

# Portable Alpha

## - Philosophy, Process & Performance

Edward Kung  
Senior Manager, Product Development  
PanAgora Asset Management  
260 Franklin Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> floor  
Boston, MA 02110  
Tel: 617-439-6680  
[ekung@panagora.com](mailto:ekung@panagora.com)

Larry Pohlman  
Director of Research  
PanAgora Asset Management  
260 Franklin Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> floor  
Boston, MA 02110  
Tel: 617-439-6394  
[lpohlman@PanAgora.com](mailto:lpohlman@PanAgora.com)

*Forthcoming in the Journal of Portfolio Management Spring 2004*

### **Abstract**

Active investment managers provide two types of return: the return generated from market exposure or “beta” and the return that comes from selection skill or “alpha.” Active “beta” returns typically come from market timing. That is, increasing market exposure in up-markets and decreasing it in down-markets. Passive beta returns come from index fund exposure. “Alpha” comes from security selection within an asset class. As such, the value-added from a true alpha strategy does not depend upon the direction of the market. A true stock-picker, for instance, would have a beta of 1.0 relative to their market benchmark, and all value-added would come from their “active risk” or stock picking. Portable alpha refers to the *process* of separating the alpha from the beta and then applying it to other portfolios. Our focus here is to show how investors can obtain portable alphas via traditional long-only strategies and explore the effects of implementing portable alphas in a variety of investment scenarios and provide a discussion of the benefits and drawbacks.

## Introduction

U.S. financial markets have been anything but normal. According to Ryan Labs, pension assets underperformed pension liability by about 67.83% for the past three years, the worst since the firm began tracking asset liability funding ratios in 1987.

Pension administrators have been forced to re-think and shift their focus on their ability to pay benefit, control risk and smooth out volatility. However, the quest for alpha has been hampered by the adherence to the classic asset allocation process [Arnott 2002, Bernstein 2003, and Litterman 2003]. As a result, alpha has diminished.

Portable alpha rises based on the notion that asset allocation and the search for alpha are separable. *Portable alpha enables investors to budget risk and enhance alpha (potentially) without dramatically changing asset allocation.* In this paper, we will explore the effects of implementing portable alphas in a variety of investment scenarios and provide a discussion of the benefits and drawbacks.

## What is portable alpha?

Active investment managers provide two types of return: the return generated from market exposure or “beta” and the return that comes from selection skill or “alpha.” Active “beta” returns typically come from market timing. That is, increasing market exposure in up-markets and decreasing it in down-markets. Passive beta returns come from index fund exposure. “Alpha” comes from security selection within an asset class. As such, the value-added from a true alpha strategy does not depend upon the direction of the market. A true stock-picker, for instance, would have a beta of 1.0 relative to their market benchmark, and all value-added would come from their “active risk” or stock picking. Portable alpha refers to the *process* of separating the alpha from the beta and then applying it to other portfolios.

A portable alpha strategy is a beta neutral portfolio that is implemented through an overlay or by strategic asset allocation. Within strategic asset allocation, a plan can have: 1) an outright allocation to portable alpha; 2) capital commitment to portable alpha strategies while using futures or swaps to maintain the existing overall asset allocation (sometimes referred to as “equitization”).

Within these broad groupings, portable alpha can be generated many different ways. For example, an alpha-generating portfolio consisting entirely of futures uses very little cash (due to margin requirement) and provides an alpha that can be applied *over* all or part of the portfolio. We will refer to strategies that use little or no cash as “overlay” strategies or “leveraged” strategies. Alternatively, plan sponsors can invest in a portable alpha strategy where the investment manager purchases securities and uses derivatives to remove market exposure. For example: a manager of small cap equities who generates 4% alpha each year can hedge the small cap market exposure, or beta, by selling Russell 2000 Index futures against the portfolio. This results in a pure alpha return that can be applied to the overall fund.

Implementing a portable alpha strategy requires careful consideration. In theory, most investment strategies can be converted into portable alpha provided there is alpha to begin with. The first consideration is liquidity. A hedging vehicle is required in order to eliminate market exposure. That means there is an available index future, swap contract, or Exchange Traded Fund (ETF) to be used for hedging. Some investment strategies, such as real estate or private equity, do not lend themselves to constructing portable alpha due to the lack of a hedging instrument. Secondly, we need to be aware of the amount of “alpha” that can be generated. Efficient asset classes will not lend themselves to generating enough alpha to be worthwhile.

