv. Roberto D’Atri – Ordine degli Avvocati di Roma – robertodatri@gmail.com

Prof. Rita Laura D’Ecclesia – Sapienza University, Rome – ritadec022@gmail.com

Prof. Giuseppe De Arcangelis – Sapienza University of Rome – giuseppe.dearcangelis@uniroma1.it

Prof. Giorgio Di Giorgio – LUISS University – gdg@luiss.it

Prof. Elvira Di Nardo – Università Basilicata, Potenza – elvira.dinardo@unibas.it

Prof. Carlo Ambrogio Favero – Bocconi University, Milan – carlo.favero@unibocconi.it

Prof. Gino Favero – University of Parma – gino.favero@unipr.it

Prof. Riccardo Ferretti – Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia – riccardo.ferretti@unimore.it

Dr. Antonio Foglia – Independent – AFoglia@belgrave.com

Prof. Paolo Foschi – University of Bologna – paolo.foschi2@unibo.it

Prof. Maurizio Franzini – Sapienza University, Rome – maurizio.franzini@uniroma1.it

Prof. Marco Frittelli – Università degli Studi di Milano – marco.frittelli@unimi.it

Prof. Gianluca Fusai – Università del Piemonte Orientale – Fusai@eco.unipmn.it

Avv. Federico Gambini – avv.federicogambini@gmail.com

Prof. Gino Gandolfi – University of Parma – gino.gandolfi@unipr.it

Prof. Donald Geman – Johns Hopkins University – geman@jhu.edu

Prof. Helyette Geman – Birbeck University of London – h.geman@bbk.ac.uk

Prof. Emilio Girino – CUA Finance Department – girino@ghidini-associati.it

Prof. Martino Grasselli – Dipartimento di Matematica (University of Padova) and Finance Lab (Pole Universitaire Léonard De Vinci, Paris La Defense) – grassell@math.unipd.it

Prof. Giancarlo Giudici – Politecnico di Milano – giancarlo.giudici@polimi.it

Prof. Luigi Guiso – Einaudi Institute for Economics and Finance – guiso@tin.it

Prof. Riccardo Gusso – Ca' Foscari University of Venice – rgusso@unive.it

Prof. Marco Isopi – Sapienza University, Rome – isopi@mat.uniroma1.it

Avv. Raffaele Izzo – Studio Legale Vaiano-Izzo – r.izzo@vaianoizzo.it

Prof. Stephany Griffith Jones – Columbia University, NY – s.griffith-jones@ids.ac.uk

Prof. Markku Kallio – Aalto University School of Business – markku.kallio@aalto.fi

Prof. Vincent Kaminski – Rice University – vincent.kaminski@rice.edu

Prof. Burak Kazaz – Whitman School of Management, Syracuse University – bkazaz@syr.edu

Prof. Ruediger Kiesel – University Duisburg-Essen – ruediger.kiesel@uni-due.de

Dr. Miloš Kopa – Charles University Prague – kopa@karlin.mff.cuni.cz

Mr. Maurizio Landini – FIOM CGIL – segreteria.generale@fiom.cgil.it

Sen. Elio Lannutti – ADUSBEF – eliolannutti@adusbef.it

Avv. Paola Leocani – White&Case – Leocani.paola@gmail.com

Prof. Daniele Maffei – University of Brescia – daniele.maffei@unibs.it

Dr. Marco Malgarini – ANVUR – Italy – malgmarco@gmail.com

Prof. Tassos Malliaris – Loyola University Chicago – tmallia@luc.edu

Prof. Raimondo Manca – Sapienza University of Rome – raimondo.manca@uniroma1.it

Prof. Maddalena Manzi – Ca' Foscari University of Venice – manzi.maddalena@gmail.com

Dr. Andrea Mariani – Pegaso Pension Fund – amariani@fondopegaso.it

Prof. Marco Marini – Sapienza University of Rome – marini@dis.uniroma1.it

Prof. Massimiliano Marzo – University of Bologna – massimiliano.marzo@unibo.it

Prof. Rainer Masera – University “Guglielmo Marconi”, Rome – r.masera@unimarconi.it

Dr. Agostino Megale – FISAC-CGIL – amegale@fisac.it

Prof. Fabio Mercurio – New York University – fabiomerc@gmail.com

Dr. Federico Merola – Arpinge SPA – federicomerola@yahoo.it

Prof. Marcello Messori – LUISS, Rome – mmessori@luiss.it

Prof. Marco Minozzo – University of Verona – marco.minozzo@univr.it

Prof. Franco Molinari – Università di Trento – franco.molinari@unitn.it

Prof. John M. Mulvey – Princeton University – mulvey@princeton.edu

Prof. Marco Nicolosi – University of Perugia – marco.nicolosi@unipg.it

Prof. Salvatore Nistico – Sapienza University, Rome – salvatore.nistico@uniroma1.it

Prof. Marco Onado – Bocconi University, Milan – marco.onado@unibocconi.it

Prof. Sergio Ortobelli – University of Bergamo – sergio.ortobelli@unibg.it

Prof. Carmelo Pierpaolo Parello – Sapienza University, Rome – Carmelo.Parello@uniroma1.it

Prof. Lucia Visconti Parisio – University of Milan Bicocca – Lucia.parisio@unimib.it

Prof. Ugo Patroni Griffi – University of Bari – ugo@patronigriffi.com

Prof. Cristian Pelizzari – University of Brescia – cristian.pelizzari@unibs.it

Prof. Paolo Pellizzari – Ca' Foscari University of Venice – paolop@unive.it

Prof. Alessandro Penati – Università Cattolica di Milano – alessandro.penati@mac.com

Dr. Michele Pezzinga – Independent – mpezzinga@virgilio.it

Prof. Georg Pflug – University of Vienna – georg.pflug@univie.ac.at

Prof. Gustavo Piga – Tor Vergata University, Rome – gustavo.piga@uniroma2.it

Prof. Roberto Poli – Studio Poli e Associati – Roberto.Poli@poli-associati.net

Prof. Thierry Post – Koc University Graduate School of Business – thierrypost@hotmail.com

Prof. Andrea Pradi – University of Trento – andrea.pradi@unitn.it

Prof. Svetlozar Rachev – College of Business, Stony-Brook University – svetlozar.rachev@stonybrook.edu

Prof. Marina Resta – University of Genova – resta@economia.unige.it

Dr. Nicoletta Rocchi – Osservatorio Finanza CGIL – n.rocchi@cgil.it

Prof. Andrea Roncoroni – ESSEC Business School (Paris – Singapore) – roncoroni@essec.edu

Dr. Emilio Roncoroni – Studio Associato Politema – politema@iol.it

Prof. Ehud I. Ronn – The University of Texas at Austin – eronn@mail.utexas.edu

Prof. Francesco Rossi – University of Verona – francesco.rossi@univr.it

Avv. Marco Rossi – Studio tributario e legale associato Rossi & Partners – marco.rossi@studiorrp.it

