



The Art of Profitable Rebalancing

Raymond Kerzérho, MBA, CFA

February 2010

The Art of Portfolio Rebalancing

It has been our experience that portfolio rebalancing is one of the very few ways to generate additional returns for a portfolio without incurring any additional risk. It is interesting to note that while rebalancing is a significant source of added value, some of the most popular investment books don't even mention it.

So, what exactly does rebalancing entail?


Selon Larry Swedroe¹ defines rebalancing as "...the process of restoring a portfolio to its desired asset allocation". Let's take the simplified example of a portfolio with a 50% stocks / 50% bonds policy asset mix. If stocks return 25% while bonds produce a 5% return, stocks become overweighted at the end of the year (54% vs. 46%). Rebalancing involves selling 4% in stocks and buying 4% in bonds to bring the asset mix back to the desired 50/50 policy asset mix. This simple stock/bond example can be extended to a multi-asset class portfolio involving Canadian, U.S. and International equities, bonds, high-yield fixed income securities and preferred shares.

We have performed some simulations on the risk and return effects of rebalancing. Our historical study shows that a portfolio based on a widely diversified mix of asset classes, using a variety of different rebalancing strategies (e.g. rebalance every year, every second year, every time an asset class becomes misbalanced by 3%, etc.) provides both higher returns (0.50% on average) and significantly lower risk. Our results are depicted on the following page.

Why higher returns?

Most times, rebalancing a portfolio involves trimming high return assets (stocks) to plunk money into low return assets (bonds). Under such circumstances, the fact that virtually any type of rebalancing strategy we simulated produces higher returns than not rebalancing is startling. The most plausible explanation for this phenomenon is the "mean-reversion" effect.

In other words, outperforming assets tend to overshoot their "true" fundamental value. By rebalancing the portfolio, the investor systematically takes profit in these « expensive » asset classes and reinvests the proceeds into the « cheap » ones. When eventually these « cheap » asset classes revert to their (higher) long-term fundamental values, they help the rebalanced portfolio generate a modest excess return.




What are the advantages of rebalancing?

William Bernstein² does a wonderful job of explaining the advantages of rebalancing. "First, it keeps your portfolio's risk within tolerable limits. Second, it generates a bit of excess return. And third, it will instill the discipline and mental toughness essential to investment success."

1 Swedroe, L., *What Wall Street Doesn't Want You To Know*, St-Martin's Press, 2001
2 Bernstein, W., *The Four Pillars of Investing*, McGraw Hill, 2002.

Rebalancing vs. No Rebalancing (1980-2009)

(Sources: Fama and French, Morningstar Encorr, PWL Capital)



Sources: Fama and French, Morningstar Encorr and PWL Capital. Index composition: 30% Scotia Capital Short-term Index, 10% U.S. High-yield Index, 10% FTSE-NAREIT Equity Index, 17% S&P/TSX Composite Index, 7% S&P500 Index in \$CA, 7% Fama-French Large Value Index in \$CA, 3% US Small Stock Index in \$CA, 10% MSCI EAFE Index in \$CA, 6% MSCI EAFE Value Index in \$CA

The “right” rebalancing frequency

The “right” rebalancing frequency We’ve established that rebalancing will improve the portfolio’s risk and return. Consequently, the appropriate course of action must be to rebalance every year to get the easy return pick-up, right? Not exactly. According to Truman Clark³: “No simple rebalancing rule can be in the interest of all clients”. The reason being is that there are costs to rebalancing.

First, there are trading costs. For example, let’s assume that for a \$100,000 portfolio, rebalancing involves 10 to 15 trades (buys and sells). Trading costs can amount to upwards of \$500, or 0.50% of the portfolio. This means that if this portfolio is rebalanced on a yearly basis, the cost-benefits would amount to 0.50%-0.50% = 0%. On the other hand, for a \$1 million portfolio, these trading costs would amount to 0.05% (\$500 ÷ \$1,000,000). The expected cost-benefits of rebalancing on a yearly basis would therefore be equal to 0.45% per annum (0.50% - 0.05%).

The second key cost of rebalancing is tax costs. Of course this doesn’t apply to an all-RSP portfolio. But in contrast, if the investor holds large taxable assets, these costs are of great concern.

Furthermore, if the investor has a lot of unrealized capital gains, tax management strategies will favor a reduced frequency of rebalancing.

There is clearly no « one size fits all » strategy when it comes to rebalancing frequency. Nonetheless, our statistical research indicates that rebalancing once every 3 years produces roughly the same excess return than a monthly, annual or bi-annual rebalancing, with lower trading and tax costs. With this in mind, we tend to favour rebalancing periods ranging from 3 years (for portfolios with a larger asset base and smaller unrealized capital gains) to 5 years for the opposite situation.

However, these numbers are not cast in stone. Huge swings in the markets (such as the crashes of 1987 and 2008), may suddenly trigger huge portfolio imbalances, thereby presenting golden rebalancing opportunities. In addition, portfolios that benefit from regular cash contributions (or withdrawals) may be rebalanced more frequently, at no marginal cost, through the purchase (or sale) of the underweight (overweight) assets using new cash.

Conclusion

Rebalancing is an unusual strategy that can provide higher potential returns and reduced risks. There is, however, no single method of applying the strategy that suits all investors. Transaction costs, portfolio size, asset base held in registered accounts, unrealized capital gains and large contributions or withdrawals are all factors that will determine the appropriate frequency of rebalancing.

3 Clark, T., *Rebalancing: When, How and Why*, Dimensional Fund Advisors, 2001

This report was written by Raymond Kerzérho, PWL Capital Inc. The ideas, opinions, and recommendations contained in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of PWL Capital Inc.

© PWL Capital Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without prior written approval of the author and/or PWL Capital. PWL Capital would appreciate receiving a copy of any publication or material that uses this document as a source. Please cite this document as:

Raymond Kerzérho, *Director of Research*, PWL Capital Inc. *“The Art of Portfolio Rebalancing”*

For more information about this or other publications from PWL Capital, contact:

215 Redfern Avenue, Suite 200

Westmount, Quebec H3Z 3L5

Tel 514-875-7566 • 1-800-343-7566

Fax 514-875-9611

capital@pwlcapital.com



This report is published by PWL Capital Inc. for your information only. Facts and data provided are from sources we believe to be reliable, but we cannot guarantee they are complete or accurate. Information on which this report is based is available on request. Particular investments or trading strategies should be evaluated relative to each individual's objectives in consultation with the Investment Advisor.

Montréal

215 Redfern Avenue, Suite 200
Westmount, Quebec
H3Z 3L5

Tel. 514-875-1585
800-343-7566

Fax 514-875-9611
capital@pwlcapital.com

Ottawa

265 Carling Avenue, Suite 100
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 2E1

Tel. 613-237-6383
800-230-5544

Fax 613-237-5949
ottawa@pwlcapital.com

Rivière-du-Loup

494 rue Lafontaine, PO Box 397
Rivière-du-Loup, Québec
G5R 3Y9

Tel. 418-862-5643
800-774-7418

Fax 418-862-3585
rdl@pwlcapital.com

Toronto

3 Church Street, Suite 601
Toronto, Ontario
M5E 1M2

Tel. 416-703-3727
866-242-0203

Fax 416-203-0544
toronto@pwlcapital.com