## Sources of portable alpha

Institutional investors tend to source a portable alpha strategy from a hedge fund or fund of funds. Market neutral and long-short strategies have been the primary sources for portable alpha due to their low correlations with major market indices. **Exhibit 1** shows the correlations of all CSFB Hedge Funds with major market indices.<sup>1</sup> However, market neutral strategies are *not* always beta neutral. In fact, the CSFB Market Neutral index shows positive correlation with the S&P 500 index.

While hedge funds have been the source of additional alpha, not every alpha-generating hedge fund is appropriate for porting alpha. Market risk or systematic risk can be difficult to isolate and to remove while preserving market neutrality. Alpha also can be difficult to obtain without the benefit of hedging market risk.

In addition, research shows that hedge fund managers exhibit extremely high correlation within hedge fund style categories. On average per investment style, hedge fund’s returns in excess of cash are at least 50% correlated with each other. These high correlations imply hedge fund managers are not that unique in identifying alpha opportunities.

Furthermore, current research reveals that some hedge fund managers are simply repackaging beta and selling it as a pure alpha strategy [Jensen 2003]. In the cases of Fixed Income Arbitrage, Emerging Market, Managed Futures and Merger Arbitrage indices, they are 59%, 81%, 75% and 52% correlated to naïve strategies that consist of simple mortgages, short term corporate, emerging market equity, debt and various Euro dollar instruments.

This is not to say one should ignore the hedge fund in its entirety. A carefully chosen hedge fund or portfolio of hedge funds may still provide the best return, risk and diversification benefits investors seek.

An **alternative** for transporting alpha is to combine traditional *long-only* funds that produce consistent alpha with short positions in index derivatives. In fact, there are considerable benefits to hiring managers who run portable alpha strategies as a variation of an existing long-only fund. First, these investment managers/firms are usually willing to disclose their investment philosophy and processes. Hedge funds with proprietary trading strategies are more reluctant to reveal their investment insight. Second, these

managers tend to have well defined investment processes. Hedge funds, on the other hand, quite often rely upon the skill of one individual. Third, traditional long-only products tend to have fairly long and reliable track records. Hedge funds, in general, have limited live track records [Anson 2001]. As a result, hedge fund indices and universes built based upon these hedge fund track records will inevitably experiences the survivorship bias, backfill bias and self-selection bias. This is true even after index or universe creators try to minimize those [Asness 2001].

In sourcing portable alpha, investors should explore alpha opportunities where managers demonstrated their abilities to generate significant IC in the strategy. Institutional investors are familiar and comfortable with the alphas that have been generated from traditional long-only strategies, and have already implemented these alphas in the plan, but *inefficiently* given the fact that majorities of products bundle the beta and alpha together. Our focus here is to show how investors can obtain portable alphas via traditional long-only strategies and implement them onto other strategies or asset classes.

## Exhibit 1

### Correlation Analysis

1994 - 4/2003

	<i>SP500</i>	<i>EAFE</i>	<i>Lehman AGG</i>	<i>Non US Bond</i>	<i>RE</i>	<i>Cash</i>
CSFB Hedge Fund Index	0.46	0.41	0.14	-0.20	0.24	0.10
CSFB Multi Strategy	0.04	0.09	0.02	0.09	0.11	0.09
CSFB Emerging Market	0.47	0.48	-0.13	-0.27	0.27	-0.07
CSFB Fixed Income Arb Index	-0.01	0.00	0.07	-0.22	0.21	0.03
CSFB Global Macro	0.22	0.11	0.24	-0.22	0.17	0.08
CSFB Managed Futures	-0.26	-0.13	0.30	0.35	-0.09	-0.08
CSFB Short Bias	-0.76	-0.64	0.10	0.09	-0.27	0.05
CSFB Market Neutral Index	0.40	0.34	0.06	0.03	0.24	0.25
CSFB Event Driven	0.54	0.52	-0.05	-0.21	0.39	0.10
CSFB Convertible arb index	0.11	0.07	0.07	-0.21	0.20	0.14
CSFB Hedged Long Short Index	0.57	0.57	0.05	-0.02	0.22	0.10