Prof. Giulia Rotundo – Sapienza University, Rome – giulia.rotundo@uniroma1.it

Prof. Carlo Rovelli – Aix-Marseille University – rovelli@cpt.univ-mrs.fr

Prof. Wolfgang Runggaldier – University of Padova – runggal@math.unipd.it

Prof. Antonio Saitta – University of Messina – ansaitta@unime.it

Prof. Claudio Sardoni – Sapienza University of Rome – claudio.sardoni@uniroma1.it

Prof. Filippo Sartori – University of Trento – filippo.sartori@unitn.it

Prof. Pasquale Scaramozzino – SOAS, University of London – ps6@soas.ac.uk

Dr. Alfonso Scarano – ASSOTAG – scaralfonso@gmail.com

Prof. Sergio Scarlatti – Tor Vergata University Rome – sergio.scarlatti@uniroma2.it

Dr. Paolo Sironi – IBM Risk Analytics – thepsironi@yahoo.it

Prof. Mikhail Smirnov – Columbia University, NY – smirnov@math.columbia.edu

Prof. Dr. Gerhard Speckbacher – Vienna University of Economics and Business – unternehmens.fuehrung@wu.ac.at

Prof. Jaap Spronk – RSM Erasmus University, Rotterdam – jspronk@rsm.nl

Prof. Silvana Stefani – University of Milano Bicocca – silvana.stefani@unimib.it

Prof. Giorgio Szego – Sapienza University of Rome – gsz.jbf@fastwebnet.it

Prof. Paola Musile Tanzi – University of Perugia – paola.musiletanzi@unipg.it

Prof. Roberto Tasca – University of Bologna – roberto.tasca@unibo.it

Prof. Pietro Terna – University of Torino, Italy – pietro.terna@unito.it

Prof. Luisa Tibiletti – University of Torino – luisa.tibiletti@unito.it

Prof. Tomáš Tichý – VŠB-TU Ostrava – tomas.tichy@vsb.cz

Prof. Marco Tolotti – Ca' Foscari University of Venice – tolotti@unive.it

Prof. Giuseppe Torluccio – University of Bologna – giuseppe.torluccio@unibo.it

Prof. Anna Torriero – Catholic University of Milan – anna.torriero@unicatt.it

Rosario Trefiletti – FEDERCONSUMATORI – rosario.trefiletti@federconsumatori.it

Prof. Tiziano Vargiolu – University of Padova – vargiolu@math.unipd.it

Prof. Emeritus Oldřich Alfons Vašíček – oldrich.vasicek@gmail.com

Prof. On. Elio Veltri – Democrazia e Legalità – elio.veltri2004@libero.it

Dr. Antonio Viotto – FINERGIA SRL MILANO ITALY – aviotto@finrisk.it

Prof. Vincenzo Visco – NENS – vincenzo.visco@nens.it

Prof. Gerhard-Wilhelm Weber – IAM, METU – gweber@metu.edu.tr

Prof. Rafal Weron – Wroclaw University of Technology – rafal.weron@pwr.edu.pl

Prof. Zvi Wiener – The Hebrew University of Jerusalem – mzwiener@mscc.huji.ac.il

Avv. Luca Zamagni – Axiis Legal Network – zamagni@axiis.it

Prof. Stefano Zamagni – University of Bologna – stefano.zamagni@unibo.it

Prof. Vera Negri Zamagni – University of Bologna – vera.negri@unibo.it

Prof. Luca Zamparelli – Sapienza University, Rome – luca.zamparelli@uniroma1.it

Prof. Stavros A. Zenios – University of Cyprus – zenios.stavros@ucy.ac.cy

Prof. Giovanni Zambruno – Università di Milano Bicocca – giovanni.zambruno@unimib.it

Dr. Paola Zerilli – University of York – paola.zerilli@york.ac.uk

Prof. Emeritus William Ziemba – London School of Economics – wzimi@mac.com

Prof. Constantin Zopounidis – Technical University of Crete – kostas@dpem.tuc.gr

ANNEX I

SHORT-FORM OR SUMMARY DISCLOSURE OF AN HYPOTHETICAL PRIIP

CONSOB RISK-BASED APPROACH[†]

Product Description
The product has a floor of 80% and a cap of 120% of the amount invested. Its payoff depends on a formula linked to the return of a basket of three shares over the last 4 years.

Product Structure: Return-Target		
Investment Time Horizon: 4 Years		
Degree of Risk		
low	medium-low	
medium	MEDIUM-HIGH	
high	very high	
Unbundling of the price		
Riskless component	84.13%	
Risky component	10.92%	
Total financial value	95.05%	
Costs	4.95%	
Price	100%	
Table of probabilistic performance scenarios		
Scenario	Probability	Median Value (w.r.t. 100 €)
The return is negative	42.3%	88 €
The return is positive but lower than the return of the risk-free asset [‡]	13.8%	103 €
The return is positive and in line with the return of the risk-free asset	29.8%	115 €
The return is positive and higher than the return of the risk-free asset	14.1%	119 €

[†]CONSOB - Quaderno di Finanza n.63 “Un approccio quantitativo risk-based per la trasparenza dei prodotti non-equity”, April 2009.

[‡] The Overnight Index Swap (OIS) term structure is used to identify the risk-free thresholds.



MOVEMENT FOR RISK TRANSPARENCY

Response to the Consultation by EBA, EIOPA and ESMA on the Discussion Paper (JC/DP/2015/01) on “Risk, Performance Scenarios and Cost Disclosures in Key Information Documents for Packaged Retail and Insurance-based Investment Products”.

We are a group of academics, consumers associations, unions and other representatives of investors’ interests who want to express a common view about the issues regarding Packaged Retail and Insurance- based Investment Products that have been raised in the JC/DP/2015/01 consultation paper. We want to remember that on December 4th 2010 and January 31th 2011 we sent two different letters to the European Commission and to ESMA in response to two public consultations on “the selection and presentation of performance scenarios in the Key Investor Information document (KIID) for structured UCITS” and on “the legislative steps for the Packaged Retail Investment Products initiative”, expressing in both contributions our shared position about the use of the scenario analysis/valuation matrix (also known as “what-if” analysis) approach to implement the performance scenarios in the KIID for structured UCITS and PRIIPs. Also, on 17th June 2013 we submitted a public response to the IOSCO consultation on Retail Structured Products (CR05/13), highlighting our strong preference for the use of probability scenarios as a tool to properly inform the retail investor about the risks of the product. Eventually, on 16th February 2015 we reaffirmed strongly our point of view by responding to the public consultation JC/DP/2014/02 on the Key Information Document for PRIIPs. In all these letters we highlighted the inadequacy of the scenario analysis/valuation matrix as transparency tool, since it provides a partial representation of the potential returns of a structured product. We also pointed out that the natural use of the scenario analysis/valuation matrix is inside advertising pamphlets, while its unavoidable arbitrariness makes it of little use in a document (like the KIID for UCITS and the now imminent KIID for PRIIPs), especially if the final aim of the document is to provide “sufficient information for the average retail investor to make an informed investment decision”, (as previously stated in the Consultative Document on PRIIPs published by the European Commission on November 26th 2010). With the present public response, we want to confirm again our reasoned opinion about the usefulness and validity of probability scenarios by responding concretely to the majority of the questions arisen in the discussion paper.

