

# Modeling Time-to-Event Contingent Cash Flows: A Discrete-Time Survival Analysis Approach \*

Jackson P. Lautier<sup>†‡</sup>      Vladimir Pozdnyakov<sup>†</sup>      Jun Yan<sup>†</sup>

January 14, 2022

\*This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DHE 1747453.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Connecticut

<sup>‡</sup>Corresponding to [jackson.lautier@uconn.edu](mailto:jackson.lautier@uconn.edu).

## Abstract

Actuaries must often come up with risk estimates from incomplete data rapidly and accurately. One such example is predicting and pricing cash flows from a trust of individual contingent risks, such as an automobile lease consumer asset-backed security. We find that using a discrete-time product-limit estimator modified for random truncation and censoring to estimate a survival distribution for consumer automobile lease contracts along with our proposed cash flow model can effectively predict future cash flows. Furthermore, the combination of this lifetime estimator and our cash flow model allows for the derivation of direct formulas to consistently estimate the actuarial present value, its associated variance, and the conditional-tail-expectation of the full pool of contingent risks at a given point in time without the need for simulation. We also prove the modified discrete-time product-limit estimator yields an asymptotically multivariate normal estimation vector with independent components, which may be of use for small samples. The cash flow model and formulaic results perform well when applied to the Mercedes-Benz Auto Lease Trust (MBALT) 2017-A securitized bond.

**Keywords**— Asymptotically Unbiased, Credit Risk, Lifetime Data, Risk Management

# 1 Introduction

One main professional task of an actuary is to model time-to-event contingent cash flows. For example, they may desire to better understand the potential credit risk of a consumer automotive lease securitization, which is a structured financial product that consists of a trust of individual lease contracts. Since each lessee has the option to terminate the contract early or may default on promised payments, the cash flow stream of each lease contract - and hence the overall trust - is contingent on the random termination time of each lease.

If risk managers desire to estimate the distribution function of lease lifetimes, however, they must consider the practical constraints of such data. For example, loan performance is reported monthly, and so it is preferable to assume discrete-time. Further, the data is left-truncated because investors only observe lease contracts that survive long enough to be included into the trust. Similarly, pricing a securitized bond that is still ongoing will consist of working with a number of leases that are known to still be active with a yet unknown termination time, and so the data is frequently right-censored.

A natural tool from survival analysis to address these forms of incomplete data is the well-known discrete-time modified product-limit estimator, originating in [Tsai et al. \(1987\)](#). Actuaries likely have at least some familiarity with the modified product-limit estimator, particularly given the discussion in Chapter 18 of [Dickson et al. \(2020\)](#) and Chapter 12 of [Klugman et al. \(2012\)](#). However, the estimator may remain underutilized, as there has been limited insurance applications with a direct connection to [Tsai et al. \(1987\)](#), especially regarding the estimator's potential as the lifetime survival distribution underlying a cash flow projection model. [Duchesne and Rioux \(2003\)](#) suggest to use the product-limit estimator to extend the minimum Cramér-von Mises estimator to data that is grouped or censored. [Klugman and Rioux \(2006\)](#) proposed a unified approach to fitting loss models, which incorporates data modifications. [Vilar et al. \(2009\)](#) attempt to use nonparametric estimators equipped to consider truncation and censoring to estimate aggregate losses. [Zhao and Zhou \(2010\)](#) propose to use a semi-competing risks copula and semi-survival copula mod-

els to fit the dependence structure of the event times with delays in the individual claim loss model for incurred-but-not-reported (IBNR) claims (the reference to [Tsai et al. \(1987\)](#) occurs to suggest possible extensions to truncated data). [Liu et al. \(2012\)](#) highlight the potential bias in ignoring truncation when modeling income-protection insurance. [Lopez \(2012\)](#) provides a new nonparametric estimator of the joint distribution of two lifetimes under random right-censoring and left-truncation, which can be seen as a bivariate extension of the Kaplan–Meier estimator. [Lee \(2017\)](#) overviews deductible ratemaking, which naturally requires making estimates from incomplete data. In a later work, [Lopez \(2019\)](#) uses a copula model to predict the final amount of a claim and its distribution from micro-level data, which entails using the product-limit estimator with a weighting scheme to correct for incomplete data biases. Other related applications consider only truncation (e.g., [Sercu, 1997](#); [Herbst, 1999](#); [Paulsen et al., 2008](#); [Blostein and Miljkovic, 2019](#)).

Therefore, we are writing to highlight the merits of the product-limit estimator subject to random truncation and right-censoring, as examined by [Tsai et al. \(1987\)](#). We show that the estimator, when wrapped with a standard present-value cash flow model, performs well in the realistic application to a consumer auto lease asset-backed-security. Further, we derive a convenient actuarial present-value formula at the trust level, including its associated variance. This allows for estimation of prices and risk metrics without the need for simulations. Finally, the discrete-case offers attractive asymptotic properties, which, to our knowledge, we prove in the technical appendix for the first time in the statistical literature.

The paper proceeds as follows. In [Section 2](#), we review the probabilistic assumptions behind the discrete-time product-limit estimator adjusted for random truncation before it is introduced in [Section 3](#). Our cash flow model and the related pricing and risk metric formulaic results, the major results of this paper, follow in [Section 4](#). [Section 5](#) provides a series of simulation studies to verify major results. [Section 6](#) includes a detailed application to the MBALT 2017-A financial transaction, and we conclude in [Section 7](#). The asymptotic properties of the discrete-time product-limit estimator may be found in [Appendix A.1](#).

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we work from [Woodroffe \(1985\)](#) to explain that we can make meaningful inference about the distribution of a lifetime of interest from truncated data (a well-accepted yet nontrivial claim on close examination). Next, we introduce censoring. Finally, we introduce our specific sampling procedure, which differs from both [Woodroffe \(1985\)](#) and [Tsai et al. \(1987\)](#). For narrative convenience, we remain in context of the automotive lease securitization application.

Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be two independent, positive, and integer-valued discrete random variables, with distribution functions  $F$  and  $G$ , respectively. Further assume that we only observe the pairs  $(X, Y)$  for which  $Y \leq X$ . That is, our observed data is conditional. Hence, let  $H_*$  denote the joint distribution function of  $X$  and  $Y$  given  $Y \leq X$ , and let  $F_*$  and  $G_*$  denote the marginal distribution functions given  $Y \leq X$  of  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively. Formally,

$$H_*(F, G, x, y) = \Pr(X \leq x, Y \leq y \mid X \geq Y),$$

is the joint conditional distribution with conditional marginal distributions  $F_*$  and  $G_*$ . Note that we include  $F$  and  $G$  within the notation of  $H_*$ , which may appear superfluous.

To explain its import, let the support of  $F$  be  $(a_F \leq x \leq b_F)$ , where  $0 \leq a_F \leq b_F \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and let the support of  $G$  be  $(a_G \leq y \leq b_G)$ , where  $0 \leq a_G \leq b_G \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Note that there will be complete truncation (full data loss), if  $a_G \geq b_F$ . Now,  $H_*$  may be constructed from any pairs of  $F$  and  $G$  such that  $(F, G) \in \mathcal{K}$ , where

$$\mathcal{K} = \{(F, G) : F(0) = 0 = G(0), \quad \Pr(Y \leq X) > 0\}.$$

In an application setting, however, we observe conditional  $H_*$ . This is potentially problematic

because there is a second set of pairs  $(F, G)$  recoverable from  $H_*$ :

$$\mathcal{K}_0 = \{(F, G) \in \mathcal{F} : a_G \leq a_F, \quad b_G \leq b_F\}.$$

To elaborate, for any  $(F, G) \in \mathcal{K}$ , let  $F_0 = \Pr(X \leq x \mid X \geq a_G)$  and  $G_0 = \Pr(Y \leq y \mid Y \leq b_F)$ . Then  $(F_0, G_0) \in \mathcal{K}_0$ , and Lemma 1 of [Woodroffe \(1985\)](#) demonstrates  $H_*(F_0, G_0) = H_*(F, G)$  for any  $(F, G) \in \mathcal{K}$ . In other words, we have two potential pairs  $(F_0, G_0)$  and  $(F, G)$  that lead to the same  $H_*$ . How, then, can we make inference on  $X$  from truncated data?

