### THE PRICE OF RISK: LOOKING BACK AND FORWARD!

Risk on, risk off...

#### The "One" Metric

- Investors are often in search of a single metric that will tell them whether a market is under or over valued, and consequently whether they should buying or selling holdings in that market.
- With equities, the metric that has been in use the longest is the PE ratio, modified in recent years to the CAPE, where earnings are normalized (by averaging over time) and sometimes adjusted for inflation.
  - That metric, though, has been signaling that stocks are over valued for most of the last decade, a ten-year period when stocks delivered blockbuster returns.
  - The failures of the signal have been variously attributed to low interest rates, accounting mis-measurement of earnings (especially at tech companies), and by some, to animal spirits.
- In this post, I offer an alternative, albeit a more complicated, metric that I believe not only offers a more comprehensive measure of pricing levels, but also a barometer of the ups and downs in the market in 2020.

#### The PE Ratio: The Lazy Investment Metric



#### And the reason its failed...



#### E/P Ratios, T.Bond Rates and Term Structure



Earnings to Price versus Interest Rates: S&P 500

### The Price of Risk

Risk Premium	This is the "extra" return you demand for investing in a risky investment. It will be a function of (a) how risk averse you are, with premium increasing with risk aversion. (b) how much risk is perceive in the investment, with premium higher for riskier investments.
Risk free Rate	Expected return on an investment with guaranteed cash flows

#### **Basic Propositions**

- 1. <u>Risk premiums can be estimated</u>: If you can observe the price that an investor pays for a risky asset, and are willing to estimate the expected cash flows on that asset, you can estimate the expected return on that asset and net out the risk free asset to arrive at a risk premium.
- 2. <u>Risk premiums can and will change over time</u>: Risk premiums are driven by risk aversion, and risk aversion itself can change over time. In fact, greed and fear, two big drivers of market prices, also affect risk aversion, with investors becoming more risk averse and charging higher premiums, when the fear factor becomes dominant.
- 3. When risk premiums change, prices will move: As risk premiums change, the prices that investors are willing to pay for risky assets will also change, with the two moving in opposite directions. Intuitively, if you want to earn a higher risk premium on an investment, holding cash flows fixed, you will pay less for that investment today.

## Price of Risk in Bond Markets

The Default Spread

#### Corporate Bonds: The Price of Risk

If you accept the proposition that a bond with default risk is riskier than an otherwise equivalent bond (same coupon and maturity) issued by a default-free entity, the price of risk in the bond market can be measured by looking at the differences in yields between the two bonds.

Yield to Maturity on a Bond: Mechanics and Intuition

**The Intuition**: If you the bond today, and the promised cash flows get delivered, this is the return you will earn on the bond over its maturity. If you pay a higher price, you will earn a lower expected return (yield to maturity).

Bond Price today = 
$$\frac{Coupon_1}{(1+r)} + \frac{Coupon_2}{(1+r)^2} + \frac{Coupon_3}{(1+r)^3} \dots \dots + \frac{Face Value of Bond}{(1+r)^n}$$

**The Mechanics:** The **yield to maturity** is that discount rate that yields a present value of cash flows = bond price today

#### Corporate Bond Spreads: Jan 2021 vs Jan 2020



10

#### After a roller coaster ride in 2020



		Yields and Spreads on Corporates							
	Spr	ead over 10	-yr Treasury	/	Yield on Corporate				
S&P Bond Rating	12/31/19	2/14/20	3/20/20	12/31/20	12/31/19	2/14/20	3/20/20	12/31/20	
AAA	0.63%	0.69%	1.43%	0.73%	2.55%	2.28%	2.35%	1.61%	
AA	0.48%	0.72%	2.64%	0.80%	2.40%	2.31%	3.56%	1.68%	
A	0.73%	0.80%	3.15%	0.84%	2.65%	2.39%	4.07%	1.72%	
ввв	1.27%	1.33%	3.73%	1.57%	3.19%	2.92%	4.65%	2.45%	
BB	1.85%	1.93%	7.45%	3.49%	3.77%	3.52%	8.37%	4.37%	
В	3.40%	3.40%	10.74%	5.24%	5.32%	4.99%	11.66%	6.12%	
CCC or lower	9.86%	9.65%	17.81%	10.83%	11.78%	11.24%	18.73%	11.71%	