QUESTION 1 (§ 2.2.2 CHOICE OF MODEL, CHOICE OF PARAMETERS)

Please state your preference on the general approach how a distribution of returns should be established for the risk indicator and performance scenarios' purposes. Include your considerations and caveats.

The value of any PRIIP can be represented, over the period comprised by its time horizon, by a specific stochastic process denoted by $\{S_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$. For $t = T$, the final value of the product (i.e. S_T), is a random variable whose risk-neutral density is the raw data to be analyzed in order to build both the risk indicator and the performance scenarios. The adoption of the risk-neutral measure \mathbb{Q} represents the basic methodological requirement in order to ensure that information conveyed by the risk indicator and the performance scenarios is objective, meaningful and also consistent both intrinsically (i.e. across the various indicators it encloses) and with respect to the message provided. It's only under the measure that any arbitrary assumption on the future evolution of the market variables is discarded, allowing an effective comparability across the fair prices of different PRIIPs and across their potential performances and the associated variability. This comes directly from the fact that the risk-neutral measure is the only one consistent with the no-arbitrage principle, which, in fact, provides the connection between the fair value of any contingent claim with a time horizon T and the risk-neutral probability density function of the possible final values of the contingent claim at time T . This is also the reason why market practitioners make use, in their business, of pricing and hedging models defined under the stated measure. Sometimes, especially for elementary and short-term PRIIPs, the risk-neutral density of S_T has a closed form, but in general terms it can always be determined through Monte Carlo simulation techniques¹.

QUESTION 2 (§ 2.2.2 CHOICE OF MODEL, CHOICE OF PARAMETERS)

How should the regulatory technical standards define a model and the method of choosing the model parameters for the purposes of calculating a risk measure and determining performance under a variety of scenarios? What should be the criteria used to specify the model? Should the model be prescribed or left to the discretion of the manufacturer? What should be the criteria used to specify the parameters? Should the parameters be left to the discretion of the manufacturer, specified to be in accordance with historical or current market values or set by a supervisory authority?

Most of the stochastic models used to describe the above processes (see QUESTION 1) can be chosen by the manufacturer for the purposes of calculating a risk measure and determining performance. The majority of them is defined in continuous time and then suitably discretised to perform the necessary simulations. The preference for continuous-time models stems from their greater flexibility (also in computational terms), since, also in the case of quite complex PRIIPs whose pay-offs depend on specific quantitative algorithms and are exposed to a multiplicity of risk factors, they allow a description of the dynamics of the variables of interest and the ways in which they affect the value of the PRIIP over time. With regards to the time step of the simulation, it should be reasonably short and close to the common continuous-time modeling assumptions. Weekly or daily discretisation grids are fine.

From a technical point of view, the adoption of the risk-neutral probability measure is obtained by properly inserting the simulated trajectories of the short risk-free rate into the dynamics of the process $\{S_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$, in either a direct or indirect way, depending on the characteristic of the PRIIP. For instance, where the value of the PRIIP depends, among other things, on the behavior of a share of an equity index, the trajectories of these underlying assets must be built, as is well known, by inserting into their drift component, at any step of the simulation, the value of the short risk-free rate obtained corresponding to the same time step.

¹ Glasserman P., 2004, "Monte Carlo Methods in Financial Engineering" (Springer).

Among the simplest PRIIPs, some are typically easy to model, as they usually exhibit a direct dependence on the portfolio of the underlying assets; they can be accurately represented by means of common stochastic differential equations, such as Geometric Brownian Motion, possibly slightly revised to reflect features connected to the management style adopted or (if necessary) to the stochastic term structure of the benchmark's volatility. Other PRIIPs, on the other hands, are in all respects, contingent claims, that is, PRIIPs whose payoffs structures work over a specific time horizon and are linked (often in a non-linear way) to underlying assets or reference values, according to specific formulas and subject to the fulfillment of precise conditions. This implies that stochastic models used to describe the possible patterns of the PRIIPs over time must carefully consider all relevant risk factors and the particularly way in which, depending in financial engineering choices, these factors can affect the future cash flows of the investment until the expiry of its time horizon. Parameters and variable associated with different risk factors have to be properly calibrated by the manufacturer through estimates based on current market data and by taking care of their consistency with the features of any single PRIIP and with the reality of the reference market.

Clearly, since most PRIIPs have a time horizon longer than one year, variables like interest rates, credit spreads, volatilities and correlations cannot be assumed to be constant; models used to perform simulations must therefore include a suitable set of stochastic differential equations in order to cope with this element of complexity. The same requirements are used in the models developed by market practitioners to obtain the most accurate assessments of the value of any PRIIP which they want to sell or include in their proprietary portfolios.

Risk-neutral simulations must also consider the size and the time schedule of periodic or one-off amounts paid to the investor or invested in other financial assets during the implicit time horizon of the PRIIP; simulations must also suitably deal with PRIIPs including path-dependent features which can trigger an early redemption (like callable or puttable bonds, American or Bermudan options²), the coupon size or existence or the switch to another pay-off structure (e.g. flipping the coupons from fixed to floating or vice versa).

QUESTION 3 (§ 2.2.3 TIME VALUE OF MONEY – WHAT REPRESENTS A LOSS FOR THE RETAIL INVESTOR?)

Please state your view on what benchmark should be used and why. Are there specific products or underlying investments for which a specific growth rate would be more or less applicable?

We believe, that in the methodological environment described in the answers of QUESTION 1 AND QUESTION 2, the most correct choice is *b*. *The amount invested grown at the risk-free growth rate.*

In fact, in this context the most reasonable choice is to identify the macro-events according to criteria able to immediately disclose the performance risks of a PRIIP, defined as its ability to create added value for the investor with respect to the initial outlay per se and also to the results achievable by taking an alternative investment decision. Hence, it is necessary to look for an alternative investment which minimizes any arbitrary assumption on investor's preferences and, at the same time, is able to represent in a clear, immediate and significant way how the specific risk factors and financial structure of the PRIIP will affect the payoffs that can be obtained. From this perspective, the simplest choice is to compare the risk-neutral density of the product with the density associated with the investment of the same amount of money in the risk-free asset. The latter is intended as an investment which, over the same time horizon of the PRIIP and given an initial outlay equal to the issue price (i.e. 100), pays a return equal to that accrued at the risk-free rate of the currency are where the PRIIP is sold. In finance this process is also called risk-neutral numéraire and it is modeled through the stochastic process $\{B_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ which is governed by the equation $B_T := \exp\left(\int_0^T r_s ds\right)$, which reveals that the unique source of uncertainty for the risk-free asset are the movement in the interest rate curve. Hence, the risk-neutral density of the final values of an initial investment of 100 in the risk-free asset reproduces exactly the impact of interest rate volatility on the returns of a financial investment, ensuring that the comparison with the PRIIP highlights the influence of the specific features that characterize such a PRIIP.