Source: CSFB/Tremont

## Portable alpha funding & its impact

Determining the source for funding a portable alpha allocation is a critical decision since it has direct impacts on risk budgeting, asset allocation, and performance measurement. Investors can fund a portable alpha strategy by:

1. Decreasing equity allocation and substituting a portable alpha strategy
2. Decreasing fixed income allocation and substituting a portable alpha strategy
3. Scaling down the overall allocation from each asset class proportionately and substituting a portable alpha strategy<sup>ii</sup>

Each of these scenarios generates distinct portfolio characteristics. To illustrate the effects of various funding allocation decisions and the impact of changes in investment markets, we have constructed a sample defined benefit plan portfolio consisting of 36%

S&P 500, 23% Non US equity, 21% Lehman Aggregate, 7% Non US Bond and 8% Real Estate. Throughout this paper, we refer to it as “the Plan”.

To study the impact of funding portable alpha in the Plan, we constructed 12 scenarios, each of which represent 5% incremental portable alpha allocations funded by equity, fixed income or both asset classes.

**Exhibit 2** shows that the Plan’s portfolio risk is reduced in an almost linear fashion after funding a portable alpha strategy with equity allocation. The result is that a portion of the more volatile equity asset class was replaced with a low volatility market neutral strategy (CSFB Market Neutral Index). In addition, since the portable alpha strategy is essentially uncorrelated with other asset classes, the overall risk of the portfolio is reduced.


The Plan’s return will improve significantly with little change in total risk once we fund the same portable alpha with fixed income assets. This is because a market neutral strategy exhibits risk characteristics similar to those of fixed income assets. The result is that a market neutral strategy can be used as a substitute for a fixed income product.

Since in most plans there is a larger allocation to equities than to fixed income investments, scaling down both asset classes proportionately to fund a market neutral portable alpha can reduce a plan’s overall risk accordingly.

Exhibit 2 also suggests that even with a 5% allocation to portable alpha, the Plan can achieve meaningful risk reduction, alpha enhancement or both.

## Exhibit 2

**Portable Alpha Allocation at the Plan Level**  
1994 - 4/2003




## Optimal allocation

Due to the long and short nature of the investments, portable alpha strategies have broader investment opportunities and should have better risk and return characteristics than a traditional long-only strategy. While in theory a plan could use up to 100% portable alpha in lieu of traditional long-only products, this may not be feasible due to institutional plan guidelines and investment constraints.

To gauge the optimal portable alpha allocation for the plan, we constructed an efficient frontier based on the monthly returns for the Plan's asset mix. We further plotted the original Plan and the plan with 10%, 20% and 25% of portable alpha on the frontier. **Exhibit 3** shows that an inefficient portfolio based upon the Plan strategic allocation can be moved to a more efficient portfolio by adding 20-25% of a properly chosen portable alpha. <sup>iv</sup> As a result, the Plan could enhance its alpha by 20 bps per month or 240 bps per year with virtually the same amount of risk.

### Exhibit 3

Adding Portable Alpha can move Plan Sponsor's Portfolio to the Efficient Frontier



## Not all portable alphas are equal

Portable alpha strategies come in many different styles. The correlation between the alpha and the target portfolio can have a significant impact on performance. The risk and return profile of a portfolio can be significantly changed by incorporating portable alpha.

To illustrate this point, we created two hypothetical portable alphas. In the first case, we assumed that a manager with perfect foresight moved between the S&P value and growth indices. In the second case, we assumed that a manager with perfect foresight moved between the Lehman Treasury and Corporate Bond indices. Since we are interested in alpha and not beta, we removed all systematic risk and return from the alphas. Finally, since the return and volatility of equity returns is higher than that of fixed income securities, we scaled the two alphas to have the same mean and standard deviation.