In most applications, we cannot. But not all is lost. Indeed, Theorem 1 of [Woodroffe \(1985\)](#) states that we can find a unique  $(F_0, G_0)$  if we restrict our construction of  $H_*$  to just the members of  $\mathcal{K}_0$ . More formally, for every  $H_*$  based on some  $(F, G) \in \mathcal{K}$ , there is only one pair  $(F_0, G_0) \in \mathcal{K}_0$  such that  $H_*(F_0, G_0) = H_*(F, G)$ , and this pair is given by  $F_0$  and  $G_0$ . Theorem 1 of [Woodroffe \(1985\)](#) also shows how to recover the cumulative hazard functions of  $F_0$  and  $G_0$  and therefore recover  $F_0$  and  $G_0$ .

Let us now turn to our application. Let  $T$  denote the random time of a new lease contract origination. We assume  $T$  is discrete and spans the finite range  $1 \leq T \leq m$ . Define the time until lease contract termination, our lifetime variable of interest, to be  $X$ . Lease contracts have a fixed duration, and we denote this final possible termination time to be  $\omega$ , where  $1 \leq \omega \leq r$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since issuers of structured debt typically have a legal obligation to the trust to select lease contracts with a minimum history of on-time payments, the youngest least in the trust will have some minimum age,  $\Delta$ , where  $1 \leq \Delta \leq \omega$ .

Thus, the trust begins at time  $m + \Delta$ , where  $\Delta$  is non-random. If we denote  $Y = m + \Delta + 1 - T$ , then  $\Delta + 1 \leq Y \leq m + \Delta$ . Notice that  $Y$  represents the minimum amount of time a lease must remain active to be observed in the trust. Hence, we will only observe  $X$  given  $X \geq Y$ , and therefore  $Y$  is a truncation random variable. Further, if we assume the time of a new lease contract origination,  $T$ , is independent of the time of lease termination,  $X$ , then  $X$  and  $Y$  will be independent. For completeness, notice  $\Delta + 1 \leq X \leq \omega$ .

In terms of recovery, therefore, we have  $a_G = \Delta + 1$ ,  $b_G = m + \Delta$ ,  $a_F = \Delta + 1$ , and  $b_F = \omega$ . Hence, if  $\Delta > 0$ ,  $F_0 = \Pr(X \leq x \mid X \geq \Delta + 1) \neq F = \Pr(X \leq x)$ , as leases may terminate after one month (we assume  $P(X = 0) = 0$ , though this need not be the case in general applications). Thus, in the proceeding, all inference about  $X$  must be made from  $F_0$ . We emphasize this is the case in nearly all data subject to random truncation, a subtle and perhaps overlooked nuance of estimating distribution functions from truncated data. For additional details, see the seminal work [Woodroffe \(1985\)](#), or, for a discrete-case focused discussion, [Lautier et al. \(2021\)](#).

We now introduce censoring. Let  $m + \Delta + 1 \leq \varepsilon \leq m + \omega$  be the present time, at which there remain leases in the trust with ongoing payments. This present time,  $\varepsilon$ , represents the censoring time. Specifically,  $\Pr(T + X > \varepsilon) > 0$  and so

$$\begin{aligned} X + T \leq \varepsilon &\iff X \leq m + \Delta + 1 - T + \varepsilon - (m + \Delta + 1) \\ &\iff X \leq Y + \varepsilon - (m + \Delta + 1). \end{aligned}$$

If we define  $C = Y + \varepsilon - (m + \Delta + 1)$ , then it is clear the censoring time is a function of the truncation random variable  $Y$ . More precisely,  $C$  equals the truncation time  $Y$  plus a constant. As such, it is convenient to define

$$\tau = \varepsilon - (m + \Delta + 1),$$

and so  $C = Y + \tau = \varepsilon - T$ . If  $\varepsilon > \omega + m$ , then there are no censored observations.

Consider now the observable range of  $X$ . In the case of no truncation and no censoring, it is clear  $1 \leq X \leq \omega$ ; that is, the entire distribution of  $X$  is observable. In the case of truncation, each lease in the trust will have a minimum survival time of  $\Delta + 1$ , and so  $\Delta + 1 \leq X \leq \omega$ , as we demonstrated in the previous section. If we also include censoring, then each lease termination time will only be observable if  $X \leq C = Y + \tau = \varepsilon - T$ . Hence, our observable range of  $X$  becomes  $\Delta + 1 \leq X \leq \min(\omega, \varepsilon - 1)$ . It is convenient to write

$\xi = \min(\omega, \varepsilon - 1)$ , and so  $\Delta + 1 \leq X \leq \xi$ . We emphasize here that the complete finite right tail of  $X$  is estimable only if  $\varepsilon - 1 \geq \omega$ . On the other hand, if  $\varepsilon - 1 < \omega$ , then there is no information on the distribution function of  $X$  for  $x \in \{\varepsilon, \dots, \omega\}$ . See Figure 1 for the complete lease origination and trust time line.

We now have a description of our lifetime variable of interest,  $X$ , the truncation random variable,  $Y$ , and the censoring random variable,  $C = Y + \tau$ . In an applied setting, of course, we have observed data and must attempt to infer information about  $X$ . Thus, how such data may be generated or sampled from some population of independent random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  is of interest. Since, the securitized trust consists of only those pairs of  $(X, Y)$  such that  $X \geq Y$ , we assume our population has already been truncated, and it is this truncated population from which we are sampling  $(X_i, Y_i)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . However, because of censoring, we do not observe  $(X_i, Y_i)$ . Instead, for each pair  $(X_i, Y_i)$ , we observe only the random variables  $Y_i, \min(X_i, C_i)$ , where  $C_i = Y_i + \tau$ , and  $\mathbf{1}_{X_i \leq C_i}$  (i.e., if  $X_i$  was censored). Our goal, therefore, is to extract as much information as possible about  $X$  from these three random variables. We formalize how to do so in the following section.

### 3 Estimation

For the discrete space, we suggest working in terms of the hazard rate

$$\lambda(x) = \frac{\Pr(X = x)}{\Pr(X \geq x)}, \tag{1}$$

because we can recover the distribution function for  $X$  as follows:

$$\Pr(X \geq x) = \prod_{\Delta+1 \leq k < x} [1 - \lambda(k)].$$

In building to the product-limit estimator subject to random truncation and censoring, recall again our observable data: for each lease,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we observe the truncation time  $Y_i$ ,



$\min(X_i, C_i)$ , where  $X_i$  represents the termination time of lease  $i$  and  $C_i = Y_i + \tau$  represents the censoring time of lease  $i$ , and  $\mathbf{1}_{X_i \leq C_i}$ , i.e., whether or not the observation was censored. In the following, the subscript  $\tau$  will indicate an underlying data set that has been truncated and censored. Define

$$f_{*,\tau}(x) = \Pr(X_i = x, X_i \leq C_i) = \Pr(X = x, X \leq C \mid X \geq Y), \quad (2)$$

and

$$C_\tau(x) = \Pr(Y_i \leq x \leq \min(X_i, C_i)) = \Pr(Y \leq x \leq \min(X, C) \mid X \geq Y). \quad (3)$$

We first show

$$\lambda_\tau(x) = \frac{f_{*,\tau}(x)}{C_\tau(x)}.$$

Define  $\alpha = \Pr(X \geq Y)$  and observe from the independence of  $X$  and  $Y$

$$\begin{aligned} C_\tau(x) &= \Pr(Y_i \leq x \leq \min(X_i, C_i)) = \Pr(Y \leq x \leq \min(X, C) \mid X \geq Y) \\ &= \frac{\Pr(Y \leq x \leq C) \Pr(x \leq X)}{\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$f_{*,\tau}(x) = \Pr(X_i = x, X_i \leq C_i) = \Pr(X = x, X \leq C \mid X \geq Y) = \frac{\Pr(X = x) \Pr(Y \leq x \leq C)}{\alpha}.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{f_{*,\tau}(x)}{C_\tau(x)} = \left[ \frac{\Pr(X = x) \Pr(Y \leq x \leq C)}{\alpha} \right] \left[ \frac{\alpha}{\Pr(Y \leq x \leq C) \Pr(x \leq X)} \right] = \lambda_\tau(x).$$

See Section 2 of [Lautier et al. \(2021\)](#) for an extended discussion of why having  $C_\tau(x)$  in the denominator is not a concern (i.e., it is nonzero).

