

April 2015



Political Risk and Emerging Market Investing An Innovative Multi-Asset Approach

Executive Summary

1. **Macro-political risks in Emerging Markets have increased since the 2008 – 2009 Global Financial Crisis, reflecting the growing importance of top-down analysis in managing Emerging Market portfolios.**
2. **Given the increasing frequency and intensity of political - economic crises, a more systematic method of measuring political risk and evaluating its impact on market prices is required for Emerging Markets.**
3. **A central thesis of investing in Emerging Markets assets is that given volatility and dispersion in these markets, there are better opportunities for risk-adjusted returns through a multi-asset approach. This is true, except in times of heightened political risk, where assets become highly correlated.**
4. **We advocate a “three pillar” approach to Emerging Markets: investing in a broader range of asset classes, top-down, dynamic management of risk allocation to these countries / asset classes, and explicitly incorporating a systematic measure of political risk and its impact on Emerging Market assets.**

Contributors:

We wish to thank the following contributors for their work on this White Paper.

From Nikko Asset Management: Al Clark, Robert Samson, Tanuj Dutt, Peter Knight

From Eurasia Group: Alexander Kazan, Aditi Marisetti

Section One: Managing Macro-Political Risk in Emerging Markets

- Macro-political risk is increasing as a result of structural shifts in the international balance of political and economic power, with the US less willing / able to provide global leadership, but no real alternatives emerging to take its place.
- Rather than the “de-coupling” of Emerging Markets and Developed Markets often discussed after the 2008-2009 Global Financial Crisis, macro factors – such as US monetary policy – are actually having a greater role in driving tail-risk in Emerging Markets.
- A top-down approach, incorporating systematic measurement of political risk, can potentially deliver better results than traditional bottom up processes.

The Rise of Macro-Political Risk

Over the last 25 years, Emerging Market equities have outperformed developed market equities by 3.3% p.a. These higher returns came at the expense of substantially higher risk. The annualized volatility of Emerging Market equity returns was 23% p.a. In comparison, developed market equities had much lower volatility of 15% p.a.

Higher risk was accepted as a necessary pre-condition for enjoying the higher returns provided by Emerging Markets. More recently, investors have begun to question whether they will be adequately compensated for this higher risk. Concern is growing on two fronts:


- i) The frequency of market shocks is resulting in more frequent drawdowns
- ii) The source of the risk is changing from diversifiable idiosyncratic or stock-specific risk to non-diversifiable macro-political risk

This paper uses the distinction between macro-political risk as non-project specific risks which affect all participants in a country, as opposed to micro-political risk which effect a particular project or segment of a country. Where we refer to political risk more broadly, it would encompass all political change that alters business expectations and economic values.

Nikko Asset Management, in order to address the concerns regarding the rise of macro-political risk, has conducted our own in-depth research to further understand the changing complexion of risks in Emerging Markets and their impact on assets. The research suggests the frequency of market shocks is increasing in Emerging Markets.

Chart 1 below shows the weekly drawdowns experienced by investors in Emerging Market equities since 2001. The greater clustering of the bars towards the right side of the chart shows the increasing severity and frequency of market corrections during, and since, the financial crisis.

Chart 1: Weekly Drawdowns for Emerging Market Equities 2001 – 2014




Source: Nikko Asset Management Research

From the perspective of long-term investors, drawdown risk becomes an even greater concern when markets are range-bound, as opposed to a secular uptrend. The chart above shows two very different return profiles for Emerging Market equities, pre and post the global financial crisis. In the period prior, the market recovered from each drawdown to move a leg higher. More recently though, range-bound markets imply that even drawdowns of similar magnitude and frequency have become significantly more damaging.

Even though Emerging Markets have matured as investment destinations, their vulnerability to shocks has only increased. In Chart 2 we isolate the 30 worst weekly drawdowns over the last 15 years. Drawdowns experienced during, and since, the crises are shaded in dark blue. These outnumber drawdowns prior to the crisis by two times -- i.e. 20 out of the worst 30 drawdowns have occurred since the onset of the financial crisis. The magnitude has been larger in the more recent past as compared to the early part of the last decade.