#### Are spreads too low? Comparing to history

Year	AAA	BBB	CCC& Lower
12/31/97	0.42%	0.93%	6.52%
12/31/98	0.62%	1.71%	9.22%
12/31/99	0.75%	1.53%	12.92%
12/31/00	0.98%	2.66%	16.29%
12/31/01	0.70%	2.22%	21.00%
12/31/02	1.02%	2.70%	20.69%
12/31/03	0.61%	1.30%	12.96%
12/31/04	0.55%	1.13%	7.99%
12/31/05	0.61%	1.21%	7.58%
12/31/06	0.56%	1.22%	6.20%
12/31/07	1.22%	2.45%	5.87%
12/31/08	3.43%	7.84%	16.75%
12/31/09	0.77%	2.48%	19.91%
12/31/10	0.66%	2.11%	10.18%
12/31/11	0.87%	3.15%	10.31%
12/31/12	0.64%	2.04%	11.04%
12/31/13	0.60%	1.74%	8.27%
12/31/14	0.65%	1.98%	7.57%
12/31/15	0.75%	2.41%	10.98%
12/31/16	0.71%	1.66%	14.37%
12/31/17	0.54%	1.28%	8.60%
12/31/18	0.78%	2.02%	7.67%
12/31/19	0.52%	1.30%	9.92%
12/31/20	0.55%	1.30%	12.61%
High	3.43%	7.84%	21.00%
Average	0.81%	2.10%	11.48%
Median	0.66%	1.86%	10.24%
Low	0.42%	0.93%	5.87%

#### And to default rates...



## Price of Risk in Equity Markets

#### Backward looking versus Forward looking

#### Equities: The Price of Risk

- Equities are riskier than bonds (or at least most bonds), and it stands to reason that there is a price of risk bearing in the equity markets.
- While that price has a name, i.e., the equity risk premium, it is more difficult to observe and estimate than the default spread in bond markets. The simple reason is that unlike a bond, which comes with specified coupons, the cash flows that you receive when you buy stocks are neither pre-specified nor guaranteed.
- This difficulty in observing the equity risk premium leads many to look backwards, when asked to estimate the equity risk premium.

#### **Historical ERP**



16

#### The perils of trusting the past.....

Noisy estimates: Even with long time periods of history, the risk premium that you derive will have substantial standard error. For instance, if you go back to 1928 (about 90 years of history) and you assume a standard deviation of 20% in annual stock returns, you arrive at a standard error of greater than 2%:

Standard Error in Premium =  $20\%/\sqrt{90} = 2.1\%$ 

Survivorship Bias: Using historical data from the U.S. equity markets over the twentieth century does create a sampling bias. After all, the US economy and equity markets were among the most successful of the global economies that you could have invested in early in the century.

#### An Alternative...



#### The ERP on January 1, 2021



## The Anatomy of a Crisis: Implied ERP from September 12, 2008 to January 1, 2009



Aswath Damodaran

20

#### And a more recent crisis... A wild ride in 2020



21

## ERP and Market Judgments

Backward looking versus Forward looking

#### A Market Gauge?

- As we are engulfed by talk of market bubbles and corrections, it is worth nothing that any question about the overall market can really be reframed as a question about the implied equity risk premium.
  - If you believe that the current implied equity risk premium is too low, you are in effect also saying that stocks are overvalued, just as a judgment that the equity risk premium is too high is equivalent to arguing that stocks are undervalued.
  - So, at 4.72%, is the equity risk premium too low and is the market in a bubble?