**Remark.** We have been assuming  $C = Y + \tau$ , where  $\tau = \varepsilon - (m + \Delta + 1)$ , a constant.

However, the results hold more generally if  $C = f(Y)$ , where  $f$  is a Borel function and  $C \geq Y$  almost surely.

Since (2) and (3) are directly estimable from the data via

$$\hat{f}_{*,\tau,n}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{X_i \leq C_i} \mathbf{1}_{\min(X_i, C_i) = x}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{C}_{\tau,n}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq x \leq \min(X_i, C_i)},$$

we have the natural estimator for (1) as follows:

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(x) = \frac{\hat{f}_{*,\tau,n}(x)}{\hat{C}_{\tau,n}(x)} = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{X_i \leq C_i} \mathbf{1}_{\min(X_i, C_i) = x}}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq x \leq \min(X_i, C_i)}}. \quad (4)$$

Tsai et al. (1987) state that (4) is the nonparameteric conditional maximum likelihood estimator of  $\lambda_\tau$ . Further, it is not difficult to show that (4) is same estimator as in Section 18.4.3 of Dickson et al. (2020) and Section 12.1 of Klugman et al. (2012). We prefer the indicator representation because of its natural relationship to computational programming, which facilitates applications. In Appendix A.1, we show the vector of estimators  $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{\tau,n} = (\hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(\Delta + 1), \dots, \hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(\xi))^T$  is asymptotically normal with independent components and consistent for the vector of true hazard rates,  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_\tau = (\lambda_\tau(\Delta + 1), \dots, \lambda_\tau(\xi))^T$ .

Lastly, we again wish to emphasize that we can make meaningful inference about  $F$  from  $F_0$  only; we cannot recover  $F$ . Then again, it is noteworthy that we can make the connection from our incomplete observed data in  $Y_i$ ,  $\min(X_i, C_i)$ , and  $\mathbf{1}_{X_i \leq C_i}$  to a sizable portion of  $X$ . Indeed, this a major contribution of the related statistical literature.

## 4 Cash Flow Model

We first introduce a working cash flow model that is dependent on a survival random variable,  $X$ . By estimating  $X$  from incomplete data using (4), we can build from our working cash flow model to derive formulas to calculate the actuarial present value, its variance, and common risk metrics of interest. These formulas may help practioners avoid potentially time intensive

simulations. Further, using the results of Appendix A, we can show our proposed estimators are consistent.

## 4.1 Model Introduction

Our objective is to project the future cash flows of a trust of lease contracts. For generality, suppose the present time is  $m + \Delta + 1 \leq \varepsilon \leq m + \omega$ . This implies the trust is ongoing with payment history but has not yet terminated. Our model will build from a single lease contract to the full trust. Let there be  $N$  total lease contracts, and consider lease  $i$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq N$ .

Suppose the age of this lease contract at time  $\varepsilon$  is  $\Delta + 1 \leq x_{\varepsilon(i)} \leq \xi$ . At time  $\varepsilon$ , the present value (PV) of the future payments of this lease contract is

$$\text{PV}_i = \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{X_i - x_{\varepsilon(i)} + 1} \frac{R_i}{(1+r)^j} \right] + \frac{Z(X_i - 1)V_i}{(1+r)^{X_i - x_{\varepsilon(i)} + 1}}, \quad (5)$$

where  $Z(X - 1)$ ,  $\Delta + 1 \leq X \leq \xi$  is an auto depreciation percentage from a reference table,  $V_i$  represents the initial value of vehicle  $i$ ,  $r$  is the monthly rate of interest,  $R_i$  represents the  $i$ th contractual lease payment; and  $X_i$  is the  $i$ th lease termination time random variable.

**Remark.** *The assumed timing of cash flows in (5) warrants emphasis. Suppose lease  $i$  terminates at age  $t$ , where  $x_{\varepsilon(i)} \leq t \leq \xi$ . The investor will not receive the cash-flow until the end of the reporting period, and so interest discounting should be for  $t - x_{\varepsilon(i)} + 1$  months. We further assume that the vehicle will be sold in the previous month to the lease contract termination. Hence, we reference the depreciation factor corresponding to  $Z(t - 1)$ .*

Note that we obtain a straightforward interpretation of (5) in terms of a lease contract:

$$\text{PV}_i = \underbrace{\left[ \sum_{j=1}^{X_i - x_{\varepsilon(i)} + 1} \frac{R_i}{(1+r)^j} \right]}_{\text{Monthly Payments}} + \underbrace{\frac{Z(X_i - 1)V_i}{(1+r)^{X_i - x_{\varepsilon(i)} + 1}}}_{\text{Residual Payment}}.$$

The variables  $R_i$ ,  $V_i$ , and  $x_{\varepsilon(i)}$  are known for lease  $i$ . The depreciation function  $Z(\cdot)$  may be estimated independently from  $X_i$ . We interpret  $Z(\cdot)$  as a vehicle depreciation given  $X_i$ , and so it is known once  $X_i$  is known. Hence, the randomness of  $PV_i$  follows entirely from the randomness in  $X_i$ . The present value of the complete trust is then simply:

$$PV_{\text{Trust}} = \sum_{i=1}^N PV_i. \quad (6)$$

The set-up of (6) allows for many attractive simplifications, which we now explore.

## 4.2 Pricing and Risk Assessment

It will likely be of interest to calculate a price or actuarial present value (APV) of the future lease trust cash flows. Certainly, for investors, using these future cash flows to determine a price would be of great interest on the secondary trading market. Similarly, risk managers may desire to examine the potential variability in such APV calculations. The present section considers these goals.

As alluded to earlier, we may simplify (5) when  $r > 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} PV_i &= \sum_{j=1}^{X_i - x_{\varepsilon(i)} + 1} \frac{R_i}{(1+r)^j} + \frac{Z(X_i - 1)V_i}{(1+r)^{X_i - x_{\varepsilon(i)} + 1}} \\ &= \frac{R_i}{(1+r)} \left[ \frac{1 - (1+r)^{-(X_i - x_{\varepsilon(i)} + 1)}}{1 - (1+r)^{-1}} \right] + \frac{Z(X_i - 1)V_i}{(1+r)^{X_i - x_{\varepsilon(i)} + 1}} \\ &= \frac{R_i}{r} + \left[ Z(X_i - 1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right] \left[ \frac{1}{1+r} \right]^{X_i - x_{\varepsilon(i)} + 1}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Finance professionals may enjoy the interpretation of the (7): a present value of a perpetuity of future contract payments that is adjusted downward by the present value of the difference of the large residual payment and the lost future value of the perpetual lease payments. Recall again that the only random component of (7) is the timing of the lease termination,  $X_i$ . To calculate an actuarial present value (APV), we may use Theorem 4.1. Its proof may

be found in Appendix A.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Suppose we have a collection of  $N$  time-to-event contingent cash flows streams following the individual model (5) and the aggregate model (6). Call the collection of these cash flow streams the Trust. Denote the survival random variable of interest for lease  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$  by  $X_i$  and its hazard rate by (1). Let  $X_i$  be independent of  $X_j$ ,  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq N$ . Then*

(i) *The actuarial present value of the Trust is:*

$$\text{APV}_{\text{Trust}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \text{APV}_i, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\text{APV}_i = \frac{R_i}{r} + \sum_{j=x_{\varepsilon(i)}}^{\xi} \left\{ \left( Z(j-1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right) \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right)^{j-x_{\varepsilon(i)}+1} \lambda_{\tau}(j) \prod_{x_{\varepsilon(i)} \leq k \leq j-1} [1 - \lambda_{\tau}(k)] \right\};$$