QUESTION 4 (§ 2.2.3 TIME VALUE OF MONEY – WHAT REPRESENTS A LOSS FOR THE RETAIL INVESTOR?)

² Hull J., 2011 "Options, Futures and Other Derivatives", 8th Edition (Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice Hall).

What would be the most reasonable approach to specify the growth rates? Would any of these approaches not work for a specific type of product or underlying investment?

We believe, that in the methodological environment described in the answers of QUESTION 1 QUESTION 2 and QUESTION 3, the most correct choice is *a. The asset grows at the risk free rate (with the hypothesis that the risk-premium is equal to zero).*

In fact, from a technical point of view, the adoption of the risk-neutral measure implies a risk premium equal to zero. The final risk-neutral probability distribution is therefore obtained by properly inserting the simulated trajectories of the short risk-free rate into the dynamics of the process $\{S_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$, in either a direct or indirect way, depending on the characteristics of the PRIIP. For instance, where the value of the PRIIP depends, among other things, on the behavior of a share or an equity index, the trajectories of these underlying assets must be built, as is well known, by inserting into their drift component, at any step of the simulation, the value of the short risk-free rate obtained corresponding to the same time step.

QUESTION 5 (§ 2.2.4 TIMEFRAME OF THE RISK AND REWARD INFORMATION)

Please state your view on what time frame or frames should the Risk Indicator and Performance Scenarios be based.

Our position on the subject is coherent more with option *c. Show the risk indicator for the recommended holding period, but include a warning or narrative text that explains the possible variation in risk over time.* Nevertheless, additional performance scenarios may be considered suitable for PRIIPs with path-dependent features which can trigger an early redemption (like callable or puttable bonds, American or Bermudan options), the coupon size or existence or the switch to another pay-off structure (e.g. flipping the coupons from fixed to floating or vice versa).

QUESTION 6 (§ 2.3.1.2 CREDIT RISK)

Do you have any views on these considerations on the assessment of credit risk, and in particular regarding the use of credit ratings?

Our view on the delicate issue of the assessment of credit risk is oriented towards the use of *credit spreads* inferred from quoted CDS or liquid bonds of the PRIIP's manufacturer, where the market is active and liquid. It is obvious that, in absence of reliable information about credit spreads, second best methodologies should come into play, such as the use of *credit ratings* of the issuer or of a comparable obligor, where available .

Anyway, we want to remark that the information to be embedded in the implied probability distribution via CDS or bonds spreads has the indisputable advantage of being always updated and reactive to the variable market conditions, having considered moreover its direct connection with the quoted prices of liquid assets. When the market volatility is high, this technical properties is of fundamental importance in the perspective of the investor protection, especially with respect to other metrics that are based on historical data or economic and accounting information, e.g. the rating estimated for the evaluation of the credit risk of the issuers of PRIIPs.

QUESTION 7 (§ 2.3.1.3 LIQUIDITY RISK)

Do you agree that liquidity issues should be reflected in the risk section, in addition to clarifications provided in other section of the KID?

We agree in full with the proposed KID scheme on liquidity risk.

QUESTION 8 (§ 2.3.1.3 LIQUIDITY RISK)

Do you consider that qualitative measures such as the ones proposed are appropriate or that they need to be supplemented with some quantitative measure to some extent? Should cost and exit penalties for early redemptions be considered a component of the liquidity risk and hence, be used to define a product as liquid or not for the KID purpose?

We believe that quantitative information is inherently more objective and less manipulable and therefore it should be exploited to the possible maximum extent. In this perspective, we advise the use of quantitative indicators like the bid-offer spreads, where a secondary market is active. However, we acknowledge that here are many situations where such information is not available or is not sufficiently reliable to be incorporated in the KID; only in these cases qualitative information should be supplemented, with clear warnings about the unavailability of more objective measures of liquidity risks.

For what regards the debate regarding the influence of costs and early redemptions penalties, we are keen to sustain that a PRIIP burdened by high exit penalties is inherently less liquid and that this feature should be reflected in the definition of an appropriate liquidity risk indicator.

QUESTION 9 (§ 2.3.3.1 INTEGRATING RISKS)

Please state Your views on the most appropriate criteria and risk levels' definition in case this approach was selected.

We don't think that the implementation of Option 1 could be feasible and improve the standard of information conveyed to the investor without the development of an objective quantitative measure of risk that integrates market and credit risk. This approach is characterized by over-reliance on qualitative measure. However, in the logic of offering a contribution also on topics we do not fully support, we consider a 6-levels scale for risks richer and theoretically more able to capture the inherent riskiness of different PRIIPs. The level of loss should be calculated with the aid of the most reliable quantitative measures (preferably volatility-based).

QUESTION 10 (§ 2.3.3.1 INTEGRATING RISKS)

Please state Your views on the required parameters and possible amendments to this indicator.

We clearly dismiss Option 2 since it appears a theoretical construction not supported by literature and empirical tests. Instead, in this context it's interesting to recognize how reliable and economic is the information connected with the full evaluation approach, since these data have been already calculated, verified and stored by the manufacturer for reasons of hedging and risk management. The benefits of exploiting this set of information in the perspective of the construction of a robust and integrated risk indicator is invaluable. More considerations on these topics are developed in the following questions.

QUESTION 11 (§ 2.3.3.1 INTEGRATING RISKS)

Please state Your views on the appropriate details to regulate this approach, should it be selected.

Our position, as expressed in the answers of QUESTION 1, QUESTION 2, QUESTION 3 AND 4, is clearly in favor of the use of forward looking simulation models, for reasons of consistency, robustness and coherency. We believe that the manufacturer has to employ the same models he uses for hedging and risk management operations in his day-to-day activities, on whose he has full control. The regulator should only supervise the process of information production, by giving guidelines and principles and controlling the quality of the information produced. By exploiting the existent and reliable internal models of the manufacturer, a final probability distribution of the potential returns is obtained, that fully incorporates all the PRIIPs relevant risk components. In this perspective, we support the *integration of credit risk via the incorporation of default scenarios into the distribution of returns.*

After having obtained the distribution of returns, we acknowledge that different measure can be consistently calculated: VaR, ES, volatility of the forward looking returns. Among these, we slightly prefer a volatility-based indicator, that appears simple and more manageable, especially if complemented with the additional information of probability scenarios (see QUESTION 15, 16, 17 AND 18).