Chart 2: Weekly Drawdowns for Emerging Market Equities 2001 - 2014




Source: Nikko Asset Management Research

The above analysis not only validates our concern regarding the greater frequency and severity of market shocks, but also highlights the changing nature of emerging market risks. As correlations across securities and asset classes rise during such stress events, the perceived safety of portfolio diversification becomes an increasingly less effective way to manage portfolio risk. Hence the primary source of portfolio risk moves from diversifiable, idiosyncratic or stock specific risk to non-diversifiable, macro-political risk.

To understand the changing nature of macro-political risk, we constructed an Emerging Market Multi-Asset portfolio and assessed the change in contribution to risk from different asset classes over time. The portfolio consisted of an equally weighted allocation to Emerging Market equities, Emerging Market hard currency bonds and Emerging Market local-currency bonds (currency was disaggregated and treated as a stand-alone risk). The results are shown in Chart 3.

Chart 3: Risk Allocation among assets within a Representative Emerging Market Multi-Asset Portfolio



Source: Nikko Asset Management Research

Before 2008, the equity portion (largest source of stock-specific risk) contributed the lion's share of portfolio volatility – roughly 70%, compared to 20% from currency and about 10% from the bond portion. It is not surprising that bonds and currency added more to portfolio risk during the 2008 crisis, reflecting perceptions of higher top-down risk. However, it is surprising that currency and bond volatility (the largest sources of macro-political risk) have remained elevated since the crisis, currently comprising more than 50% of portfolio volatility.

These findings coincide with those of the Eurasia Group, described later and shown in their political risk index measure for Frontier, Developed and Emerging Markets.

There are many potential reasons for this change; among these, Eurasia Group's research highlights the following:

- Declining global leadership from the US and no alternative emerging to take its place
- Growing Emerging Market powers with varying political systems have led to divergent global interests
- The greater integration of Emerging Markets as part of the global economy and hence their increasing sensitivity to exogenous macro-political/economic shocks

No resolution to these contributing factors appears likely in the short term, and macro-political risk likely will continue to play a central role in the outcomes for Emerging Market portfolios. A top-down investment approach to managing Emerging Market portfolios, as opposed to the more traditional bottom-up processes, may well be a superior approach.

A Top-Down Approach to Emerging Market Investing

A top-down investment approach for managing Emerging Market portfolios recognizes both the increasing importance of macro-political risk on Emerging Market asset returns as well as the rapid evolution of capital markets across many of the larger emerging countries. Nikko Asset Management’s position is that a top-down approach should consist of three key pillars:


- Broadening the investment opportunity set from just equities to multiple asset classes (equities, local-currency bonds, hard-currency debt and FX) to add additional sources of returns and lower overall portfolio risk
- Dynamic management of risk allocations to these asset classes (and to their building blocks such as Indian equities and Brazilian bonds) to protect downside risk
- A systematic methodology for measuring and quantifying political risk and its potential effects on Emerging Market asset outcomes

Creating an investment process that focuses on these three pillars positions an investor to accommodate the changing nature of Emerging Market investment risk and its impact on portfolios.

Pillar 1: The benefits of broadening the investment universe can be shown through simple returns analysis of the equally weighted Emerging Market portfolio (equities, local and hard-currency bonds) mentioned earlier. As can be seen in Chart 4, this portfolio slightly underperformed Emerging Market equities since 2002, but outperformed both hard and local-currency bonds.

However, the benefits of a broader investment universe played out by significantly reducing the risk. The volatility of the equally weighted portfolio was about half that of Emerging Market equities over the period, and the drawdown in 2008 was only 20% compared to a 53% loss for Emerging Market equities.

Chart 4: Relative Performance of Representative Emerging Market Multi-Asset Portfolio vs other Asset Classes



Source: Nikko Asset Management Research

Pillar 2: To maximize the benefits of a broader investment universe, it is important for a top-down approach to dynamically manage the portfolio’s risk allocation. Investment risk premiums are not static and given the expectation that Emerging Market assets will continue to be impacted by growing macro-political risks, an investment process needs to be able to handle the changing nature of Emerging Market asset risk premiums.