(ii) *The variance of present value of the Trust is:*

$$\text{Var}[\text{PV}_{\text{Trust}}] = \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Var}[\text{PV}_i], \quad (9)$$

where

$$\text{Var}[\text{PV}_i] = 2 \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right) \text{APV}_i - \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 + Q_i - (\text{APV}_i)^2,$$

and

$$Q_i = \sum_{j=x_{\varepsilon(i)}}^{\xi} \left\{ \left[ \left( Z(j-1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right)^{2(j-x_{\varepsilon(i)}+1)} \right] \lambda_{\tau}(j) \prod_{x_{\varepsilon(i)} \leq k \leq j-1} [1 - \lambda_{\tau}(k)] \right\}.$$

From (4), we have natural estimators for (8) and (9). Further, by Theorem A.1, the estimators are consistent. We summarize with the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.1.1.** Replace  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_\tau = (\lambda_\tau(\Delta+1), \dots, \lambda_\tau(\xi))^T$  with the estimator  $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{\tau,n} = (\hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(\Delta+1), \dots, \hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(\xi))^T$  in Theorem 4.1. Then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

(i)

$$\widehat{\text{APV}}_{\text{Trust}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \text{APV}_{\text{Trust}},$$

where

$$\widehat{\text{APV}}_{\text{Trust}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{\text{APV}}_{n,i}, \quad (10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{APV}}_{n,i} = & \frac{R_i}{r} + \\ & \sum_{j=x_\varepsilon(i)}^{\xi} \left\{ \left( Z(j-1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right) \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right)^{j-x_\varepsilon(i)+1} \hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(j) \prod_{x_\varepsilon(i) \leq k \leq j-1} [1 - \hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(k)] \right\}; \end{aligned}$$

(ii)

$$\widehat{\text{Var}}_n[\text{PV}_{\text{Trust}}] \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \text{Var}[\text{PV}_{\text{Trust}}],$$

where

$$\widehat{\text{Var}}_n[\text{PV}_{\text{Trust}}] = \sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{\text{Var}}_n[\text{PV}_i], \quad (11)$$

$$\widehat{\text{Var}}_n[\text{PV}_i] = 2 \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right) \widehat{\text{APV}}_{n,i} - \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 + \hat{Q}_{n,i} - (\widehat{\text{APV}}_{n,i})^2,$$

and

$$\hat{Q}_{n,i} = \sum_{j=x_\varepsilon(i)}^{\xi} \left\{ \left[ \left( Z(j-1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right)^{2(j-x_\varepsilon(i)+1)} \right] \hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(j) \prod_{x_\varepsilon(i) \leq k \leq j-1} [1 - \hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(k)] \right\}.$$

We demonstrate our cash flow model can be utilized in a realistic application in Section 6, including estimating common risk metrics of interest.

## 5 Simulation Study

In this section, we verify Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.1.1, and the formulaic calculation of a common risk metric estimate, Tail-Value-at-Risk or Conditional-Tail-Expectation (CTE). That is, we can calculate the CTE of the APV using (14) without the need for running a simulation. As a first step, we use a hypothetical example with a known distribution for lease terminations. This will allow us to verify the consistency of (10) and (11). In a second step, we use actual MBALT 2017-A trust data for a more realistic application. This is further validation for the accuracy of (8) and (9), and we will demonstrate that one may use (14) directly in lieu of a simulation.

For the first step, assume  $Y$  follows a discrete uniform distribution over  $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, 10\}$  and  $X$  follows a truncated geometric distribution over  $\mathcal{X} = \{1, \dots, 24\}$ . The pmf of  $X$  is

$$\Pr(X = x) = \begin{cases} p(1-p)^{x-1}, & x = 1, 2, \dots, 23; \\ \sum_{x=24}^{\infty} p(1-p)^{x-1}, & x = 24; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where  $0 < p < 1$ . Here we assume  $p = 0.20$ ,  $r = 0.03$ ,  $V_1 = \$100,000$ ,  $R_1 = 100$ ,  $Z(X) = (1.05)^{-X}$ ,  $x_{\varepsilon(1)} = 6$ , and  $\xi = 24$ . Call this the “first lease contract” and denote it by  $X_1$ . Thus, for  $1 \leq j \leq 18$  we have

$$\Pr(X_1 = j + x_{\varepsilon(1)} \mid X_1 \geq x_{\varepsilon(1)}) = \begin{cases} 0.2 & j = 1; \\ (0.2)(1 - 0.2)^{j-1} & 1 < j < 18; \\ (1 - 0.2)^{17} & j = 18. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

One may verify

$$\sum_{j=1}^{18} \Pr(X_1 = j \mid X \geq 6) = 1.$$

Hence, by (15) and (18), we have  $APV_1 = 56,197.86$  and  $\sqrt{\text{Var}[\text{PV}_1]} = 14,328.49$ . We next ran a simulation using the distribution in (13) directly. Each possible value of  $j$  corresponds to a present value, which is then weighted by its associated probability. For example, with  $j = 3$ , we have  $X_1 = 9$ ,  $\Pr(X_1 = 9 \mid X_1 \geq 6) = 0.128$ , and

$$PV_{X_1=9} = \frac{100}{(1.03)} + \frac{100}{(1.03)^2} + \frac{100}{(1.03)^3} + \frac{(1.05)^{-8}100,000}{(1.03)^3} = 62,223.25.$$

As a quick validation of the accuracy and consistency of (10), we ran  $n = 1,000,000$  scenarios. This resulted in an empirical mean of 56,184.49 and an empirical standard deviation of 14,324.65, both of which match closely with  $APV_1$  and  $\sqrt{\text{Var}[\text{PV}_1]}$ , respectively.

We next consider  $\text{Var}[\text{PV}_{\text{Trust}}]$ . For simplicity, we assume  $N = 2$ . Specifically, the “second lease contract”,  $X_2$ , has  $V_2 = 80,000$ ,  $x_{\varepsilon(2)} = 9$ , and  $R_2 = 500$ . The remaining assumptions are the same as the first lease contract. Again by (15) and (18) we have  $APV_2 = 40,765.56$  and  $\sqrt{\text{Var}[\text{PV}_2]} = 8,342.445$ . We again ran  $n = 1,000,000$  scenarios. The empirical correlation was  $-0.0020$ , which is very close to zero. Furthermore, the empirical variance was 274,785,297, which corresponds well to  $\text{Var}[\text{PV}_1] + \text{Var}[\text{PV}_2] = 274,902,053$ .

In the second step, we verify (8), (9), and using (14) directly through a simulation study with MBALT 2017-A. Throughout these results, we assume we have 12 months of observed trust performance data,  $e = 12$ . To perform this validation, we first calculate (10) and (11), which we just verified are consistent for the unknown quantities (8) and (9). Thus, we compare (10) and (11) with the empirical mean and variance of 1,000 simulations of lease lifetimes using our fitted distribution built from  $\hat{\Lambda}_{n,\tau}$ . That is, for each lease  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq 866$ , still ongoing after 12 months of trust data, we simulate a time of lease contract termination,  $X_{i,\text{sim}}$ , and then construct a sequence of cash flows using that specific lease’s monthly payment and vehicle value information. These cash flows are then discounted with interest and totaled to find a simulated trust present value. This process is repeated 1,000 times to generate a distribution for the APV, from which we can find the corresponding



empirical mean, variance, and CTE. Table 1 demonstrates (10), (11), and (14) closely match the simulated estimates.

## 6 Application

We now consider the Mercedes-Benz Auto Lease Trust (MBALT) 2017-A consumer automobile lease asset-backed security. Detailed individualized contract population information and loan performance data is available through the Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis, and Retrieval (EDGAR) system, freely accessible to the public through the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Details of the financial transaction may be found in [Mercedes-Benz \(2017\)](#), which is also accessible through the SEC. For convenience, we have included complete individual lessee and cash flow data in the accompanying online supplemental material for interested readers.

The MBALT 2017-A transaction had 56,402 lease contracts with original terms ranging from 24 to 60 months. For simplicity, we only consider leases with an original termination schedule of 24 months. This reduces our sample size to  $n = 866$  lease contracts. When we refer to the “trust” henceforth, we are referring to this reduced sample of 866 leases. The MBALT 2017-A securitized bond was placed in April of 2017, and the transaction closed in August of 2019. Hence, we have a total of 28 months of loan performance and cash flow data. At initialization, the oldest lease in the trust was 21 months old, and the youngest lease was 3 months old. Therefore, in our notation, we have  $\Delta = 3$  and  $m = 18$ .