**Exhibit 4**  
**Risk-Return & Correlations**

January 1984 - April 2003

	Return (%)	Std Dev (%)	S&P 500 Index	Lehman Aggregate Bond Index	Value / Growth Alpha	Treasury/ Credit Alpha
S&P 500 Index	12.26	15.85	1.00			
Lehman Aggregate Bond Index	9.61	4.6	0.20	1.00		
Value/Growth Alpha	<b>11.65</b>	<b>3.18</b>	0.27	<b>0.10</b>	1.00	
Treasury/Credit Alpha	<b>11.65</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>-0.10</b>	0.33	0.11	1.00

We then transported these two “*true alphas*” on to two different portfolios. The first was 100% invested in the S&P 500 and the second was 100% invested in the Lehman Government / Credit index. **Exhibit 4** shows the return characteristics and correlations of the four securities. As one would expect, the correlation between the S&P 500 portfolio and the fixed income alpha is lower than the correlation of the S&P 500 with the equity alpha. Similarly, the correlation between the Lehman G/C portfolio with the equity alpha is lower than the correlation of the Lehman G/C and the fixed income alpha.

The final step in our example was to compare the information ratios of portfolios created by transporting the alphas to the two different base portfolios. The results are shown below in **Exhibit 5**.

**Exhibit 5**  
**Information Ratio**

January 1984 - April 2003

	Return (%)	Std Dev (%)	Information Ratio
S&P + Value/Growth Alpha	25.26	15.98	1.58
<b>S&amp;P + Treasury/Credit Alpha</b>	<b>25.30</b>	<b>15.84</b>	<b>1.60</b>
Lehman Agg + Treasury/Credit Alpha	22.26	5.92	3.76
<b>Lehman Agg + Value/Growth Alpha</b>	<b>22.26</b>	<b>5.85</b>	<b>3.81</b>

Due to the lower correlation between asset classes, the S&P 500 portfolio plus the fixed income alpha produces a higher information ratio than the S&P 500 plus the equity alpha. Similarly, the combination of the Lehman G/C portfolio and the equity alpha results in a higher information ratio than the Lehman G/C and the fixed income alpha portfolio.

This example illustrates why synthetic enhanced equity portfolios created from a fixed income alpha and equity futures can have higher information ratios than pure enhanced index equity portfolios. It is not because the return is higher but rather that the risk is

lower. With the latest introduction of fixed income Exchange Trade Funds (ETFs), it is also feasible to create synthetic fixed income portfolios that combine equity alphas with fixed income ETFs that could have higher information ratios than enhanced fixed income portfolios.

Since actual portfolios typically include a wide variety of asset classes for funding, the optimal portable alpha for a portfolio could possibly involve a combination of alpha sources rather than a single allocation.

## Implementation

Institutional investors can implement a portable alpha strategy through a beta neutral program that transports alpha to any desired asset class or strategy. *Equitization refers to a process which combines a portable alpha with index futures, swaps or ETFs.* The cash remains invested in a portable alpha strategy that is then combined with a long futures position, providing a total return close to the S&P 500 index plus portable alpha. The equitized portable alpha strategy can exhibit the risk and return characteristics of any equity market.

### Case Study 1: US Large Cap with Small Cap Portable Alpha

There are many different sources of alpha. **Exhibit 6** shows the median alpha (defined as excess return of the manager over beta times benchmark) for the traditional long-only strategies. In the past 10 years, the median US large cap managers generated 0.58% alpha. This compares to a 3.78% median alpha for small cap managers. Suppose the Plan wants to maintain its strategic asset allocation to large cap domestic equity but would like to enhance performance by adding small cap alpha.

#### Exhibit 6

**Median Manager Alpha & Active Risk**  
10 Years Ending March 2003


	<i>Alpha</i>	<i>Active Risk</i>
<b>Large Cap Core</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>3.94</b>
Large Cap Growth	-0.03	7.25
Large Cap Value	1.96	5.94
<b>Small Cap Core</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>7.87</b>
Small Cap Value	1.89	7.86
Small Cap Growth	7.41	11.22
Core Fixed income	0.17	1.00
High Yield	1.16	3.29
Emerging Market	2.93	9.92
Non US Equity	3.18	7.99
Non US Fixed Income	1.11	4.08
Real Estate	1.83	3.48

Source: PSN

Using our sample Plan's asset mix, the small cap portable alpha can be funded by reducing the large cap allocation from 36% to 26%. Assume the 10% reduction in the large cap allocation is equal to \$1,000,000. The basic investment process is as follows:

- Step 1: Investment manager deposits \$50,000 to satisfy the margin account with a broker. This allows for the purchase of \$1,000,000 in equity index futures, leaving \$950,000 to be used for investment.
- Step 2: Investment manager buys S&P 500 index futures to establish market exposure equal to \$1,000,000 (10%) to bring the large cap asset class allocation back to the original 36%.
- Step 3: Investment manager purchases \$950,000 in small cap stocks. This Long-Only portfolio is designed to beat the Russell 2000 Index, but it has a beta of 1.0 relative to the index. The securities are custodied by the broker.
- Step 4: Investment manager shorts \$950,000 worth of Russell 2000 index futures to eliminate market exposures or beta.