Nikko Asset Management employs a disciplined approach to dynamic risk allocation. Rather than use traditional market benchmarks, all assets in which we invest need to earn their way into the portfolios, the asset must display attractive characteristics, based on proprietary models, of one or more of the following:

- Attractive valuations
- Positive momentum
- Supportive macro-political dynamics

Pillar 3: Quantifying macro-political risk and measuring its potential impact on Emerging Market asset prices is a difficult undertaking. To address this, Nikko Asset Management collaborates with Eurasia Group, utilising their systematic methodology for quantifying political risk and embedding the results in the investment process. The following section describes in detail how Eurasia Group measures political risk.

Section Two: Political Risk and Asset Prices

- **Political risk is an important driver of Emerging Market returns. However, it is difficult to measure and its impact on asset prices is underappreciated and poorly understood**
- **Eurasia Group has developed a systematic approach to measure political risk and apply it in an asset-pricing framework to better understand the links between politics and market prices**
- **Macro-political trends – including more frequently and rapidly-transmitted shocks – are increasing the need for incorporating a systematic approach to political risk into Emerging Market portfolio management**

As described above, political risk is a key driver of Emerging Market returns. However, it is challenging to measure and formally incorporate into the investment process, and its effects on asset prices generally is underappreciated by investors.

To address this gap, Eurasia has developed a systematic approach to measuring political risk, which forms Pillar 3 of the investment approach described in the previous section above. In this section we discuss why political risk matters to Emerging Market asset prices and what factors are driving the increasing influence of political risk, and how Eurasia has implemented a methodical approach to assessing political risk, which is embedded in the Nikko Asset Management investment process.

Why Political Risk Matters – Key Drivers

There is evidence of significant relationships between political risk factors and returns across various asset classes, in areas such as equity index volatility¹, bond spreads², forward risk premia between spot and forward FX rates³ and CDS spreads⁴. Research also shows that political effects are especially important in the Emerging Markets.

In particular, there are five main factors explaining why politics matters so much for asset prices in Emerging Markets:

- Institutional capacity to manage shocks. Political institutions, government strength, and the relationships between societies and their governments place important constraints on the ability of governments to manage adverse internal and external economic shocks. This can take the form of institutional constraints on fiscal and monetary policy responses to economic contractions, emergency legislation and crisis management, and economic reform. The contrasting examples of Brazil vs India's response to the winding back of quantitative easing in the US is a reflection of their differing abilities to manage this shock.
- Policy uncertainty. Most fundamentally, politics create uncertainty about future policies, which in turn affects expected levels of economic activity (growth) and profitability through their impact on investment, taxes, consumer and business confidence, and the price and availability of credit, among other channels. Asset prices, of course, are sensitive to actual policy changes, but also to "headline risk" around elections and other signals of potential future changes to policy.
- Competition and operating environment. Politics determines the rules of the game for producers and consumers – setting the level and form of competition and market orientation or "openness" within an economy. The competitive environment, in turn, directly affects both the value of firms and the volatility of the operating environment – which are both reflected in asset prices. Moreover, politics can drive uncertainty around a firm's ability to physically operate and can materially impact levels of production (through supply chain, legal, judicial, and other risks).
- Sovereign creditworthiness. Politics and policy choices directly impact the ability and willingness of governments and state-owned enterprises to pay debt.
- Market structure can amplify political shocks. Unanticipated political shifts can cause large and very fast shifts in desired portfolio balances, resulting in large price adjustments. Being able to adjust early to political signals can significantly help investors in Emerging Markets manage their downside risk.

How to measure Political Risk

While politics is clearly a major contributor to tail-risk in Emerging Markets portfolios, the challenge is in defining and quantifying how these political forces interact with the market to gain insight into their effect on returns.

In modelling the effects of political risk, the first key challenge is definition. Often, political risk means different things in different contexts.

The second major challenge is developing a systematic method for measuring the political risk.