Though each lease is scheduled to terminate after 24 months, lessees may elect to terminate the contract early or extend. In addition, there may be a delay from the final monthly payment until the point the vehicle is sold and the trust is repaid. Therefore, we assigned the observed time of lease termination to be the month in which the large residual payment was paid into the trust. Additionally, we estimated the depreciation table by a simple average of the residual amount as a percentage of the original vehicle value for each lease

contract terminated in a given month. Note that we used all 56,402 lease contracts to estimate the automobile depreciation. Lastly, the month-to-month depreciation table,  $Z(\cdot)$ , was smoothed using local polynomial regression fitted via the `loess` function in R, a component of the `stats` base R package. See [R Core Team \(2020\)](#) for details.

We have the actual cash flows for all 28 months. Hence, we assume a censoring (or pricing) time of  $e = 6, 12, 18, 24$  months after the start of the MBALT 2017-A transaction (these correspond to times  $\varepsilon = 28, 34, 40, 46$  on Figure 1). That is, we form estimates of the lease termination distribution  $X$  with (4) using  $e$  months of loan performance data. Since our main focus is the monthly cash flow, we assume  $r = 0$ . Formally, suppose we have trust data for the first  $e$  months. We performed the simulation procedure in Figure 2 to examine the ability of (6) to predict cash flows from MBALT 2017-A.

In other words, we use (6) with a random  $X$  estimated from (4) to project possible paths of the next  $28 - e$  months of cash flows for the MBALT 2017-A transactions. If our model is appropriate, the true cash flows should fall a majority of the time within the 95% empirical confidence interval. A close examination of Figure 3 demonstrates that this is indeed the case. It is also encouraging that the shape of the confidence interval tracks the actual cash flows for the viability of the estimator  $\hat{\Lambda}_{\tau,n}$  to capture the lease termination behavior for this trust. We performed similar validations with a second auto lease securitization, [Mercedes-Benz \(2019\)](#), though these results are omitted for brevity.

**Remark.** *Due to censoring, it is possible that we may have a number of leases still active as of the age of the oldest observed lease termination. In this case, we will need some estimate for the tail behavior of the lease termination distribution without access to observed data. We recommend extending the estimated hazard rate for the final observed termination month forward assuming a geometric (i.e., exponential) tail. This is a common practice in survival analysis (see, for example, Section 12.1 of [Klugman et al. \(2012\)](#)).*

One advantage of using Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.1.1, is ability to avoid potentially computationally intensive simulations, even for risk metric estimates like CTE. To see this,

consider Figure 4. We see that the empirical distribution of simulations within Table 1 form the standard bell-shaped curve. This is not surprising. Each simulation represents an observation from the MBALT 2017-A trust random variable, which is ultimately based on the estimates  $\hat{\Lambda}_{n,\tau}$ . Since each simulation is independent and identically distributed, the asymptotic properties of the central limit theorem hold.

Therefore, it is not unreasonable to approximate the actuarial present value of the MBALT 2017-A trust with a normal distribution with parameters  $\mu = \widehat{\text{APV}}_{\text{Trust}}$  and  $\sigma = \sqrt{\widehat{\text{Var}}_n[\text{PV}_{\text{Trust}}]}$ . Hence, many risk metrics of interest may be estimated with minimal additional effort. For example, one may use [Landsman and Valdez \(2003\)](#) to directly calculate the CTE as follows. Let  $\pi_\alpha$  represent the the  $(1 - \alpha)\%$  quantile of a normal distribution,  $\mathcal{Z}$ , with mean  $\mu$  and standard deviation  $\sigma$ . Then

$$\text{CTE}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\pi_\alpha) = \mu + \left[ \frac{\left(\frac{1}{\sigma}\right) \phi\left(\frac{\pi_\alpha - \mu}{\sigma}\right)}{1 - \Phi\left(\frac{\pi_\alpha - \mu}{\sigma}\right)} \right] \sigma^2, \quad (14)$$

where  $\phi(\cdot)$  represents the probability density function and  $\Phi(\cdot)$  represents the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. Note that here we would likely be concerned with the bottom  $\alpha\%$  of the distribution of APV calculations. Other calculations, such as Value-at-Risk, may also be obtained with minimal effort.

One comment that warrants emphasis is that our model used to calculate (10), (11), and (14) relies on the assumption of independence between individual leases and also does not consider the potential volatility of the depreciation percentage reference,  $Z(\cdot)$ . Hence, depending on the nature of the application, it may be prudent to incorporate the inherent randomness in  $Z(\cdot)$  or the possible dependence between individual leases.

## 6.1 A Remark on a Small Sample Size

Throughout our analysis to this point, we have been working with a trust of data that contains a fairly large sample size of 866 lease contracts. In some applications, however, actuaries may be attempting to estimate the survival probabilities of interest with a much smaller sample. For example, in a pricing exercise, with early emerging experience, or perhaps with more esoteric insurance applications (e.g., high-net-worth individuals, athletes insuring against injuries, etc.). In the instance of a small sample size,  $n$ , of incomplete data, it may be desirable to incorporate the randomness of the estimation vector  $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{\tau,n}$  using Theorem A.1. Conveniently,  $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{\tau,n}$  is asymptotically normal with independent components. Thus, it is not difficult to first simulate  $\hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}$  for each  $x \in \{\Delta + 1, \dots, \xi\}$ . The value of this additional step is that the same estimated confidence intervals of Figure 3 may be wider than those estimated from assuming  $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{\tau,n}$  is nonrandom. We demonstrate as follows.

From the 866 lease contracts in MBALT 2017-A, we take a random sample of 50 leases. Call this reduced sample the “small trust”. We repeat the simulation process in Figure 2 with the additional step of first simulating  $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{\tau,n}$  to obtain a realization of the estimated DF (that is, simulating  $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{\tau,n}$  would fall between lines 7 and 8). Note also that the small trust leads to a number of zero estimates within the components of the estimation vector  $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{\tau,n}$  and thus a zero variance. For simplicity, we linearly interpolate each zero  $\hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}$  and then use Theorem A.1 to approximate the variance. The remaining steps proceed as before. In Figure 5, we compare the simulated and deterministic empirical confidence intervals. It is clear the two intervals do not always agree.

## 7 Conclusion

The product-limit estimator adjusted for random truncation and censoring has received only light coverage in actuarial applications. After giving some extended background on the derivation of the discrete-time estimator (4) and our specific sampling procedure, we

demonstrate that this estimator along with our present value model in (6) can be an effective tool to project cash flows.

To argue this last point, we considered the Mercedes-Benz (2017) auto lease consumer asset-backed security. We demonstrated that we can capture cash flow pattern and variability using our proposed cash flow model built from a survival random variable estimated from the modified product-limit estimator. From this, we derived formulas to calculate the actuarial present value and its variance at a given point along the securitization's lifetime. Using the asymptotic properties of the discrete-time product-limit estimator, we proved our formulaic estimators will be consistent (i.e., asymptotically unbiased). We also showed simulations of the actuarial present value will be approximately normal, and so additional risk metrics of interest can be easily calculated, though we caution that the assumption of independence should be reviewed carefully before generalizing to broad applications. The asymptotic properties of the discrete-time product-limit estimator may be of additional use to capture the variance of such estimators in applications with a smaller sample size. All major results have complete technical proofs in Appendix A. We emphasize that these proofs include the first complete proof of asymptotic normality for discrete-time product-limit estimator over a finite time horizon in the case of both random truncation and censoring, filling a gap in the statistical literature.

We also feel the foundation of the model in (6) can be extended to increase precision because of the flexibility of the function  $Z(\cdot)$ . Within our application, for example, a subject matter expert can calculate automotive depreciation values and pass these values to the risk analyst or  $Z(\cdot)$  could be adjusted to be vehicle make or model dependent.

