



DETERMINING THE GEOMETRIC MEAN RETURN PROFILE OF A BLENDED S&P AND FARMLAND PORTFOLIO

ABSTRACT:

Geometric mean maximization (“GMM”) seeks to achieve growth of the capital invested such that the terminal wealth is maximized as opposed to maximizing risk adjusted returns as measured by the Sharpe ratio. Assets described as cost effective safe havens can be colloquially described as enhancing the GMM of a portfolio across various confidence levels. Based on simplified testing on a 100% S&P portfolio, Canadian farmland weighted pursuant to Veripath’s portfolio construction tool, appears to be such a safe haven at relatively modest allocation levels.

KEY WORDS:

Geometric mean maximization, Sharpe ratio, farmland, portfolio construction model, S&P, risk adjusted returns, Monte Carlo simulation

GEOMETRIC MEAN MAXIMIZATION “GMM” EXPLAINED:

Rather than re-invent the wheel, we have included two fairly standard and accepted definitions of geometric mean maximization and why it's worth considering as a portfolio construction tool over and above traditional risk adjusted return metrics (e.g. Sharpe Ratio):

“Academics and practitioners usually optimize portfolios on the basis of mean and variance. They set the goal of maximizing risk-adjusted returns measured by the Sharpe ratio and thus determine their optimal exposures to the assets considered. However, there is an alternative criterion that has an equally plausible underlying idea; geometric mean maximization aims to maximize the growth of the capital invested, thus seeking to maximize terminal wealth. This criterion has several attractive properties and is easy to implement, and yet it seems to have taken a back seat to the maximization of risk-adjusted returns.”
Source – Geometric Mean Maximization: An Overlooked Portfolio Approach? Javier Estrada

“Geometric mean returns measure the average rate at which investment returns compound over a given period of time. The geometric or compound return represents the return that is achieved through reinvestment whereas the arithmetic return is simply the average of a series of returns over a given period of time. The geometric mean will always be equal to or less than the arithmetic mean. There are a couple of reasons why the geometric mean is important in the context of retirement finances. First, for most people financial planning for retirement involves taking a sum of money and both: a) making it last, and; b) turning it into income. The compounding effects reflected in geometric mean returns are the primary driver of the terminal wealth that is the basis

“Liberty means responsibility. That is why most men dread it.” – George Bernard Shaw

of retirement finances. Second, the volatility of returns is the key factor in the difference between geometric returns and arithmetic returns... Consider, for example, the person who invests \$100 and has a 100 percent return during year 1 followed by a 50 percent loss during year 2. This person's arithmetic return is 25 percent, while the geometric return over the same period is actually zero (start with \$100, double to \$200 after the first year, then back to \$100 after the 50 percent loss during the second year). Which return is more relevant for the person who will be spending whatever money is there at the end of the investing period? Also note how hazardous volatility is to compound performance... Geometric mean maximization is simply a focus on maximizing the geometric mean or the growth rate of money that is invested. Geometric mean maximization should be considered highly relevant to anyone who is concerned about the amount of actual funds available after a period of saving and investing.”
Source - Investopedia

HOW TO PERFORM GMM ANALYSIS:

The tool used to perform GMM analysis is Monte Carlo simulation. Forward portfolio returns are modelled under various asset allocation configurations using historical return data for each portfolio asset. Large volumes of iterations can be run to produce a distribution of expected future geometric return.

“Monte Carlo Simulation, also known as the Monte Carlo Method or a multiple probability simulation, is a mathematical technique, which is used to estimate the possible outcomes of an uncertain event. The Monte Carlo Method was invented by John von Neumann and Stanislaw Ulam during World War II to improve decision making under uncertain conditions. ...Since its introduction, Monte Carlo Simulations have assessed the impact of risk in many real-life scenarios, such as in artificial intelligence, stock prices, sales forecasting, project management, and pricing.”
Source: IBM Cloud Education

VERIPATH'S GMM MODELLING METHODOLOGY:
INPUTS:

- Annual total S&P return data from 1970 to 2020 (total return with dividends)
- Annual Canadian farmland appreciation by province from 1970 to 2020 (ex-rents)
- Provinces aggregated into a single Canadian holding according to Veripath's model portfolio factor weightings
- Farmland added to the 100% S&P portfolio at values ranging up to 9.09%

PARAMETERS:

- 25-year forward holding period for S&P
- Random sample of 50 years of return data for the S&P and farmland to generate 25 years forward geometric return paths
- 10,000 iterations per farmland allocation
- 10 cases, 10,000 iterations each, 25 years = 2.5 million paths simulated

"Both optimists and pessimists contribute to society. The optimist invents the aeroplane, the pessimist the parachute." – George Bernard Shaw

RESULTS:

At ~3.85% of the total portfolio, a Canadian farmland holding (weighted according to Veripath's model portfolio factors) increased the mean, median, 5th percentile, 50th percentile and 95th percentile returns compared to simply the 100% S&P portfolio. The biggest improvement was in the 5th percentile return as farmland tended to be most effective at improving downside returns, although while still enhancing mean and upside outcomes (i.e. downside and upside increases). The 5th percentile absolute change in terminal value was 6.16%.