Eurasia Group defines political risk along four main parameters - political stability, social stability, security (in terms of internal and external threats) and economic stability (both short and long term). These aspects are discussed in more depth below.

Measuring variables, such as political risk, is methodically difficult. No direct metrics of political risk exist. Moreover, the few “off-the-shelf” measures across countries are low-frequency (usually updated annually), making them impractical for use in comparing against time-series returns on asset prices.

Because there are few tools for measuring political risk, or estimating how it is priced across countries and asset classes, investors tend to fall back on ad hoc measures and generally purely qualitative approaches.

As outlined in the description of Pillar Three, to overcome this gap Eurasia Group has developed a systematic methodology for measuring political risk and using it as a signal for top-down country allocation decisions across asset classes. Three important parts of this framework are:


1. Country scores that capture current levels of political stability (the Global Political Risk Index)
2. Formal assessments of the future outlook of political stability and its impact on the business environment (Political Trajectories)
3. Asset pricing models that estimate the interaction between political risk and market prices.

The Global Political Risk Index (GPRI)

Eurasia Group’s Global Political Risk Index (GPRI) presents a relative measure of country-level state stability, defined as the stability of the regime and the government. The regime is the set of rules that establish the institutions of the state, define the powers of those institutions, and condition interactions between the state and society. The government controls the executive institution of the regime. The GPRI assigns quantitative scores to countries, expressed on a scale of 1–100, with higher numbers corresponding to lower levels of risk. Based on these scores, the GPRI also produces ordinal rankings of the countries.

Chart 5: Global Political Risk Index
Global Political Risk Index (GPRI)

The GPRI, which is produced by Eurasia Group, measure a country’s ability to absorb political shocks. The higher the number the more stable the country



Source: Eurasia Group

The GPRI includes four category scores: Government, Society, Security, and Economy. Each of these categories contributes to the degree of state stability that a country has, as each can influence the legitimacy of the current regime and government.

- The Government score captures state stability by measuring the strength and durability of the regime and the government through factors including the cohesiveness of the government and the opposition, the degree to which the government has popular support, and the strength and transparency of government institutions.
- The Society score captures the presence and intensity of, and the potential for, social conflict that creates risks to state stability. Factors include income inequality, ethnic/class conflict, urban population growth rates, and issues that can arise from poor government service provision, such as high infant mortality and low literacy rates.
- The Security score captures state stability as influenced by internal and external security risks, including factors such as military spending, terrorism, domestic and inter-state armed conflict, and security alliances.
- The Economy score captures state stability by aggregating the risks of short-term and long-term economic instability. Short-term factors include economic performance and government finances, while long-term factors take in the structure of the economy and the environment for the private sector.

Political Trajectories

Eurasia Group's Political Trajectories are forward-looking, directional assessments of how politics will affect a country's business environment—defined as the overall economic and investment climate—over the next six months and two years. Trajectories are calculated based on an analyst survey across five political dimensions—government stability/cohesion, social stability, security, economic policy, and investment policy—and are intended to capture the future outlook for politics and its effect on the business environment.

Trajectories are assigned by Eurasia Group's country analysts through a structured methodology that converts a series of qualitative inputs into an overall quantitative score. To assign Trajectories, analysts evaluate each country's outlook across the five key political dimensions noted previously. Analysts then evaluate the impact of each outlook on the country's macro business environment, weighted by the relative importance of each dimension in generating political risks and opportunity. The qualitative inputs are translated into a raw score.

Eurasia Group has applied these political risk variables in empirical work using a time series of 22 Emerging Market equity returns and bond spreads since 2005. Returns and spreads first are regressed against a set of macro and market fundamental variables; the time series of political stability is then introduced into the regressions to see how it improves the ability to explain the variation in returns and bond spreads. Key findings of this work include:


- For equity markets, incorporating a political risk measure meaningfully improves our ability to explain differences in market returns between countries compared to a model of equity market fundamentals alone.
- Measures of political risk are generally uncorrelated with equity market fundamentals, suggesting that political risk provides independent leverage in explaining why equity returns vary across countries.
- Adding the GPRI as a political risk factor to a macro-equity factor model (including earnings growth, equity risk premia, and price-to-book ratios) raises the ability to explain the variation of returns between countries by roughly 18 percentage points⁵.
- We find similar results with Emerging Market bond spreads: Incorporating a formal measure of political risk meaningfully improves our ability to explain differences in bond spreads – both between countries and within countries over time – compared to macro and credit fundamentals alone⁶.
- Adding political risk to a macro factor model (GDP growth, current account balance, short-term interest rates, and the government's budget balance) raises the ability to explain the between-country variation in spreads by roughly eleven percentage points (and also improves the ability to explain why spreads move within a country over time).