From a risk management perspective, risk analysts can explore the sensitivity of various assumptions to use (10), (11), and (14) at the desired level of risk appetite. In addition, our model offers relatively simple risk estimates and pricing calculations. Senior managers engaged in exploratory risk analysis or in need of near real-time estimates may benefit from calculations that avoid intensive simulations. A quicker turnaround of such estimates may

also ease pressure for annual assumption updates or simulation studies, especially in early testing phases. Furthermore, the ability to update  $\hat{\Lambda}_{n,\tau}$  with each new month of performance data allows for ongoing risk monitoring, as well as potential mark-to-market applications.

Lastly, we hope that actuaries can see how the model we propose can be generalized to broad risk management and insurance applications. Our specific focus was on a trust of auto lease contracts, but it is not difficult to see how the lease contract could instead be an insurance or other related contract. In this case,  $Z(\cdot)$  could represent a cash flow that derives its value from market movements, such as with variable life insurance contracts. Indeed, it is our hope that the product-limit estimator may gain wider use in actuarial and risk management applications, and we are optimistic the encouraging results of this work will attract additional attention.

## References

- Blostein, M. and T. Miljkovic (2019). On modeling left-truncated loss data using mixtures of distributions. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 85, 35–46.
- Dickson, D. C., M. R. Hardy, and H. R. Waters (2020). *Actuarial Mathematics for Life Contingent Risks, Third Edition*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Duchesne, T. and J. Rioux (2003). “efficient and robust fitting of lognormal distributions,” robert serfling, october 2002. *North American Actuarial Journal* 7(3), 112–116.
- Herbst, T. (1999). An application of randomly truncated data models in reserving ibnr claims. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 25(2), 123–131.
- Klugman, S. and J. Rioux (2006). Toward a unified approach to fitting loss models. *North American Actuarial Journal* 10(1), 63–83.

- Klugman, S. A., H. H. Panjer, and G. E. Willmot (2012). *Loss Models: From Data to Decisions, Fourth Edition*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Landsman, Z. and E. Valdez (2003, 06). Tail conditional expectations for elliptical distributions. *North American Actuarial Journal* 7, 55–71.
- Lautier, J. P., V. Pozdnyakov, and J. Yan (2021). Estimating a distribution function for discrete data subject to random truncation with an application to structured finance.
- Lee, G. Y. (2017). General insurance deductible ratemaking. *North American Actuarial Journal* 21(4), 620–638.
- Lehmann, E. and G. Casella (1998). *Theory of Point Estimation, 2nd Edition*. Springer.
- Liu, Q., D. Pitt, Y. Wang, and X. Wu (2012). Survival analysis of left truncated income protection insurance data. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Risk and Insurance* 7(1).
- Lopez, O. (2012). A generalization of the kaplan–meier estimator for analyzing bivariate mortality under right-censoring and left-truncation with applications in model-checking for survival copula models. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 51(3), 505–516.
- Lopez, O. (2019). A censored copula model for micro-level claim reserving. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 87, 1–14.
- Mercedes-Benz (2017). Prospectus. *Mercedes-Benz Auto Lease Trust 2017-A*.
- Mercedes-Benz (2019). Prospectus. *Mercedes-Benz Auto Lease Trust 2019-A*.
- Mukhopadhyay, N. (2000). *Probability and Statistical Inference*. New York, NY: Marcel Dekker.
- Paulsen, J., A. Lunde, and H. J. Skaug (2008). Fitting mixed-effects models when data are left truncated. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 43(1), 121–133.

- R Core Team (2020). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Sercu, P. (1997). The variance of a truncated random variable and the riskiness of the underlying variables. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 20(2), 79–95.
- Tsai, W.-Y., N. P. Jewell, and M.-C. Wang (1987, 12). A note on the product-limit estimator under right censoring and left truncation. *Biometrika* 74(4), 883–886.
- Vilar, J. M., R. Cao, M. C. Ausín, and C. González-Fragueiro (2009). Nonparametric analysis of aggregate loss models. *Journal of Applied Statistics* 36(2), 149–166.
- Woodrooffe, M. (1985). Estimating a distribution function with truncated data. *The Annals of Statistics* 13(1), 163 – 177.
- Zhao, X. and X. Zhou (2010). Applying copula models to individual claim loss reserving methods. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 46(2), 290–299.

## A Asymptotic Results and Technical Proofs

This section begins with a statement of asymptotic results and then proceeds with formal proofs of all theorems, as well as a simulation study for Theorem [A.1](#).

### A.1 Asymptotic Results

We state the asymptotic properties of a vector of hazard rate estimators following [\(4\)](#). The complete proof along with a simulation study may be found in Sections [A.4](#) and [A.5](#).

**Theorem A.1** ( $\hat{\Lambda}_{\tau,n}$  Asymptotic Properties). *Define  $\hat{\Lambda}_{\tau,n} = (\hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(\Delta + 1), \dots, \hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(\xi))^T$ , where  $\hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}$  follows from [\(4\)](#). Then,*

(i)

$$\hat{\Lambda}_{\tau,n} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \Lambda_{\tau}, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty;$$



(ii)

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{\tau,n} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, \mathbf{\Sigma}), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau} = (\lambda_{\tau}(\Delta + 1), \dots, \lambda_{\tau}(\xi))^T$  with  $\lambda_{\tau}(x) = f_{*,\tau}(x)/C_{\tau}(x)$  and

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \text{diag}\left(\frac{f_{*,\tau}(\Delta + 1)\{C_{\tau}(\Delta + 1) - f_{*,\tau}(\Delta + 1)\}}{C_{\tau}(\Delta + 1)^3}, \dots, \frac{f_{*,\tau}(\xi)\{C_{\tau}(\xi) - f_{*,\tau}(\xi)\}}{C_{\tau}(\xi)^3}\right).$$

That is, the estimators  $\hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(\Delta + 1), \dots, \hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(M + \Delta + \tau)$  are consistent, asymptotically normal, and independent.

## A.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

*Proof.* Begin with (7) and take an expectation. Formally,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{APV}_i &= \mathbf{E}[\text{PV}_i] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left\{\frac{R_i}{r} + \left[Z(X_i - 1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r}\right] \left[\frac{1}{1+r}\right]^{X_i - x_{\varepsilon(i)} + 1}\right\} \\ &= \frac{R_i}{r} + \sum_{j=x_{\varepsilon(i)}}^{\xi} \left\{\left(Z(j-1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r}\right) \left(\frac{1}{1+r}\right)^{j - x_{\varepsilon(i)} + 1} \Pr(X = j \mid X_i \geq x_{\varepsilon(i)})\right\} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Now, observe for  $x_{\varepsilon(i)} \leq s \leq \xi$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(X = s \mid X \geq x_{\varepsilon}) &= \frac{\Pr(X = s)}{\Pr(X \geq x_{\varepsilon})} \\ &= \frac{\Pr(X = s) \Pr(X \geq s)}{\Pr(X \geq s) \Pr(X \geq x_{\varepsilon})} \\ &= \lambda_{\tau}(s) \prod_{x_{\varepsilon} \leq k \leq s-1} [1 - \lambda_{\tau}(k)], \end{aligned}$$

where we use the convention

$$\prod_{x_{\varepsilon} \leq k \leq s-1} [1 - \lambda_{\tau}(k)] = 1,$$

if  $s = x_\varepsilon$ . Hence, returning to (15), we have

$$\text{APV}_i = \frac{R_i}{r} + \sum_{j=x_\varepsilon(i)}^{\xi} \left\{ \left( Z(j-1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right) \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right)^{j-x_\varepsilon(i)+1} \lambda_\tau(j) \prod_{x_\varepsilon(i) \leq k \leq j-1} [1 - \lambda_\tau(k)] \right\}.$$

Equation (8) follows by the linear property of expectations. This proves (i). For (ii), recall (7), (15) and observe for a single lease contract