QUESTION 12 (§ 2.3.3.1 INTEGRATING RISKS)

Please state Your views on the general principles of this approach, should it be selected. How would You like to see the risk measure and parameters, and why?

An informed evaluation about the variation proposed here cannot be released, since the methodology described is incomplete and rather obscure.

In principle, we continue to support a forward-looking approach that exploits the internal models of the manufacturer, under a general framework where the regulator gives some general technical guidelines of reference (i.e. for instance in our proposal, the adoption of a zero risk-premium and some technical standards in the Monte Carlo simulations). The models parameters must be consistent with the value of the PRIIP estimated by the manufacturer in order to ensure internal coherence, and not superimposed by the regulator; in fact we firmly believe that significant discrepancies in the evaluation process of PRIIPs between different manufacturer with proprietary models can be avoided or reduced at minimum, via a proper regulatory oversight and an inevitable market pressure towards the convergence of results.

We support the *integration of credit risks into the simulation via a Poisson distribution considering the default risk of a PRIIP*.

QUESTION 13 (§ 2.3.3.1 INTEGRATING RISKS)

Please state Your views on the potential use of a two-level indicator. What kind of differentiators should be set both for the first level and the second level of such an indicator?

We are keen to dismiss the “two-level” indicator proposal for the inherent difficulty of implementation explained in the consultation paper.

QUESTION 14 (§ 2.3.3.2 SCALE OF THE RISK INDICATOR)

Do You have suggestions or concrete proposals on which risk scale to use and where or how the cut-off points should be determined?

Our reference table to define the scale of the risk indicator is the one tested by CONSOB, the Italy’s Securities and Exchange Commission. In fact since a few years CONSOB has adopted a risk-based approach to transparency for insurance products as Index and Unit linked, which implements consistently a forward-looking probability approach³. The methodology provides a qualitative scale of risk composed by 6 sub-classes; the PRIIP is classified inside each class by calculating a volatility-based indicator, fully consistent with the rest of the information provided.

The cut-off points were determinate periodically on the basis of a complex methodology that makes extensive use of GARCH diffusive models (see note 1). An example of application of this risk scale has been provided in the answer to the consultation paper JC/DP/2014/02.

QUESTION 15 (§ 2.4.3 ASSESSMENT OF DIFFERENT APPROACHES)

Please express Your view on the assessment described above and the relative relevance of the different criteria that may be considered.

As properly expressed in other public consultations (see for instance JC/DP/2014/02) , we strongly believe that a performance scenarios can only be stated in terms of probability: transparency has to do with helping retailers to make clear the probability of success of their investments, while a what-if analysis provides a representation of a single state of the world out of an infinity of other possible ones, and as such has zero probability; collecting all scenarios and distinguishing among good, bad and fair necessarily leads to a probability approach.

We reaffirm that comparison of different products can only be done in terms of probability: in a scenario disclosure, every product is evaluated (and not measured) in a different setting and cannot be compared across different asset classes and products unless all possible scenarios are collected (and measured) in a probability table.

³ Technical details about this approach, that address the majority of the questions regarding the implementation of performance scenario via probability, can be found in Minenna M. (2011) “A Quantitative Framework to Assess the Risk-Reward Profile of Non-Equity Products”, Risk Books.

Hence we confirm again our view that performance information should not be offered through the what-if approach (even if prescribed). As clearly stated in the consultation document, out of an infinity of possible results of the investment, this approach considers three elementary outcomes, selected at the convenience of the issuer. As witnessed by several studies and by tests on large samples of individuals, this representation fosters biased beliefs, since the three elementary scenarios are perceived as exhaustive of all performances achievable by a product and they are also considered as having the same 33% probability of occurring.

We think that the probabilistic approach is a much better alternative to concretely support investors, as it encompasses the entire probability distribution of the product's final performances and summarizes it in a set of events – calculated on a time frame that is specific for each product and corresponds to the recommended holding period – of significant importance for any investor: for example experiencing a loss (negative return), or getting back the amount invested plus a return below, above or in line with the risk-free.

For what regards the costs, we believe that, given the in-house availability of the mentioned models, issuers can provide consumers with this key information without any additional burden with respect to their usual pricing and risk management activities. Eventually, the reference to the risk-neutral measure used to calculate the fair price of the product should ensure also consistency and comparability across firms and products.

We agree with the need to supplement the probability scenarios with a proper narrative; disclaimer and warning have to be put in place in order to avoid the wrong interpretation of the probabilities. This is especially true when the longer maturity of the PRIIP or the calculated results (i.e. a negative scenario with 0% probability) make difficult to correctly read the probabilities.

QUESTION 16 (§ 2.4.4.1 DEFINITION AND NUMBER OF SCENARIOS)

Do You think that these principles are sufficient to avoid the risks of manufacturers presenting a non-realistic performance picture of the product? Do You think that they should be reinforced?

We believe that what-if scenarios are very prone to be manipulated in order to magnify the investor's expectations about a PRIIP's performances. In the standard approach, where the manufacturer can choose freely the scenarios to be represented, an intended distortion of the results is straightforward. The imposition of more strict rules can improve the comparability, but not in a decisive way.

QUESTION 17 (§ 2.4.4.1 DEFINITION AND NUMBER OF SCENARIOS)

Do You think the options presented would represent appropriate performance scenarios? What other standardised scenarios may be fixed?

Our idea is that historical information about the past performances of a PRIIP should carefully be avoided, since it clearly can be misleading for the investor; past information can anyway be recovered inside a standardized synthetic risk indicator, based on returns' volatility.

The proposal to set prescriptive scenario and growth rates seem very difficult to implement, while the benefits in terms of reasonability and greater comparability appear to us at most dim.

QUESTION 18 (§ 2.4.4.1 DEFINITION AND NUMBER OF SCENARIOS)

Which percentiles do You think should be set?

A fixed partition of the probability distribution of returns as the one proposed in the consultation paper (i.e. 10%, 50%, 90%) has the undoubted advantage to be objective and simple to obtain.

Nevertheless, we want to highlight that other solutions, only marginally more complex, may show important benefits, as the immediate adaptivity to continuously changing markets conditions. **Our reference methodology is the one tested by Consob, the Italy's Securities**

and Exchange Commission. In fact since a few years Consob has adopted a risk-based approach to transparency for insurance products as Index and Unit linked, which implements consistently a forward-looking probability approach⁴.