A Case Study on the Impact of Political Risk on Emerging Market Multi-Asset Investing: The Examples of India vs Brazil

The diverging experiences of India and Brazil in 2014 provide useful examples of how political signals can be incorporated into portfolio management decisions.

Each country held national elections in 2014 (India in May, Brazil in October) and faced similar macroeconomic pressures ahead of the elections: slowing GDP growth, widening current account deficits, and still-high inflation. Both elections pitted long-seated incumbents (In Brazil, the PT had held power since 2003, and in India the Congress party had led since 2004) against opposition parties pledging economic reform (the PSDB in Brazil, and the BJP in India). In India, the opposition BJP led by now Prime Minister Narendra Modi of course won with a large BJP majority in the lower house, while in Brazil the opposition fell short and Dilma Rousseff narrowly won re-election.

Chart 6: Divergence in Brazil and Indian Political Trajectories




Source: Eurasia research

India

In India, the landslide election victory for the relatively business-friendly Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) in May marked the first outright majority for any single party in India since 1984 (the BJP won 282 of 543 seats in the lower house of parliament). This strong performance — which exceeded the party’s own forecasts as well as those of most analysts — resulted in Modi taking undisputed control over both the party and the government. The BJP’s parliamentary strength has positioned it to deliver on promises to further liberalize the economy, modernize and expand infrastructure, and facilitate business investment and job creation.

Chart 7 & 8: India GPRI scores and Political Trajectories



Source: Eurasia Group

Leading up to the election, Eurasia Group’s political signals reflected growing optimism about the prospects of a BJP-led India. The 6-month Political Trajectory score for India improved prior to the election, and was upgraded from Neutral to Positive by April 2014 – the month ahead of the election. In addition, overall political stability scores (measured by the GPRI) increased from the beginning of the year, driven by a meaningful improvement in India’s government stability score. These signals all highlighted an increasingly positive outlook on the impact of economic and investment policy on the macro-business environment post-election.


At the same time Indian equities would have ranked as neutral on the valuation models of Nikko Asset Management’s Emerging Market strategy. While momentum signals had moved into positive territory, the lack of valuation support meant that a higher hurdle needed to be met for Indian equities to be upgraded to an overweight position within a global emerging markets portfolio. Eurasia Group’s political signals would have provided this confirmation for Nikko Asset Management to upgrade Indian equities to an overweight allocation at the end of April 2014.

Brazil

In contrast, in Brazil, incumbent president Dilma Rousseff of the PT faced a tough battle for reelection in October against Aécio Neves, and won only narrowly in a second-round runoff. With a weaker government compared to her previous term (reflected in lower government strength scores), Rousseff has struggled to pass and implement economic reforms since her victory. Within a context of little economic growth, a looming energy crisis, the Petrobras scandal, and high inflation, Rousseff will continue to face an increasingly challenging political climate. Correspondingly, Eurasia Group's political signals ahead of the election highlighted a consistent deterioration in the political outlook post-election. The six and 24-month Political Trajectories scores both fell ahead of the elections, and Brazil's short-term government stability outlook moved into negative territory in September. Overall political stability scores all declined materially, with government stability, social stability and security environment all falling in the four months leading up to the October election.

Chart 9 & 10: Brazil GPRI scores and Political Trajectories

Brazil Political Trajectories: 2014 Rousseff election




Source: Eurasia Group

In this instance too, Eurasia Group's political signals would have played a pivotal role in the underweighting of Brazil equities. Nikko Asset Management portfolio models were then indicating that valuations for Brazil equities were expensive while price momentum had turned positive. However, the deterioration in the political outlook suggested caution and the net result would have been to increase the underweight on Brazil equities relative to India, which already would have been overweight.