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[\text{PV}_i] &= \mathbf{E}[(\text{PV}_i)^2] - \mathbf{E}[\text{PV}_i]^2 \\ &= \mathbf{E}[(\text{PV}_i)^2] - (\text{APV}_i)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PV}_i^2 &= \left\{ \frac{R_i}{r} + \left[ Z(X_i - 1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right] \left[ \frac{1}{1+r} \right]^{X_i - x_\varepsilon(i) + 1} \right\}^2 \\ &= \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 + 2 \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right) \left( Z(X_i - 1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right) \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right)^{X_i - x_\varepsilon(i) + 1} \\ &\quad + \left( Z(X_i - 1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right)^{2(X_i - x_\varepsilon(i) + 1)} \\ &= \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 + 2 \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right) \left( \text{PV}_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right) + \left( Z(X_i - 1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right)^{2(X_i - x_\varepsilon(i) + 1)} \\ &= 2 \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right) \text{PV}_i - \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 + \left( Z(X_i - 1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right)^{2(X_i - x_\varepsilon(i) + 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[(\text{PV})^2] &= 2 \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right) \mathbf{E}[\text{PV}] - \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 + \mathbf{E} \left[ \left( Z(X_i - 1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right)^{2(X_i - x_\varepsilon(i) + 1)} \right] \\ &= 2 \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right) \text{APV}_i - \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 + Q_i, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_i &= \sum_{j=x_{\varepsilon(i)}}^{\xi} \left\{ \left[ \left( Z(j-1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right)^{2(j-x_{\varepsilon(i)}+1)} \right] \Pr(X_i = j \mid X_i \geq x_{\varepsilon(i)}) \right\} \\
&= \sum_{j=x_{\varepsilon(i)}}^{\xi} \left\{ \left[ \left( Z(j-1)V_i - \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right)^{2(j-x_{\varepsilon(i)}+1)} \right] \lambda_{\tau}(j) \prod_{x_{\varepsilon(i)} \leq k \leq j-1} [1 - \lambda_{\tau}(k)] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can combine (16) with (17) to write

$$\text{Var}[\text{PV}_i] = 2 \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right) \text{APV}_i - \left( \frac{R_i}{r} \right)^2 + Q_i - (\text{APV}_i)^2. \quad (18)$$

Equation (9) follows because  $X_i$  is independent of  $X_j$  for  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq N$ .  $\square$

### A.3 Proof of Corollary 4.1.1

*Proof.* The result follows from Theorem A.1 (i) and Theorem 5.2.5 (Continuous Mapping Theorem) Mukhopadhyay (2000).  $\square$

### A.4 Proof of Theorem A.1

We first define some helpful notation:

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{\tau}(k, k') &= \Pr(Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i), Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)) \\
&= \Pr(Y_i \leq \min(k, k'), \max(k, k') \leq X_i, \max(k, k') \leq C_i) \\
&= \Pr(Y \leq \min(k, k'), X \geq \max(k, k'), C \geq \max(k, k') \mid X \geq Y) \\
&= \Pr(Y \leq \min(k, k'), X \geq \max(k, k'), C \geq \max(k, k'), X \geq Y) / \Pr(X \geq Y) \\
&= \Pr(Y \leq \min(k, k'), X \geq \max(k, k'), C \geq \max(k, k')) / \alpha \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha} \Pr(X \geq \max(k, k')) \Pr(Y \leq \min(k, k'), \max(k, k') \leq C). \quad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

Notice  $c_\tau(k, k') = c_\tau(k', k)$  and  $c_\tau(k, k) = C_\tau(k)$ . Further,

$$\begin{aligned}
r_\tau(k, k') &= \Pr(X_i = \max(k, k'), Y_i \leq \min(k, k'), X_i \leq C_i) \\
&= \Pr(X = \max(k, k'), Y \leq \min(k, k'), X \leq C \mid X \geq Y) \\
&= \Pr(X = \max(k, k'), Y \leq \min(k, k'), X \leq C, X \geq Y) / \Pr(X \geq Y) \\
&= \Pr(X = \max(k, k'), Y \leq \min(k, k'), C \geq \max(k, k')) / \alpha \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha} \Pr(X = \max(k, k')) \Pr(Y \leq \min(k, k'), \max(k, k') \leq C). \tag{20}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice  $r_\tau(k, k') = r_\tau(k', k)$  and  $r_\tau(k, k) = f_{*,\tau}(k)$ . We first state a lemma, and the proof of Theorem A.1 follows.

**Lemma 1** ( $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\tau,n}$  Asymptotic Properties). *Define  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\tau,n} = (\hat{C}_{\tau,n}(\Delta + 1), \dots, \hat{C}_{\tau,n}(\xi))^T$ , where  $\hat{C}_{\tau,n}$  follows from (4). Then,*

(i)

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\tau,n} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \mathbf{C}_{\tau,n}, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty;$$

(ii)

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\tau,n} - \mathbf{C}_\tau) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_c), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $\mathbf{C}_\tau = (C_\tau(\Delta + 1), \dots, C_\tau(\xi))^T$  with  $C_\tau(x)$  as defined in (3) and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_c$  is a covariance matrix  $\|\sigma_{k',k}\|$  such that

$$\sigma_{k',k} = \begin{cases} C_\tau(k)[1 - C_\tau(k)], & k' = k \\ c_\tau(k', k) - C_\tau(k')C_\tau(k), & k' \neq k \end{cases},$$

for  $k', k = \Delta + 1, \dots, \xi$ .

*Proof.* Statement (i) follows from (ii), so it is left to show (ii). Observe

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\tau,n} = \begin{bmatrix} C_{\tau,n}(\Delta + 1) \\ \vdots \\ C_{\tau,n}(\xi) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq \Delta+1 \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq \xi \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{bmatrix} Y_{\tau, \Delta+1(i)} \\ \vdots \\ Y_{\tau, \xi(i)} \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $Y_{\tau, k(i)}$ ,  $\Delta + 1 \leq k \leq \xi$  are independent and identically distributed Bernoulli random variables with probability of success given by

$$\Pr(Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)) = \Pr(Y \leq k \leq \min(X, C) \mid X \geq Y) = C_\tau(k),$$

for  $k = \Delta + 1, \dots, \xi$ . Thus,  $E[Y_{\tau, k(i)}] = C_\tau(k)$  and  $\text{Var}[Y_{\tau, k(i)}] = C_\tau(k)(1 - C_\tau(k))$ . Now, since

$$\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} = \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq \min(k', k), X_i \geq \max(k', k), C_i \geq \max(k', k)},$$

we have

$$E[Y_{\tau, k'(i)} Y_{\tau, k(i)}] = E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq \min(k', k), X_i \geq \max(k', k), C_i \geq \max(k', k)}] = c_\tau(k', k), \quad (21)$$

for  $k', k = \Delta + 1, \dots, \xi$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[Y_{\tau, k'(i)} Y_{\tau, k(i)}] &= E[Y_{\tau, k'(i)} Y_{\tau, k(i)}] - E[Y_{\tau, k'(i)}] E[Y_{\tau, k(i)}] \\ &= c_\tau(k', k) - C_\tau(k') C_\tau(k). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that (21) reduces to  $C_\tau(k)$  when  $k' = k$ . Use Theorem 8.21 [Multivariate CLT] (pg. 61) of [Lehmann and Casella \(1998\)](#) to complete the proof.  $\square$

We now prove Theorem [A.1](#).

*Proof.* Statement (i) follows from (ii), so it is left to show (ii). Let  $\Delta + 1 \leq k \leq \xi$  and

observe

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\lambda}_{\tau,n}(k) - \lambda_{\tau}(k) &= \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i}}{C_{\tau,n}(k)} - \frac{f_{*,\tau}(k)}{C_{\tau}(k)} \\
&= \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i} C_{\tau}(k) - f_{*,\tau}(k) C_{\tau,n}(k)}{C_{\tau,n}(k) C_{\tau}(k)} \\
&= \left[ \frac{1}{C_{\tau,n}(k) C_{\tau}(k)} \right] \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{ \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i} C_{\tau}(k) - f_{*,\tau}(k) \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \}.
\end{aligned}$$

Further define

$$Z_{\tau,k(i)} = \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i} C_{\tau}(k) - f_{*,\tau}(k) \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)}.$$

Hence,

$$\hat{\Lambda}_{\tau,n} - \Lambda_{\tau} = \mathbf{A}_{\tau,n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{bmatrix} Z_{\tau,\Delta+1(i)} \\ \vdots \\ Z_{\tau,\xi(i)} \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_{\tau,n} = \text{diag}([C_{\tau,n}(\Delta+1)C_{\tau}(\Delta+1)]^{-1}, \dots, [C_{\tau,n}(\xi)C_{\tau}(\xi)]^{-1})$ . That is,

$$\hat{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda = \mathbf{A}_{\tau,n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_{\tau,(i)},$$

where  $\mathbf{Z}_{\tau,(i)} = (Z_{\tau,\Delta+1(i)}, \dots, Z_{\tau,\xi(i)})^T$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$  are independent and identically distributed random vectors. We will also subsequently show that the components of random vector  $\mathbf{Z}_{\tau,(i)}$  are uncorrelated.