In the Consob approach the percentiles are variable and determined by exploiting the information contained in the risk-neutral numéraire probability distribution (see answer to QUESTION 3). To conduct the partition of the probability distributions of the returns, the safest financial investment (i.e. the risk-neutral numéraire, $rfa \{B_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$) – that at the present date in Europe can be identified in the Overnight Index Swap term structure (OIS) – is adopted. It allows to identify three to four main performance scenarios (negative return and positive return respectively below, in line and above the rfa) each one identified by the associated probability and by a value (i.e. the conditional expected return of each partition) which synthesizes the returns achievable in that scenario. The methodology is also known as the *superimposition technique*⁵.

From a technical point of view, since both the probability density of the returns and that of a PRIIP are calculated under the risk-neutral measure \mathbb{Q} , it is legitimate to compare their final value and to properly define events to be quantified using this measure. The probability density of the risk-neutral numéraire at time T inherently associates a predetermined quantile of probability with a final value of this asset; in the search of a coherent set of reference thresholds, it is then possible to connect two values of α_1 and α_2 with the events “the final value of the rfa is lower than α_j ” (for $j=1,2$), in terms of probability quantiles α on the final distribution of the numéraire. This is formally stated as follows: $\mathbb{Q}[100B_T \leq \alpha_j] = P_j$ for $j=1,2$, where T denotes the investment time horizon of the PRIIP. The choice of specific quantiles P_j for $j=1,2$ on the density of the rfa to characterise the reference thresholds of the PRIIP’s probability density implicitly assumes a “cut” of a fixed percentage of the trajectories of the process of the rfa that are inevitably considered as not representative of the potential behaviour of the process itself at time T . Hence, the cutting procedure can be considered as a sort of correction aimed at excluding extreme events from the risk-neutral distribution of the risk-neutral numéraire and, to this end, the choice of the thresholds α_1 and α_2 must be related respectively to very low and very high quantiles. Moreover, in a broader sense, it is self-evident that if the original distribution of the risk-neutral numéraire is defined in an open interval like $[0, \infty[$, cuts on given quantiles are mandatory in order to effectively implement a criterion connected with the density of the rfa . In the Consob implementation, the values of α_1 and α_2 are set respectively to be the 2.5% and 97.5% percentiles. In formal terms this means that: $\mathbb{Q}[100B_T \leq \alpha_1] = 2.5\%$, $\mathbb{Q}[100B_T \leq \alpha_2] = 97.5\%$.

It’s interesting to observe that, by using this identification criterion, the reference thresholds are automatically anchored to variations in the positions and the dispersion of the density of the risk-neutral numéraire, and consequently these thresholds objectively reflect changes in the volatility of the interest rates and in the overall market conditions.

Anyway, the proposed idea of fixed percentiles can be considered a second-best option in conveying the necessary information to the investors by the means of a table.

QUESTION 19 (§ 2.4.4.1 DEFINITION AND NUMBER OF SCENARIOS)

Do You have any views on possible combinations?

We think that option c) *Probability approach (three scenarios) + an insurance event* is the best option. In fact, the baseline partition in three events (negative, neutral, positive) can be always supplemented by an additional sub-partition where the PRIIP’s financial structure requires it. This flexibility is one of the main advantages of the adoption of a probabilistic approach.

⁴ See note 3.

⁵ See note 3.

QUESTION 20 (§ 2.4.4.2 OTHER METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES TO CALCULATE PERFORMANCE IN EACH SCENARIO)

Do You think that credit events should be considered in the performance scenarios?

In coherence with what we stated in answers to QUESTION 11 and QUESTION 12, our view comprehend the inclusion of credit events in the probabilistic performance scenarios. Obviously, these occurrences of default have to be represented in the negative scenario; it's worth noticing that the proposed partition of the distribution of the returns by using fixed percentiles not necessarily assures it. Conversely, in the probabilistic approach described in the answer to QUESTION 19 not only the credit risk is fully integrated in the probability distribution of returns, but the proposed partition allows to include the defaulted scenarios always in the negative probability bucket.

QUESTION 21 (§ 2.4.4.2 OTHER METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES TO CALCULATE PERFORMANCE IN EACH SCENARIO)

Do You think that such redemption events should be considered in the performance scenarios?

Triggered redemption events connected with financial products like auto-callable or knock-out products can be easily modelled in the probabilistic framework described above; the final probability distribution of the returns would then consider the effects of those sophisticated contractual terms. More difficult, if not unfeasible, appears the modelisation of what appears to be a mere faculty of the investor, like a voluntary redemption. Inserting performance scenarios - calculated at specific times to highlight the impact of redemption events - would surely help the investor's comprehension.

QUESTION 22 (§ 2.4.4.2 OTHER METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES TO CALCULATE PERFORMANCE IN EACH SCENARIO)

Do You think that performance in the case of exit before the recommended holding period should be shown? Do You think that fair value should be the figure shown in the case of structured products, other bonds or AIFs? Do You see any other methodological issues in computing performance in several holding periods?

Again, we are talking exclusively of probability scenarios and dismissing what-if representations. From a general point of view, it could be useful adding more information related to early redemption, but it may prove technically difficult or too costly for certain products. In fact, the construction of the probability distribution of the returns at an arbitrary point in time could require in some cases the modelisation of the behaviour of all the underlying financial variables over time, an analytical and computational burden that may not worth the game.

QUESTION 69 (§ 3.1.3.2 SPECIFIC ISSUES RELATED TO CERTAIN TYPE OF COSTS: CALCULATION OF THE FAIR VALUE)

Do You agree with the general framework outlined above?

From our point of view, in order to highlight costs and fees, a proper calculation of the fair value of the PRIIP is always needed. In this way the investor will be immediately aware that any gap between price and fair value is a cost he is paying, either explicitly or not. Indeed, apart from explicit up-front charges, whose amount at the subscription date is a known constant to be immediately subtracted from the price, the discovery process of the fair value requires proper estimation of the negative impact of any cost item (whose amount is often random) applied during the time of the PRIIP.

In this perspective, we fully agree with the general framework outlined in the consultation paper.