As it turns out, these allocations would have been rewarded, as Indian equities outperformed Brazil equities by over 50% in USD terms from April 2014 to the end of Feb 2015.

Brazil GPRI: 2014 Rousseff election



Source: Eurasia Group

The Growing Need for a Systematic Approach on Political Risk

While macro-political conflicts continue to dominate the headlines (Russia-Ukraine, ISIS, Syria, Iraq) and have added a general degree of uncertainty and volatility to markets, in general, they have been viewed as local, contained conflicts.


We forecast that the frequency and intensity of macro-political crises are likely to increase given the current structural shifts in the international balance of political and economic power.

The United States is less willing and able to provide global leadership, but no alternatives have yet emerged to take the place of the US. Traditional American allies are distracted by domestic issues and less aligned. Emerging Market countries have become powerful enough to block global initiatives, but not so powerful (or coordinated) that they can offer their own alternatives. A growing China, a declining Russia, and many emerging markets with competing priorities and widely varying political systems is leading to more major powers with more divergent interests. The world has entered a period of “macro-political creative destruction,” with important consequences for the global economy.

The effects from heightened political risk spilling over into Emerging Markets will require investors to take a more systematic consideration of the transmission of political risk.

As the chart to the right shows, Eurasia’s GPRI index reflects the decline in macro-political stability that has accompanied these structural shifts in the macro-political order post 2008-2009 – and in particular elevated risks for Emerging Markets. This indicator presents a composite global measure of political risk – which takes country-level assessments of political stability and aggregates them using GDP (at PPP) weights – and shows a marked increase in the global economy’s exposure to political risk over the past several years, as illustrated in Chart 11.

Chart 11: Global Political Risk Index Measure of Frontier, Emerging and Developed Markets



Source: Eurasia Group

The example in the case study of India and Brazil, and the impact of the elections on their subsequent different policy responses to macro-political economic challenges, such as the tapering of quantitative easing by the US (referred to as the “taper tantrum”), demonstrates the increased sensitivity of Emerging Markets to exogenous shocks.

Because this political risk is contributing even more heavily to market prices, the need to incorporate a systematic approach to measuring political signals into Emerging Market portfolio management has increased.

Section Three: Linking Political Risk Measurement with Emerging Market Multi-Asset Management

- **Diversification benefits between investing in Emerging Markets and Developed Markets have declined over recent years, as both are now more tightly integrated into the global economy and sensitive to similar macro-political shocks**
- **Diversification benefits between asset classes within Emerging Market countries also decline markedly during times of crises, as political risk tends to drive correlation of all assets higher**
- **This emphasizes the need to be able to interpret early political-risk signals, and incorporate these into top-down country allocation decisions.**

The Linkage between Political Analysis and Portfolio Management

As noted in the first section, the growth of local-currency bonds and other asset classes within Emerging Markets now provides the investor with multiple sources of excess returns. The higher volatility of this broader range of Emerging Market assets has been seen as providing an opportunity to generate better risk adjusted returns.

A number of Emerging Market Multi-Asset Funds launched post the 2008-2009 crisis. Many of these were premised on the popular view that Developed and Emerging Markets would “decouple,” and Emerging Markets were entering a period of relative autonomous growth from Developed Markets

However, as illustrated earlier, far from decoupling and being driven more by endogenous bottom-up growth factors, Emerging Markets have actually become more sensitive to top-down macro factors and the similar macro-political shocks that affect Developing Markets.

Rather than a bottom-up view, what is now required is a better understanding of the linkages between macro-political events, Emerging Market policy responses and how these are transmitted to asset prices.

Another problem with the premise that a multi-asset approach to Emerging Markets benefits because of the dispersion between Emerging Market asset classes is that this assumption doesn't hold true during political crises, which are becoming more frequent.