#### **Comparison to History**



#### But....



#### Equity Risk Premiums and Bond Default Spreads



# Equity Risk Premiums and Cap Rates (Real Estate)



# ERP in Valuation: Choices and Consequences

Backward looking versus Forward looking

#### The Status Quo

- Analysts and appraisers have generally relied on historical equity risk premiums, and often three reasons for doing so:
  - Mean reversion, and that future risk premiums will revert back to what they used to be in the past
  - Defensibility, because, when challenged about the source, you can point to data.
  - Consistency, i.e., that everyone uses that numbers.
- □ Each of these arguments has a fatal flaw:
  - Mean reversion works only if there have been no structural breaks in the system.
  - Historical risk premiums are still estimates, not facts
  - You can be consistent and biased

### Why implied premiums matter?

- In many investment banks, it is common practice (especially in corporate finance departments) to use historical risk premiums (and arithmetic averages at that) as risk premiums to compute cost of equity. If all analysts in the department used the arithmetic average premium (for stocks over T.Bills) for 1928-2020 of 8.28% to value stocks in January 2021, given the implied premium of 4.72%, what are they likely to find?
  - a. The values they obtain will be too low (most stocks will look overvalued)
  - b. The values they obtain will be too high (most stocks will look under valued)
  - c. There should be no systematic bias as long as they use the same premium to value all stocks.
- What if analysts are using the historical geometric average premium of 4.83% from 1928 to 2020 as their ERP?

#### Which equity risk premium should you use?

#### If you assume this

Premiums revert back to historical norms and your time period yields these norms

Market is correct in the aggregate or that your valuation should be market neutral

### Marker makes mistakes even in the aggregate but is correct over time

#### Premium to use

Historical risk premium

Current implied equity risk premium

Average implied equity risk premium over time.

Predictor	Correlation with implied	Correlation with actual	Correlation with actual return		
	premium next year	return- next 5 years	– next 10 years		
Current implied premium	0.763	0.427	0.500		
Average implied premium: Last 5	0.718	0.326	0.450		
years					
Historical Premium	-0.497	-0.437	-0.454		
Default Spread based premium	0.047	0.143	0.160		

### Extensions of the ERP

#### Backward looking versus Forward looking

### Valuation Garnishes: The ERP Check

- In valuation, it has become common practice to adjust discount rates for "missing" risk factors. These include:
  - Small cap premiums, where "small" companies are given higher discount rates
  - Illiquidity premiums, where "less liquid" or "private" companies have higher discount rates
  - Company specific risk premiums, which are basically made-up numbers to get to a discount rate you wanted to in the first place.
- □ These premiums are usually justified on two grounds:
  - Historical risk premiums for the factor in question (Small Cap, Illiquid)
  - Everyone does it.

#### The Ubiquitous Small Cap Premium

Figure 4: The Small Cap Premium from 1927 to 2019: Smallest versus Largest Deciles



-75.00%

The Counter: Between 1981 and 2019, small cap stocks have earned about 0.19% less than the average stock. There has been no small cap premium for four decades.

#### And an implied ERP approach to estimating it...

- The implied ERP for the S&P 500, composed of large cap stocks, as of January 2021, was4.72%.
- On January 1, 2021, the S&P 600, S&P's small cap index was trading at 1118.93, with aggregated dividends and buybacks amounting to 2.02% (22.60 in index terms) of the index in the trailing 12 months. Earnings were expected to bounce back in 2021 and 2022, before settling into lower growth. Allowing for an increase in cash payout, as the growth rate decreases over time, yields the following equation: 1118.93

 $= \frac{34.83}{(1+r)} + \frac{46.67}{(1+r)^2} + \frac{55.47}{(1+r)^3} + \frac{64.43}{(1+r)^4} + \frac{73.55}{(1+r)^5} + \frac{73.55(1.0093)}{(r-.0093)(1+r)^5}$ 

- □ Solving for the expected return, we get:
  - Expected return on small cap stocks = 6.86%
  - Implied equity risk premium for small cap stocks = 6.86% -0.93% = 5.93%
- □ Small cap premium in January 2021 = 5.93% 4.72% = 1.21%
- □ Small cap premium in January 2020 = 4.00% 5.24% = -1.24%

#### Sector Risk

- In standard practice, we differentiate expected returns across companies and sectors, by estimating a measure of relative risk (like beta):
  - Expected Return = Risk free Rate + Beta (ERP)
  - This, of course, then opens up a debate about beta as a measure of risk and its numerous weaknesses both as a risk measure and how you measure it.
- If this debate exhausts you, as it does me, you could skip the entire process and let the market tell you the implied expected return for a sector.