CONCLUSION:

Based on this simplified analysis, Canadian farmland could not be discounted as a cost-effective safe haven in that it increased the geometric mean return over the 25-year forecast period at all relevant levels of return in this simulation. Further analysis would be warranted.

FL in Portfolio	Mean	Median	5th Percentile	50th Percentile	95th Percentile	Terminal Change in NW Median	5th
0.00%	10.849%	10.937%	4.811%	10.937%	16.562%	0.00%	0.00%
0.99%	10.929%	11.008%	4.797%	10.937%	16.672%	1.62%	-0.31%
1.96%	10.935%	11.003%	4.873%	11.008%	16.650%	1.50%	1.49%
2.91%	10.938%	11.004%	4.985%	11.003%	16.614%	1.51%	4.24%
3.85%	10.939%	10.993%	5.062%	11.004%	16.582%	1.28%	6.16%
4.76%	10.939%	10.988%	5.124%	10.993%	16.557%	1.17%	7.74%
5.66%	10.938%	10.975%	5.169%	10.988%	16.528%	0.85%	8.91%
6.54%	10.936%	10.963%	5.210%	10.975%	16.494%	0.60%	9.98%
7.41%	10.934%	10.948%	5.288%	10.963%	16.467%	0.25%	12.02%
8.26%	10.934%	10.930%	5.339%	10.948%	16.449%	-0.16%	13.41%
9.09%	10.927%	10.908%	5.374%	10.908%	16.420%	-0.65%	14.35%

APPENDIX A: DATA TABLES

Table 1: Veripath Factor Weighted Portfolio Model

		AB	ON	MB	SK	QC	NS	NB	BC	PE	NL
		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Regulatory environment (Investor permitted)											
Average productivity adjusted wheat pricing (<\$2,500/tonne)		1		1	1						
Average productivity adjusted wheat pricing (\$3,500/tonne => X => \$2,500/tonne)						1					
Average productivity adjusted wheat pricing (> \$3,500/tonne)							1	1	1	1	1
Farmland sharpe ratio (>0.75, <=1.25)			1	1		1					1
Farmland sharpe ratio (>1.25, <=1.5)					1		1				
Farmland sharpe ratio (>1.5)		1									
Correlation to inflation (1970s = >0.3, <=0.4)		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Correlation to inflation (1970s = >0.4, <=0.5)											
Correlation to inflation (1970s = > 0.5)											
Up/down ratio (< 1 down year in last 25 years)		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Up/down ratio (< 3 => X down years in last 25 years)											
Up/down ratio (> 3 down years in last 25 years)											
Raw acre size as a percent of Canada total (>5%)		1	1	1	1	1					
Market turnover (>\$2B pa)		1	1		1				1		
Percent operators also cash renters (>50%)		1			1						
Annual growth in average farm size (>1%)		1			1						
Farm leverage (<20%)		1	1		1	1					
Crop composition (field crops >75%)		1	1		1						
		AB	ON	MB	SK	QC	NS	NB	BC	PE	NL
		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Regulatory environment (Plans permitted)											
	Weighting (0-5)										
Average productivity adjusted wheat pricing (<\$2,500/tonne)	5	5	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average productivity adjusted wheat pricing (\$3,500/tonne => X => \$2,500/tonne)	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Average productivity adjusted wheat pricing (> \$3,500/tonne)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Farmland sharpe ratio (>0.75, <=1.25)	3	0	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Farmland sharpe ratio (>1.25, <=1.5)	4	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Farmland sharpe ratio (>1.5)	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correlation to inflation (1970s = >0.3, <=0.4)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Correlation to inflation (1970s = >0.4, <=0.5)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correlation to inflation (1970s = > 0.5)	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Up/down ratio (< 1 down year in last 25 years)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Up/down ratio (< 3 => X down years in last 25 years)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Up/down ratio (> 3 down years in last 25 years)	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Raw acre size as a percent of Canada total (>5%)	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Market turnover (>\$2B pa)	2	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
Percent operators also cash renters (>50%)	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Annual growth in average farm size (>1%)	3	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Farm leverage (<20%)	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Crop composition (field crops >75%)	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Raw Score	(A)	29	18	18	28	19	12	8	10	8	11
Raw Acres	(B)	52	13	19	64	8	1	1	7	1	0.07
Matrix adjusted acre weight	(A/C x B/D)	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Simple acre weighted portfolio (% acres)	(B/D)	31.3%	7.8%	11.4%	38.5%	4.8%	0.6%	0.6%	4.2%	0.6%	0.0%
Matrix adjusted portfolio (% acres)	(A/C X B/D)/(E)	36.5%	5.7%	8.3%	43.4%	3.7%	0.3%	0.2%	1.7%	0.2%	0.0%
Target Market Size (millions acres)		166	52	13	19	64	8	1	7	1	0.07