The result is that the plan sponsor is able to maintain the original 36% strategic domestic equity market exposure (original 26% + 10% S&P 500 Index Futures) plus the small cap portable alpha. (See diagram)



*Transporting alpha through equitization allows the investor to maintain large cap asset class exposure, while benefiting from alpha generated from small cap assets without changing the plan's existing asset allocation.*

New generation of ETFs such as MSCI EAFE and Emerging Markets index funds have made it possible for institutional investors to transport alphas from international equity universes to any other asset class similar to the large cap-small cap example discussed above. The MSCI EAFE ETF has delivered consistent index-like performance.


## Portable alpha in up-markets

**Exhibit 7** illustrates how portable alpha would work in an up-market. We assume the small cap manager can generate a 4% median alpha from stock selection. The large cap

and small cap capitalization sectors represented by the S&P 500 and Russell 2000 indexes generated 27% and 18%, respectively for the three years ending March 2000.

S&P 500 index futures would gain roughly \$270,000, as the market went up 27% during this period. As the Russell 2000 index went up 18%, small cap stocks would gain \$209,000 from the combination of market impact and alpha. The portfolio would lose \$171,000 from shorting the Russell 2000 index futures. The difference of \$38,000 (\$209,000 - \$171,000) represents the 4% (\$38,000/\$950,000) of small cap alpha the strategy would generate. Since the alpha for \$38,000 is portable, it is applied to the original \$1,000,000 resulting in a 3.8% return above what an index manager would provide.

**Exhibit 7**  
**3 Years Bull Market**  
 April 1997 - March 2000




*Note: For illustration purpose, total return and \$ gain do not include interest rebate on the short and interest earned on margin.*

**Portable alpha in down-markets**

**Exhibit 8** illustrates how portable alpha would work in a down-market. One again, we assume that the small cap manager can deliver 4% median alpha from stock selection. The S&P 500 and Russell 2000 indexes generated negative 17% and 11% returns, respectively, for the three years ending March 2003.

Large cap index futures would generate a loss of \$170,000 since the S&P 500 Index went down 17%. The small cap stock would have a loss of \$66,500 (-11% market return + 4% alpha X initial investment \$950,000). The short Russell 2000 Index futures would generate a gain of \$104,500, as the Russell 2000 Index went down 11%. By incorporating the small cap portable alpha, the Plan would reduce the loss by 4%.

**Exhibit 8**  
**3 Years Bear Market**  
 April 2000 - March 2003



Note: For illustration purpose, total return and \$ gain do not include Interest rebate on the short and interest earned on margin.

**Case Study 2**  
**Fixed Income Futures Overlay without Committing Large Capital**


Portable alpha strategies implemented through equitization can provide greater flexibility; however, a scarcity of capital may constrain portable alpha allocation. Alternatively, futures overlay enables investors to transport alphas that have zero correlation with major market indices *without* committing capital other than margin deposits.

Here’s an example how we transport alpha via fixed income futures overlay. The sample portable alpha strategy is an *all* futures based portfolio engineered from the traditional core fixed income product. It is assumed to deliver 1-2% of pure alpha per year and is neutral to the credit, duration or convexity. For the same Plan’s asset mix, let’s assume the 21% of Fixed Income asset class represented by the Lehman Aggregate Index is equal to \$100,000,000. In practice, we need to satisfy only a 3% margin requirement to trade fixed income futures. The investment process is as follows:

- Step 1: Investment manager deposits \$3,000,000 or 3% of \$100,000,000 to satisfy the margin account with a broker.
- Step 2: Investment manager employs the futures based fixed income portable alpha strategy on a Lehman Aggregate portfolio with market exposure equal to \$100,000,000.


**Exhibit 9** illustrates how portable alpha works through fixed income futures overlay. The index portfolio provides a market return. This is combined with T-bill returns and the return from the portable alpha. In this hypothetical example, the Plan will benefit by an *additional* \$10,812,000 (assuming a 2% compound on \$100 million for 5 years) from portable alpha.