## Example: Estimating the Risk Premium for Banks in October 2008

- In October 2008, we were in the throes of a market crisis, with banks at the center of the action. In effect, there was a clear sense that banks, historically viewed as safe investments, had transitioned to becoming much riskier, relative to the market.
- Using a beta for a bank, based upon historical data, would therefore yield too low an expected return for the future, given that shift.
- As an alternative, I estimate the expected return, using the ERP approach.

#### Bank ERP

- In September 2008, I took a look at the S&P Commercial Bank index, which was trading at 318.26 on September 12, 2008, with an expected dividend yield of 5.83% for the next 12 months.
- Assuming that these dividends will grow at 4% a year for the next 5 years and 3.60% (the treasury bond rate) thereafter, well below the nominal growth rate in the overall economy, we arrived at the following equation:

 $318.26 = \frac{19.30}{(1+r)} + \frac{20.07}{(1+r)^2} + \frac{20.87}{(1+r)^3} + \frac{21.71}{(1+r)^4} + \frac{22.57}{(1+r)^5} + \frac{22.57(1.036)}{(r-.036)(1+r)^5}$ 

- Solving for the expected return yields a value of 9.74%, which when netted out against the riskfree rate at the time (3.60%) yields an implied premium for the sector:
  - Expected return on a Bank (cost of equity) = 9.74%
  - Implied ERP for Banking in September 2008 = 9.74% 3.60% = 6.14%

## Going Global?

**Country Risk and ERP** 

## Expanding to a global mindset: An approach for estimating equity risk premiums for other markets

- Country ratings measure default risk. While default risk premiums and equity risk premiums are highly correlated, one would expect equity spreads to be higher than debt spreads.
- Another is to multiply the bond default spread by the relative volatility of stock and bond prices in that market. Using this approach for Brazil in January 2021, you would get:
  - Country Equity risk premium = Default spread on country bond\*  $\sigma_{Country}$ Equity /  $\sigma_{Country Bond}$ 
    - Standard Deviation in Bovespa (Equity) = 30%
    - Standard Deviation in Brazil government bond = 20%
    - Default spread for Brazil= 2.65%
  - Brazil Country Risk Premium = 2.65% (30%/20%) = 3.98%
  - Brazil Total ERP = Mature Market Premium + CRP = 4.72% + 3.98% = 8.70%