Dr. Alberto Aghemo - Fondazione Giacomo Matteotti - info@fondazionematteottiroma.org

Dr. Giuseppe Amari - Fondazione Giuseppe Di Vittorio - g.amari@fdv.cgil.it

Prof. Flavio Angelini - University of Perugia - flavio.angelini@unipg.it

Prof. Antonio Annibali - Dip. Memotef - Univ Sapienza Roma - antonio.annibali@uniroma1.it

Prof. Amedeo Argentiero - University of Perugia - amedeo.argentiero@gmail.com

Prof. Michele Bagella - Tor Vergata University, Rome - bagella@economia.uniroma2.it

Prof. Emilio Barone - LUISS, Rome - ebarone@luiss.it

Prof. Diana Barro - Ca' Foscari University Venice - d.barro@unive.it

Prof. Christopher Baum - Boston College - baum@bc.edu
Prof. Antonella Basso - Ca' Foscari University of Venice - basso@unive.it
Prof. Francesca Beccacece - Bocconi University, Milan - francesca.beccacece@unibocconi.it
Dr. Nicola Benini - ASSOFINANCE - nicolabenini@ifaconsulting.eu
Prof. Fred Espen Benth - University of Oslo - fredb@math.uio.no
Dr. Daniele Bernardi - DIAMAN SCF - daniele@diaman.it
Dr. Franco Berti - B&B consulting - f.beriti@bebconsulting.org
Prof. Marida Bertocchi - University of Bergamo - marida.bertocchi@unibg.it
Prof. Marco Bigelli - University of Bologna - marco.bigelli@unibo.it
Ing. Giuseppe Bivona - Independent - g_bivona@yahoo.it
Prof. Francesco Bochicchio - Studio Legale Bochicchio - studiobochicchio@legalebochicchio.it
Dr. Salvatore Bragantini - Independent - sbragantini@gmail.com
Prof. Dr. Thilo Meyer-Brandis - University of Munich - t.meyer-brandis@web.de
Dr. Sandro Brunelli - University of Rome Tor Vergata - brunellisandro82@gmail.com
Dr. Susanna Camusso - CGIL - segreteria.camusso@cgil.it
Dr. Giorgio Canobbio - Concentric - g.canobbio@concentric.it
Prof. Massimiliano Caporin - University of Padova - massimiliano.caporin@unipd.it
Dr. Antonio Castagna - Iason - antonio.castagna@iasonltd.com
Prof. Rosella Castellano - University of Macerata - castellano@unimc.it
Prof. Filippo Cavazzuti - University of Bologna - filippo.cavazzuti@unibo.it
Prof. Stefano Cenni - University of Bologna - stefano.cenni@unibo.it
Avv. Massimo Cerniglia - Studio Legale Cerniglia - segreteria@studiolegalecerniglia.it
Prof. Roy Cerqueti - University of Macerata - roy.cerqueti@unimc.it
Prof. Umberto Cherubini - University of Bologna - umberto.cherubini@unibo.it
Prof. Alain Chevalier - ESCP Europe - chevalierescp@gmail.com
Prof. Giuseppe Ciccarone - Sapienza University of Rome - giuseppe.ciccarone@uniroma1.it
Prof. Andrea Consiglio - University of Palermo - andrea.consiglio@unipa.it
Prof. Giorgio Consigli - University of Bergamo - giorgio.consigli@unibg.it
Prof. Cesare Conti - Bocconi University, Milan - cesare.conti@unibocconi.it
Prof. Francesco Corielli - Bocconi University, Milan - francesco.corielli@unibocconi.it
Prof. Jaks Cvitanic - Caltech - cvitanic@hss.caltech.edu
Prof. Carlo D'Adda - University of Bologna - carlo.dadda@unibo.it
Avv. Roberto D'Atri - Ordine degli Avvocati di Roma - robertodatri@gmail.com
Prof. Rita Laura D'Ecclesia - Sapienza University, Rome - ritadec022@gmail.com
Prof. Giuseppe De Arcangelis - Sapienza University of Rome - giuseppe.dearcangelis@uniroma1.it
Prof. Giorgio Di Giorgio - LUISS University - gdg@luiss.it
Prof. Elvira Di Nardo - Università Basilicata, Potenza - elvira.dinardo@unibas.it
Prof. Carlo Ambrogio Favero - Bocconi University, Milan - carlo.favero@unibocconi.it
Prof. Gino Favero - University of Parma - gino.favero@unipr.it
Prof. Riccardo Ferretti - Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia - riccardo.ferretti@unimore.it
Dr. Antonio Foglia - Independent - AFoglia@belgrave.com
Prof. Paolo Foschi - University of Bologna - paolo.foschi2@unibo.it
Prof. Maurizio Franzini - Sapienza University, Rome - maurizio.franzini@uniroma1.it
Prof. Marco Frittelli - Università degli Studi di Milano - marco.frittelli@unimi.it
Prof. Gianluca Fusai - Università del Piemonte Orientale - Fusai@eco.unipmn.it
Avv. Federico Gambini - avv.federicogambini@gmail.com
Prof. Gino Gandolfi - University of Parma - gino.gandolfi@unipr.it
Prof. Donald Geman - Johns Hopkins University - geman@jhu.edu
Prof. Helyette Geman - Birbeck University of London - h.geman@bbk.ac.uk
Prof. Emilio Girino - CUA Finance Department - girino@ghidini-associati.it
Prof. Martino Grasselli - Dipartimento di Matematica (University of Padova) and Finance Lab (Pole Universitaire Léonard De Vinci, Paris La Defense) - grassell@math.unipd.it
Prof. Giancarlo Giudici - Politecnico di Milano - giancarlo.giudici@polimi.it
Prof. Luigi Guiso - Einaudi Institute for Economics and Finance - guiso@tin.it
Prof. Riccardo Gusso - Ca' Foscari University of Venice - rgusso@unive.it
Prof. Marco Isopi - Sapienza University, Rome - isopi@mat.uniroma1.it