As Table 1 illustrates, in times of crisis the correlation between debt and equity assets in an Emerging Market country or region can become much more highly correlated, and benefits from dispersion reduced dramatically.

Correlation between asset classes within countries rise sharply leading up and in the immediate aftermath of major political risk events. This is true for both negative and positive political shocks. Table 1 provides a representative sample of major political risk events across the emerging markets over the past fifteen years, from Vicente Fox's election as president in Mexico in 2000 (a positive political “shock”) to the re-election of Dilma Rousseff (a more negative risk event) in October 2014. The sample includes elections, institutional crises (Turkey in 2001, Philippines in 2005), and government collapses (Argentina in 2001, Egypt in 2011, Ukraine in 2013). Some of these events were well-anticipated, and others were not.

As Table 1 shows, major political risk events are associated with an increase in correlation between equities and sovereign bonds, suggesting that country-level asset prices are increasingly macro-driven around political events, and less so by asset class fundamentals. We develop a stylized estimate of intra-country asset correlation around political events by looking at the mean level of correlation across various times ahead of and following each of these events: Correlations tend to rise meaningfully 3-6 months ahead of the event, peak in the 30 days prior, and subsequently “normalize” following the event.

Despite divergent election results, and subsequently diverging asset price performance, the evolution of asset class correlation followed a remarkably similar path in both cases. In India, equities and bonds were moderately correlated (.36) six months ahead of the election and rose steadily ahead of the election, peaking (at 0.64) in the 30 days following the election; in the subsequent six months correlations steadily declined to fairly low levels (0.14). Brazil too saw an increase in correlation ahead of the election, peaking at a high 0.83 in the 90 days before the election, and subsequently declined -- although still remaining at relatively high levels (.68 six months out), likely reflecting still-high levels of political risk in Brazil.

A systematic framework for understanding political risk effectively helps to anticipate change in correlation and volatility for better top-down portfolio management. As the case study on page nine demonstrates, an investment process that evaluates valuation, momentum and macro inputs is significantly enhanced when political risk can be accurately measured and understood.

Table 1: Asset Correlations in Emerging Markets during Political Crises

Event	Country	Start date	Start -180	Start -90	Start -30	Start +30	Start +90	Start +180
Fox wins Presidency	Mexico	1-Dec-00	0.38	0.36	0.34	-0.58	-0.08	0.19
February institutional crisis	Turkey	22-Feb-01	0.52	0.82	0.72	0.84	0.79	0.71
President de La Rúa forced out of office	Argentina	21-Dec-01	0.69	0.57	0.14	-0.51	-0.13	0.14
Lula's election	Brazil	27-Oct-02	0.84	0.80	0.86	0.92	0.89	0.78
Election rigging scandal and crisis	Philippines	1-Jun-05	0.36	0.33	0.34	0.60	0.57	0.32
Zuma election	South Africa	22-Apr-09	0.50	0.29	0.80	0.56	0.17	0.24
President Mubarak forced to resign	Egypt	11-Feb-11	0.21	0.24	0.61	0.50	0.33	0.36
Humala makes second round	Peru	10-Apr-11	0.32	0.18	0.04	0.72	0.47	0.50
Yanukovich flees to Russia	Ukraine	2-Nov-13	0.38	0.49	0.63	0.13	0.53	0.19
Modi election	India	26-May-14	0.36	0.60	0.64	0.39	0.20	0.14
Rouseff election	Brazil	26-Oct-14	0.45	0.83	0.71	0.57	0.68	..
AVERAGE			0.46	0.50	0.53	0.38	0.40	0.36

Note: Highlighted cell show the peak period of asset class correlation
 Source: Eurasia Group