#### A Template for Estimating the ERP



ERP : Jan 2021	
Canada United S North Ar	

	Andor	ra	Caal	7.26%	11.98%	Ita	aly	Ba	aa3	2.	13%
	Austri	a	Aal	0.38%	5.10%	Je	rsey	A	aa	0.0	00%
X	Belgiu	m	Aa3	0.59%	5.31%	Li	echtenstein	A	aa	0.0	00%
$\Sigma$	Cypru	s	Ba2	2.91%	7.63%	L	ixembourg	A	aa	0.0	00%
	Denme	ark	Agg	0.00%	4 72%	M	alta	4	2	0.5	87%
7	Einlan	4	Aal	0.0070	5 100	N	ath arlanda	-		0.4	000
5	rinian	u	Aai	0.36%	5.10%	IN	emeriands	A	88	0.0	JU %
5	France	)	Aa2	0.48%	5.20%	N	orway	A	aa	0.0	00%
2	Germa	ny	Aaa	0.00%	4.72%	P	ortugal	Ba	ta3	2.	13%
• •	Greece		Ba3	3.49%	8.21%	S	pain	Ba	a1	1.	55%
	Guern	sey	Aaa	0.00%	4.72%	S	weden	A	aa	0.0	00%
~	Iceland	1	A2	0.82%	5.54%	S	witzerland	A	aa	0.0	00%
L	Ireland	1	A2	0.82%	5 54%	T	irkey	B	2	5	33%
11i	Isla of	Man	1.2	0.0270	5 210	11	w key	1	02	0.4	500
-	Isle of	Man	Aab	0.39%	3.51%	0	K.	A	аз	0	3970
						w	estern Euro	pe	8	0.	84%
		_			_		1 p				
Canada	2	Aaa	0.009	6 4.729	Ж		0				
United S	States	Aaa	0.009	6 4.729	%		2				
North A	merica		0.009	6 4.729	6	-					
		-		1			3				
Caribbea	in		5.31%	10.039	6 1	1	Country		Ratir	ng	CR
					-	2	Angola	-	Caa	1	7.20
Argenti	na	Ca	11.629	6 16.349	%	11	Botswana	+	A2	i	0.82
Belize		Caa3	9.68%	14.409	%	-	Burkina Faso		B2	2	5.33
Bolivia		B2	5.33%	10.059	%		Cameroon	$\rightarrow$	B2	_	5.33
Brazil		Ba2	2.91%	7.639	%		Congo (DR)	-	Caa	1	7.26
Chile	-	Al	0.68%	5 409			Congo (Rep o	f)	Caa	2	8.72
Colomb	via	Rag?	1 84%	6 569	70 72		Côte d'Ivoire	_	Ba	3	3.49
Costa P	lica	R2	5 3366	10.050	72		Egypt Ethiopia	+	B2 B2		5.33
Emado	r	Can2	0.690	14 400	70		Gabon	-	Caa	1	7.26
Ecuado	1	Caab	9.00%	14.403	70		Ghana		B3		6.30
El Salva	ador	DO	0.30%	11.023	70		Kenya	+	B2		5.33
Guatem	ala	Bal	2.42%	/.145	20		Morocco	-	Bal	1	2.42
Hondur	as	BI	4.36%	9.089	20		Mozambique		Caa	2	8.72
Mexico		Baal	1.55%	6.279	%		Namibia	_	Ba	3	3.49
Nicarag	ua	<b>B</b> 3	6.30%	11.029	%		Nigeria	-	B3 B2		5.33
Panama	1	Baal	1.55%	6.279	%		Rwanda		B2		5.33
Paragua	ay	Bal	2.42%	7.149	76		Senegal		Ba	3	3.49
Peru		A3	1.16%	5.889	76		South Africa Swaziland	+	Baa	2	6.30
Surinan	ne	Caa3	9.68%	14.409	Ж		Tanzania	+	B2		5.33
Urugua	y	B1	4.36%	9.089	%		Togo		<b>B</b> 3		6.30
Venezu	ela	С	19.18%	6 23.909	%		Tunisia	-	B2		5.33
Latin A	merica		3.99%	8.71%	s n		Zambia	+	Ca	-	11.6
							Africa				4.94

ey	H	32	5.	33%	1	0.05%	1
	A	a3	0.	59%		5.31%	6
tern Euro	pe		0.	84%	5	5.56%	
8					/	7	2
ountry		Rati	ng	CRF	>	ERP	
ngola		Ca	al	7.26	‰	11.989	6
enin		B	2	5.33	Ж	10.059	6
otswana		A	2	0.829	%	5.549	6
ırkina Faso	8 1	B	2	5.33	%	10.059	6
ameroon		B	2	5.33	%	10.059	6
ape Verde		B	2	5.33	Ж	10.059	6
ongo (DR)		Ca	al	7.26	Ж	11.989	6
ongo (Rep o	(f	Ca	a2	8.72	‰	13.449	6
ote d'Ivoire		Ba	3	3.49	Ж	8.219	6
gypt		B	2	5.33	‰	10.059	6
hiopia		B	2	5.33	Ж	10.059	6
abon		Ca	al	7.26	Ж	11.989	6
hana		B	3	6.30	‰	11.029	6
enya		B	2	5.33	Ж	10.059	6
ali		Ca	al	7.26	Ж	11.989	6
orocco		Bal		2.42	Ж	7.149	6
ozambique	2	Ca	a2	8.72	Ж	13.449	6
amibia		Ba	3	3.49	Ж	8.219	ъ
iger		B	3	6.30	Ж	11.029	ъ
igeria		B	2	5.33	‰	10.059	6
wanda		B	2	5.33	Ж	10.059	6
enegal		Ba	3	3.49	Ж	8.219	6
outh Africa	8	Ba	2	2.919	%	7.639	6
waziland		B	3	6.30	%	11.029	6
inzania		B	2	5.33	Ж	10.059	6
ogo		B	3	6.30	Ж	11.029	6
inisia		B	2	5.33	Ж	10.059	6
ganda		B	2	5.33	76	10.059	6
mbia		C	a	11.62	%	16.349	6
rica				4.94	%	9.66%	