### Exhibit 9



In this case, the portable alpha was used to overlay 100% of the fixed income portion of the plan. Investors can tailor the overlay to cover *all* or *part* (50%, 150%, etc.) of the portfolio based on their investment objectives. **Exhibit 10** shows how investors can transport alpha with 50% futures overlay with virtually the same investment process. *Portable alpha enables the investor to transport alpha to any asset class via fixed income futures overlay that is supported by a margin account equal to 3% of the asset.*

### Exhibit 10



Successful portable alpha implementation depends on 1) an investment manager's ability to generate consistent alpha that has low correlation with major indices; 2) an investor's ability to identify these alphas and 3) an investor/manager's ability to execute a portable alpha program.

## **Benefits of using portable alpha**

There are considerable benefits of transporting alpha within or across asset classes. Successful portable alpha programs enable institutional investors to:

- Budget risk based on a plan's investment policy and capital market forecast.
- Maintain strategic asset allocation as desired and provide flexibility to rebalance portfolios with index futures. In the case of the Large Cap-Small Cap example, investors can adjust the 10% S&P 500 index futures to shift their asset allocation.
- Transport alpha via an overlay program that is supported by a small amount of cash in a margin account.
- Not make wholesale changes to the existing manager structure.
- Clearly measure portable alpha performance. Through equitization, institutional investors can combine traditional asset classes with portable alpha (Large Cap equity + S&P 500 index futures + Small Cap portable alpha) and measure performance against an appropriate broad market index such as the S&P 500 index.

## **Challenges**

Transporting alpha is not without challenges. The key is to have a clear understanding of how these derivatives work within a portfolio context.

- Derivative transactions are efficient but are not free. Transaction costs will surely reduce alpha.
- From time to time, index futures may not track the benchmark perfectly. Investment managers and investors need to actively manage the futures position.
- Certain asset classes may not have liquid futures contracts available and more expensive instruments such as ETFs or swap contracts would increase costs.
- Investment guidelines - A portable alpha strategy typically involves derivatives and leverage to hedge market risk. While some institutional investors have a clear mandate permitting derivative usage, many do not.
- Funding - Portable alpha funding is an important subject since it has multiple impacts on a plan. Reducing any asset class to fund portable alpha may not be an easy decision both emotionally and intellectually.

- Lack of expertise - Institutions may not have the internal expertise to build and to execute a portable alpha strategy.

## Conclusion

Portable alpha strategies employ some of the best financial engineering tools available to investment managers to shape returns and to control risk. Portable alpha is more than a concept. Conceptually everyone is already doing portable alpha, but inefficiently! In the quest for alpha, we firmly believe that portable alpha will have a profound impact in active alpha investing, asset allocation and will be broadly applied in traditional portfolio management.

## Notes

---

The authors would like to express their gratitude to Peter Bernstein for his valuable comments and their PanAgora colleagues, particularly Ed Peters, Lee Cohen, David Jonas, John Brown, Mark Barnes, Jennifer Lippin, Kevin Keady and Bill Poutsiaka for their support. The authors also thank those attending the PanAgora 2003 Seminar Series for their comments.

<sup>i</sup> CSFB/Tremont Hedge Fund index data were available since 1994. All subsequent examples will use the same time period.

<sup>ii</sup> It may be advantageous to use multiple portable alphas in a portfolio with multiple asset classes.

<sup>iv</sup> We used the same CSFB Market Neutral alpha to the plan's asset mix.

## Reference:

Arnott, Robert D. 2002. "Risk Budgeting and Portable Alpha." *Journal of Investing*, summer: 15-22.

Asness, Clifford., Robert Krail., and John Liew. 2001. "Do Hedge Funds Hedge?" *Journal of Portfolio Management*, Fall: 6-19

Bernstein, Peter L. 2003. "Points of Inflection: Investment Management Tomorrow." *Financial Analyst Journal*, Vol. 59, No. 4 (July/August): 18-23.

Jensen, Greg., and Jason Rotenberg. 2003. "Hedge Funds Selling Beta as Alpha." Working paper, Bridgewater Associates, Inc.

Litterman, Bob. 2003. "Active Alpha Investing." *P&I*, August 18: 12-13.