Conclusions

1. **Instead of decoupling, the rapid evolution of capital markets means that Emerging Markets are becoming increasingly sensitive to macro-political shocks. This means that top down analysis is increasingly important to Emerging Market portfolios.**
2. **The growing frequency of macro-political shocks and their impact on Emerging Market asset prices means that it is increasingly important to have a systematic approach to assessing political risk.**
3. **There is indeed a broader range of assets within Emerging Markets, offering greater opportunities for diversification and returns, which can be accessed through a Multi-Asset approach. However, in times of political crises, the dispersion between these assets decline, and the importance of dynamic top-down, country and asset allocation becomes key in managing downside risk.**
4. **These approaches need to be incorporated into a multi-asset approach, which captures the increasingly broad sources of return within Emerging Markets, and dynamic asset allocation, which factors in macro risks, along with valuation and momentum, to be able to manage the significant downside volatility.**
5. **This new proposition is recognized by Nikko AM and is evidenced in its partnership with Eurasia Group.**

¹ See Biaklkowski, Jedrzej, et al (2006)

² See Moser (2007)

³ See Bernhard and Leblang (2006)

⁴ See Balding (2011)

⁵ See Eurasia Research Political Risk Country Portfolio: A systematic framework linking politics to asset prices, 2 June 2014

⁶ See Eurasia Research: Political Risk Country Portfolio: Political risk and sovereign debt- a systematic framework, 1 October 2014".

Eurasia Group is the world's leading global political risk research and consulting firm. More than 60 analysts covering 100+ countries in Africa, Asia, Eurasia, Europe, Latin America, the Middle East, and the United States advise a wide range of institutional investors and multinational companies on the political events and trends that move markets. Their work analyzes and forecasts country-level risks and opportunities around political stability, fiscal and monetary policies, elections, security, and legislative and regulatory risks, among other aspects of political risk. They also examine cross-border geopolitical issues such as security, trade, energy, cybersecurity, financial regulation, and global health. The firm is headquartered in New York, with offices in Washington, DC, and London, as well as on-the-ground experts and resources in over a hundred countries. Eurasia Group analysts are highly trained political scientists with extensive experience in the public and private sectors.

For more information, please visit: <http://www.eurasiagroup.net/>

Nikko Asset Management is positioning itself to be Asia's premier global asset manager. The firm offers world-class asset management solutions for global investors, and has approximately 19.46 trillion yen in assets under management*. With more than 290 investment professionals**, the firm leverages its extensive global resources representing over 30 nationalities across 12 countries. Headquartered in Asia for over 55 years, Nikko Asset Management's vantage point, extending east to west, distinguishes its investment approach.

* Consolidated assets under management and sub-advisory of Nikko Asset Management and its subsidiaries as of March 31, 2015.

** As of March 31, 2015, including employees of Nikko Asset Management and its subsidiaries, as well as 100% of investment professionals within Nikko AM's minority joint ventures.

For more information, please visit <http://en.nikkoam.com/>

Important Information

These materials have been prepared by Nikko Asset Management based on research conducted by Eurasia Group. These materials are meant to present a view on the market environment, and are not solicitation for a specific fund. Moreover, the information in these materials will not affect Nikko Asset Management's fund investment in any way. Mentions of individual stocks in these materials neither promise that the stocks will be incorporated nor constitute a recommendation to buy or sell. The information in these materials have been prepared from what is considered to be reliable information but the accuracy and integrity of the information is not guaranteed by Nikko Asset Management. Figures, charts, and other data in these materials are current as of the date of publication unless stated otherwise. In addition, opinions expressed in these materials are as of the date of publication unless stated otherwise. The graphs, figures, etc., contained in these materials contain either past or back-dated data, and make no promise of future investment returns, etc. These materials make no guarantee whatsoever of future changes to the market environment. Opinions expressed in these materials may contain opinions that are not Nikko Asset Management's but the personal opinion of the authors, and may be changed without notice.

Forwarding or quoting from these materials without the advance written permission of Nikko Asset Management representative is strictly prohibited.

Nikko Asset Management Co., Ltd.

Registration Number: Director of the Kanto Local Finance Bureau (Financial instruments firms) No. 368

Member Associations: The Investment Trusts Association, Japan, The Japan Investment Advisers Association, Japan Securities Dealers Association

nikko am

Nikko Asset Management Co., Ltd.

Midtown Tower 9-7-1 Akasaka, Minato-ku, Tokyo
107-6242 Japan
Tel: 03-6447-6000 Fax: 03-6447-6001
www.nikkoam.com/english/