6.85%

4.72%

4.72% 4.72%

5.54%

4.72%

4.72%

6.85%

6.27%

4.72%

4.72%

				_		
Albania	B1	4.	36%	9.0	8%	Ē
Armenia	Ba3	3.	49%	8.2	1%	1
Azerbaijan	Ba2	2.	91%	7.6	3%	
Belarus	B3	6.	30%	11.0	2%	
Bosnia & Herzegovina	B3	6.	30%	11.0	2%	
Bulgaria	Baal	1.	55%	6.2	7%	1
Croatia	Bal	2.	42%	7.1	4%	
Czech Republic	Aa3	0.	59%	5.3	1%	-
Estonia	A1	0.	68%	5.4	0%	-
Georgia	Ba2	2.	91%	7.6	3%	
Hungary	Baa3	2.	13%	6.8	5%	1
Kazakhstan	Baa3	2.	13%	6.8	5%	1
Kyrgyzstan	B2	5.	33%	10.0	5%	-
Latvia	A3	1.	16%	5.8	8%	
Lithuania	A3	1.	16%	5.8	8%	
Macedonia	Ba3	3.	49%	8.2	1%	1
Moldova	B3	6.	30%	11.0	2%	2
Montenegro	B1	4.	36%	9.0	8%	
Poland	A2	0.	82%	5.5	4%	
Romania	Baa3	2.	13%	6.8	5%	
Russia	Baa3	2.	13%	6.8	5%	
Serbia	Ba3	3.	49%	8.2	1%	
Slovakia	A2	0.	82%	5.5	4%	
Slovenia	A3	1.	16%	5.8	8%	-
Tajikistan	B3	6.	30%	11.0	2%	n
Ukraine	B3	6.	30%	11.0	2%	1
Uzbekistan	Baa2	1.2	84%	6.5	6%	2
E. Europe & Russia		2.	08%	6.8	0%	1
1 /0	5					
Abu Dhabi	Aa	12	0.4	8%	5.	20%
Bahrain	B	2	5.3	3%	10.	.05%
Iraq	Ca	al	7.2	6%	11.	98%
Israel	A	1	0.6	8%	5.	.40%
Jordan	В	1	4.3	6%	9.	08%
Kuwait	A	1	0.6	8%	5.	.40%
Lebanon	C	1	19.1	8%	23.	90%
Oman	Ba	3	3.4	9%	8.	21%
Qatar	Aa	13	0.5	9%	5.	31%
Ras Al Khaima	Aa	ła	0.0	0%	4.	72%
Saudi Arabia	A	1	0.6	8%	5.	40%
Sharjah	Ba	a2	1.8	4%	6.	56%
United Arab Emirate	s Aa	12	0.4	8%	5.	20%
Middle East	2		1.5	3%	6.	25%