Avv. Raffaele Izzo - Studio Legale Vaiano-Izzo - r.izzo@vaianoizzo.it
Prof. Stephany Griffith Jones - Columbia University, NY - s.griffith-jones@ids.ac.uk
Prof. Markku Kallio - Aalto University School of Business - markku.kallio@aalto.fi
Prof. Vincent Kaminski - Rice University - vincent.kaminski@rice.edu
Prof. Burak Kazaz - Whitman School of Management, Syracuse University - bkazaz@syr.edu
Prof. Ruediger Kiesel - University Duisburg-Essen - ruediger.kiesel@uni-due.de
Dr. Miloš Kopa - Charles University Prague - kopa@karlin.mff.cuni.cz
Mr. Maurizio Landini - Fiom CGIL - segreteria.generale@fiom.cgil.it
Sen. Elio Lannutti - ADUSBEF - eliolannutti@adusbef.it
Avv. Paola Leocani - White&Case - Leocani.paola@gmail.com
Prof. Daniele Maffei - University of Brescia - daniele.maffei@unibs.it
Dr. Marco Malgarini - ANVUR - Italy - malgmarco@gmail.com
Prof. Tassos Malliaris - Loyola University Chicago - tmallia@luc.edu
Prof. Raimondo Manca - Sapienza University of Rome - raimondo.manca@uniroma1.it
Prof. Maddalena Manzi - Ca' Foscari University of Venice - manzi.maddalena@gmail.com
Dr. Andrea Mariani - Pegaso Pension Fund - amariani@fondopegaso.it
Prof. Marco Marini - Sapienza University of Rome - marini@dis.uniroma1.it
Prof. Massimiliano Marzo - University of Bologna - massimiliano.marzo@unibo.it
Prof. Rainer Masera - University "Guglielmo Marconi", Rome - r.masera@unimarconi.it
Dr. Agostino Megale - FISAC-CGIL - amegale@fisac.it
Prof. Fabio Mercurio - New York University - fabiomerc@gmail.com
Dr. Federico Merola - Arpinge SPA - federicomerola@yahoo.it
Prof. Marcello Messori - LUISS, Rome - mmessori@luiss.it
Prof. Marco Minozzo - University of Verona - marco.minozzo@univr.it
Prof. Franco Molinari - Università di Trento - franco.molinari@unitn.it
Prof. John M. Mulvey - Princeton University - mulvey@princeton.edu
Prof. Marco Nicolosi - University of Perugia - marco.nicolosi@unipg.it
Prof. Salvatore Nistico - Sapienza University, Rome - salvatore.nistico@uniroma1.it
Prof. Marco Onado - Bocconi University, Milan - marco.onado@unibocconi.it
Prof. Sergio Ortobelli - University of Bergamo - sergio.ortobelli@unibg.it
Prof. Carmelo Pierpaolo Parello - Sapienza University, Rome - Carmelo.Parello@uniroma1.it
Prof. Lucia Visconti Parisio - University of Milan Bicocca - Lucia.parisio@unimib.it
Prof. Ugo Patroni Griffi - University of Bari - ugo@patronigriffi.com
Prof. Cristian Pelizzari - University of Brescia - cristian.pelizzari@unibs.it
Prof. Paolo Pellizzari - Ca' Foscari University of Venice - paolop@unive.it
Prof. Alessandro Penati - Università Cattolica di Milano - alessandro.penati@mac.com
Dr. Michele Pezzinga - Independent - mpezzinga@virgilio.it
Prof. Georg Pflug - University of Vienna - georg.pflug@univie.ac.at
Prof. Gustavo Piga - Tor Vergata University, Rome - gustavo.piga@uniroma2.it
Prof. Roberto Poli - Studio Poli e Associati - Roberto.Poli@poli-associati.net
Prof. Thierry Post - Koc University Graduate School of Business - thierrypost@hotmail.com
Prof. Andrea Pradi - University of Trento - andrea.pradi@unitn.it
Prof. Svetlozar Rachev - College of Business, Stony-Brook University - svetlozar.rachev@stonybrook.edu
Prof. Marina Resta - University of Genova - resta@economia.unige.it
Dr. Nicoletta Rocchi - Osservatorio Finanza CGIL - n.rocchi@cgil.it
Prof. Andrea Roncoroni - ESSEC Business School (Paris - Singapore) - roncoroni@essec.edu
Dr. Emilio Roncoroni - Studio Associato Politema - politema@iol.it
Prof. Francesco Rossi - University of Verona - francesco.rossi@univr.it
Avv. Marco Rossi - Studio tributario e legale associato Rossi & Partners - marco.rossi@studiorrp.it
Prof. Giulia Rotundo - Sapienza University, Rome - giulia.rotundo@uniroma1.it
Prof. Carlo Rovelli - Aix-Marseille University - rovelli@cpt.univ-mrs.fr
Prof. Wolfgang Runggaldier - University of Padova - runggal@math.unipd.it
Prof. Antonio Saitta - University of Messina - ansaitta@unime.it
Prof. Claudio Sardoni - Sapienza University of Rome - claudio.sardoni@uniroma1.it
Prof. Filippo Sartori - University of Trento - filippo.sartori@unitn.it
Prof. Pasquale Scaramozzino - SOAS, University of London - ps6@soas.ac.uk

Dr. Alfonso Scarano - ASSOTAG - scaralfonso@gmail.com
Prof. Sergio Scarlatti - Tor Vergata University Rome - sergio.scarlatti@uniroma2.it
Dr. Paolo Sironi - IBM Risk Analytics - thepsironi@yahoo.it
Prof. Mikhail Smirnov - Columbia University, NY - smirnov@math.columbia.edu
Prof. Dr. Gerhard Speckbacher - Vienna University of Economics and Business - unternehmens.fuehrung@wu.ac.at
Prof. Jaap Spronk - RSM Erasmus University, Rotterdam - jspronk@rsm.nl
Prof. Silvana Stefani - University of Milano Bicocca - silvana.stefani@unimib.it
Prof. Giorgio Szego - Sapienza University of Rome - gsz.ibf@fastwebnet.it
Prof. Paola Musile Tanzi - University of Perugia - paola.musiletanzi@unipg.it
Prof. Roberto Tasca - University of Bologna - roberto.tasca@unibo.it
Prof. Pietro Terna - University of Torino, Italy - pietro.terna@unito.it
Prof. Luisa Tibiletti - University of Torino - luisa.tibiletti@unito.it
Prof. Tomáš Tichý - VŠB-TU Ostrava - tomas.tichy@vsb.cz
Prof. Marco Tolotti - Ca' Foscari University of Venice - tolotti@unive.it
Prof. Giuseppe Torluccio - University of Bologna - giuseppe.torluccio@unibo.it
Prof. Anna Torriero - Catholic University of Milan - anna.torriero@unicatt.it
Rosario Trefiletti - FEDERCONSUMATORI - rosario.trefiletti@federconsumatori.it
Prof. Tiziano Vargiolu - University of Padova - vargiolu@math.unipd.it
Prof. Emeritus Oldřich Alfons Vašíček - oldrich.vasicek@gmail.com
Prof. On. Elio Veltri - Democrazia e Legalità - elio.veltri2004@libero.it
Dr. Antonio Viotto - FINERGIA SRL MILANO ITALY - aviotto@finrisk.it
Prof. Vincenzo Visco - NENS - vincenzo.visco@nens.it
Prof. Gerhard-Wilhelm Weber - IAM, METU - gweber@metu.edu.tr
Prof. Rafal Weron - Wroclaw University of Technology - rafal.weron@pwr.edu.pl
Prof. Zvi Wiener - The Hebrew University of Jerusalem - mzwiener@mscc.huji.ac.il
Avv. Luca Zamagni - Axis Legal Network - zamagni@axis.it
Prof. Stefano Zamagni - University of Bologna - stefano.zamagni@unibo.it
Prof. Vera Negri Zamagni - University of Bologna - vera.negri@unibo.it
Prof. Luca Zamparelli - Sapienza University, Rome - luca.zamparelli@uniroma1.it
Prof. Stavros A. Zenios - University of Cyprus - zenios.stavros@ucy.ac.cy
Prof. Giovanni Zambruno - Università di Milano Bicocca - giovanni.zambruno@unimib.it
Dr. Paola Zerilli - University of York - paola.zerilli@york.ac.uk
Prof. Emeritus William Ziemba - London School of Economics - wzimi@mac.com
Prof. Constantin Zopounidis - Technical University of Crete - kostas@dpem.tuc.gr