Table 2: Monte Carlo Results @ S&P 100% Portfolio

		Percentile	Value
Mean	10.85%		
Number of Trials	10000	0%	-2.75%
Standard error	0.04%	5%	4.81%
		10%	6.17%
Minimum	-2.75%	15%	7.10%
Maximum	22.47%	20%	7.80%
Median	10.94%	25%	8.43%
Range	25.23%	30%	9.05%
		35%	9.56%
Standard Deviation	3.58%	40%	10.04%
Variance	0.13%	45%	10.50%
		50%	10.94%
Skewness	-0.15	55%	11.38%
Kurtosis	2.92	60%	11.84%
		65%	12.30%
		70%	12.80%
		75%	13.36%
		80%	13.93%
		85%	14.55%
		90%	15.36%
		95%	16.56%
		100%	22.47%

Table 3: Monte Carlo Results @ S&P plus 4% Farmland Portfolio (3.85% of total)

		Percentile	Value
Mean	10.94%		
Number of Trials	10000	0%	-1.65%
Standard error	0.03%	5%	5.06%
		10%	6.40%
Minimum	-1.65%	15%	7.28%
Maximum	25.02%	20%	7.98%
Median	10.99%	25%	8.57%
Range	26.67%	30%	9.08%
		35%	9.59%
Standard Deviation	3.49%	40%	10.08%
Variance	0.12%	45%	10.56%
		50%	10.99%
Skewness	-0.06	55%	11.44%
Kurtosis	2.88	60%	11.90%
		65%	12.35%
		70%	12.81%
		75%	13.33%
		80%	13.94%
		85%	14.59%
		90%	15.39%
		95%	16.58%
		100%	25.02%

WHO IS VERIPATH:

Veripath is a Canadian alternative investment firm. Members of Veripath's management team have decades of farmland, private equity, and private credit investment experience. Veripath implements its farmland strategy in a way that seeks to preserve as far as possible farmland's low-volatility return profile – the attribute that we believe generates a material portion of Canadian farmland's superior risk adjusted returns. Veripath does this by seeking to minimize operational, weather, geographic and business-related risks – and capture the pure return from land appreciation. Utilizing a unique split fund, evergreen structure, Veripath opens the Canadian farmland investment thesis to the largest possible universe of investors and for the first time makes compliance with the various provincial farmland ownership regulations simple and straightforward. Canadian farmland allocations have several compelling characteristics that make them a worthwhile portfolio allocation for both institutional and retail investors and Veripath's structures are available to both. For more information on Veripath, please feel free to register online at www.veripathfarmland.com or call 587-390-8267.



#300, 4954 Richard Rd SW, Calgary, AB T3E 6L1
www.veripathpartners.com

DISCLAIMER

Our reports, including this paper, express our opinions which have been based, in part, upon generally available public information and research as well as upon inferences and deductions made through our due diligence, research and analytical process. The information contained in this paper includes information from, or data derived from, public third party sources including industry publications, reports and research papers. Although this third-party information and data is believed to be reliable, neither Veripath Partners nor its agents (collectively "Veripath") have independently verified the accuracy, currency or completeness of any of the information and data contained in this paper which is derived from such third party sources and, therefore, there is no assurance or guarantee as to the accuracy or completeness of such included information and data. Veripath and its agents hereby disclaim any liability whatsoever in respect of any third party information or data, and the results derived from our utilization of that data in our analysis. While we have a good-faith belief in the accuracy of what we write, all such information is presented "as is," without warranty of any kind, whether express or implied. The use made of the information and conclusions set forth in this paper is solely at the risk of the user of this information. This paper is intended only as general information presented for the convenience of the reader, and should not in any way be construed as investment or other advice whatsoever. Veripath is not registered as an investment dealer or advisor in any jurisdiction and this report does not represent investment advice of any kind. The reader should seek the advice of relevant professionals (including a registered investment professional) before making any investment decisions. The opinions and views expressed in this paper are subject to change or modification without notice, and Veripath does not undertake to update or supplement this or any other of its reports or papers as a result of a change in opinion stated herein or otherwise.