Ce	ountry		PRS	_	CRP		ER	P	l
	geria	5	57.25	5	8.729	6	13.44	4%	ł
B	runei		80	_	0.829	6	5.54	%	ł
G	ambia	e	53.75	>	6.309	6	11.0.	2%	ł
G	uinea Dissou		53.5	_	11.62	70	16.34	476	ł
G	uinea-Bissau		62		F 229	0	10.0	570	ł
G L	uyana		3 75		3.337	2	16.3	19/	ł
In	20		0 25	;	9 729	~	13.4	4.70	ł
K	area DPR		50.75		11 62	8 86	16.3	196	ł
Li	beria		53.5		11.62	×	16.3	196	t
Li	bva		58.25	5	8.729	6	13.4	4%	1
M	ladagascar	6	53.25	5	6.309	6	11.0	2%	1
M	lalawi	5	58.75	5	8.729	6	13.4	4%	1
M	lyanmar	6	53.75	5	6.309	6	11.0	2%	1
Si	erra Leone	5	58.75	5	8.729	6	13.4	4%	1
s	omalia		50.5		11.62	ж	16.34	4%	
Sι	udan	10	88.25	5	19.18	Ж	23.9	0%	
S	/ria		47		19.18	Ж	23.90	0%	l
Υe	emen, Republic		50		19.18	%	23.9	0%	l
Zi	mbabwe	5	52.25	5	11.62	Ж.	16.34	4%	
	10				-			_	
	Bangladesh		Ba3		3.49%	5	3.21%		
3	Cambodia		B2		5.33%	10	0.05%		
	China		A1		0.68%	-	5.40%		
	Fiji		Ba3		3.49%	8	3.21%		
	Hong Kong		Aa3		0.59%	4	5.31%		
C	India		Baa	3	2.13%	(	5.85%		
1	Indonesia		Baa	2	1.84%	(	5.56%		
1	Janan		A1		0.68%	4	5.40%		
2	Korea	-	A 97		0.48%	4	5 20%		
١.	Loos	-	Can		9 726	12	2 4 4 6%		
1	Laus	_	Caa	-	0.7270	1.	210		
1	Macao	_	Aas		0.39%	-	0.31%		
3	Malaysia		A3		1.16%	-	5.88%		
	Maldives		B3	_	6.30%	11	1.02%		
	Mauritius		Baal	L	1.55%	(	5.27%		
	Mongolia		B3		6.30%	11	1.02%		
	Pakistan		<b>B</b> 3		6.30%	11	1.02%		
1	Papua New Guine	a	B2		5.33%	10	0.05%		
	Philippines		Baa	2	1.84%	(	5.56%		
	Singapore		Aaa		0.00%	1	172%	_	
	Solomon Islands		R3		6 30%	11	0.2%		
1	Sri Lanka	-	Carl		7.260	11	0.0270		
	JII Lalika	_	Caa	-	0.50%	1	.210		
	Talwan		Aas		0.59%	-	0.31%		
	Thailand		Baa	L	1.55%	(	5.27%		
	Vietnam		Ba3		3.49%	5	3.21%		
1									
۱r	A				0000		70.00	1	
1L	Australia	4	Aaa	(	»,00%	4	.12%	-	

%	Australia	Aaa	0.00%	4.72%
%	Cook Islands	<b>B1</b>	4.36%	9.08%
%	New Zealand	Aaa	0.00%	4.72%
%	Australia & NZ		0.00%	4.72%

Blue: Moody's Rating Red: Added Country Risk Green #: Total ERP

Extending to a multinational: Regional breakdown Coca Cola's revenue breakdown and ERP in 2012

Region	Revenues	Total ERP	CRP
Western Europe	19%	6.67%	0.67%
Eastern Europe & Russia	5%	8.60%	2.60%
Asia	15%	7.63%	1.63%
Latin America	15%	9.42%	3.42%
Australia	4%	6.00%	0.00%
Africa	4%	9.82%	3.82%
North America	40%	6.00%	0.00%
Coca Cola	100%	7.14%	1.14%

Things to watch out for

1. Aggregation across regions. For instance, the Pacific region often includes Australia & NZ wit

2. AObscure aggregations including Eurasia and Oceania

#### The Bottom Line

- The price of risk is a market-set number in any risky asset market, and it will move up and down depending upon investor risk aversion and concerns/hopes about the economy.
- Since the price of risk is market-set and dynamic, it makes little sense to estimate it by looking backwards at historical data, especially given the noise in stock returns. The implied ERP is a dynamic, forward-looking estimate of the risk premium in equity markets.
- Using the implied ERP approach also provides insights on market timing, asset allocation and a clear-eyed measure of premiums like the small cap or illiquidity premiums often attached to discount rates.