First notice  $\mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i}$  is a Bernoulli random variable with probability parameter  $f_{*,\tau}(k)$ . Similarly,  $\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)}$  is a Bernoulli random variable with probability parameter  $C_{\tau}(x)$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
E[Z_{\tau,k(i)}] &= E[\mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i} C_{\tau}(k) - f_{*,\tau}(k) E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)}]] \\
&= f_{*,\tau}(k) C_{\tau}(k) - f_{*,\tau}(k) C_{\tau}(k) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We now show

$$\text{Cov}[Z_{k(i)}, Z_{k'(i)}] = \begin{cases} C_\tau(k) f_{*,\tau}(k) [C_\tau(k) - f_{*,\tau}(k)], & k = k' \\ 0, & k \neq k'. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

Since  $E[Z_{\tau,k(i)}] = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[Z_{\tau,k(i)}, Z_{\tau,k'(i)}] &= E[Z_{\tau,k(i)} Z_{\tau,k'(i)}] \\ &= E \left[ \left( \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i} C_\tau(k) - f_{*,\tau}(k) \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left( \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k', X_i \leq C_i} C_\tau(k') - f_{*,\tau}(k') \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \right) \right] \\ &= C_\tau(k) C_\tau(k') E[\mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i} \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k', X_i \leq C_i}] \\ &\quad - f_{*,\tau}(k) C_\tau(k') E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k', X_i \leq C_i}] \\ &\quad - f_{*,\tau}(k') C_\tau(k) E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i}] \\ &\quad + f_{*,\tau}(k) f_{*,\tau}(k') E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)}] \end{aligned}$$

We proceed by cases.

Case 1:  $k = k'$ .

Since  $\mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i} \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k', X_i \leq C_i} = \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i}$ ,  $E[\mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i} \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k', X_i \leq C_i}] = f_{*,\tau}(k)$ . Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k', X_i \leq C_i} &= \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i} \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i), X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i} \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq X_i \leq X_i, X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i} \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{X_i=k, X_i \leq C_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i = k', X_i \leq C_i}] = E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i = k, X_i \leq C_i}] = f_{*,\tau}(k).$$

Finally,

$$\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} = \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)}.$$

Thus,  $E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)}] = C_\tau(k)$ . Replace these expectations in  $E[Z_{k(i)} Z_{k'(i)}]$  to write

$$Cov[Z_{k(i)}, Z_{k'(i)}] = C_\tau(k) f_{*,\tau}(k) [C_\tau(k) - f_{*,\tau}(k)].$$

Case 2:  $k \neq k'$ .

Since  $\mathbf{1}_{X_i = k, X_i \leq C_i} \mathbf{1}_{X_i = k', X_i \leq C_i} = 0$ ,  $E[\mathbf{1}_{X_i = k, X_i \leq C_i} \mathbf{1}_{X_i = k', X_i \leq C_i}] = 0$ . Assume  $k < k'$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i = k', X_i \leq C_i} &= \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i), X_i = k', X_i \leq C_i} \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k, X_i = k', X_i \leq C_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i = k', X_i \leq C_i}] = \Pr(X_i = k', Y_i \leq k, X_i \leq C_i)$ . Further, when  $k < k'$

$$\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i = k, X_i \leq C_i} = \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i), X_i = k, X_i \leq C_i} = 0.$$

Thus,  $E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i = k, X_i \leq C_i}] = 0$ . Now, if instead  $k > k'$ , then by symmetry,

$$E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i = k, X_i \leq C_i}] = \Pr(X_i = k, Y_i \leq k', X_i \leq C_i),$$

and  $E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i = k', X_i \leq C_i}] = 0$ . Thus, we can generalize and claim

$$\begin{aligned} &f_{*,\tau}(k) C_\tau(k') E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i = k', X_i \leq C_i}] + f_{*,\tau}(k') C_\tau(k) E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{X_i = k, X_i \leq C_i}] \\ &= f_{*,\tau}(\min(k, k')) C_\tau(\max(k, k')) r_\tau(k, k'). \end{aligned}$$



Lastly, notice  $E[\mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k \leq \min(X_i, C_i)} \mathbf{1}_{Y_i \leq k' \leq \min(X_i, C_i)}] = c_\tau(k, k')$ . Replace these expectations in  $E[Z_{k(i)} Z_{k'(i)}]$  to write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(Z_{k(i)}, Z_{k'(i)}) &= -f_{*,\tau}(\min(k, k')) C_\tau(\max(k, k')) r_\tau(k, k') + f_{*,\tau}(\min(k, k')) f_{*,\tau}(\max(k, k')) c_\tau(k, k') \\ &= f_{*,\tau}(\min(k, k')) \{f_{*,\tau}(\max(k, k')) c_\tau(k, k') - r_\tau(k, k') C_\tau(\max(k, k'))\}. \end{aligned}$$

However, using (19) and (20),

$$\begin{aligned} f_{*,\tau}(\max(k, k')) c_\tau(k, k') &= \left[ \frac{\Pr(X = \max(k, k')) \Pr(Y \leq \max(k, k') \leq C)}{\alpha} \right] \\ &\times \left[ \frac{\Pr(X \geq \max(k, k')) \Pr(Y \leq \max(k, k'), \max(k, k') \leq C)}{\alpha} \right] \\ &= \left[ \frac{\Pr(X = \max(k, k')) \Pr(Y \leq \min(k, k'), \max(k, k') \leq C)}{\alpha} \right] \\ &\times \left[ \frac{\Pr(X \geq \max(k, k')) \Pr(Y \leq \max(k, k') \leq C)}{\alpha} \right] \\ &= r_\tau(k, k') C_\tau(\max(k, k')). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\text{Cov}[Z_{k(i)}, Z_{k'(i)}] = 0$  when  $k \neq k'$ . This confirms (22). Now define

$$\mathbf{D}_\tau = \text{diag}(C_\tau(\Delta + 1) f_{*,\tau}(\Delta + 1) [C_\tau(\Delta + 1) - f_{*,\tau}(\Delta + 1)], \dots, C_\tau(\xi) f_{*,\tau}(\xi) [C_\tau(\xi) - f_{*,\tau}(\xi)]),$$

and

$$\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{\tau,n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_{\tau,(i)}.$$

Thus, by Theorem 8.21 [Multivariate CLT] (pg. 61) of [Lehmann and Casella \(1998\)](#), we may claim

$$\sqrt{n}(\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{\tau,n} - \mathbf{0}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{D}_\tau), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Next define

$$\mathbf{V}_\tau = \text{diag}(C_\tau(\Delta + 1)^{-2}, \dots, C_\tau(\xi)^{-2}),$$

and use Lemma 1 to claim  $\mathbf{A}_{\tau,n} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \mathbf{V}_\tau$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, by Theorem 5.1.6 [Multivariate Slutsky's Theorem] (pg. 283) of [Lehmann and Casella \(1998\)](#),

$$\sqrt{n}(\mathbf{A}_{\tau,n} \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{\tau,n}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}_\tau \mathbf{D}_\tau \mathbf{V}_\tau^T) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Finally, observe  $\mathbf{V}_\tau \mathbf{D}_\tau \mathbf{V}_\tau^T = \Sigma$  and  $\mathbf{A}_{\tau,n} \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{\tau,n} = \hat{\Lambda}_{\tau,n} - \Lambda_\tau$  to complete the proof. □

## A.5 Simulation Validation of Theorem A.1

Again assume the distribution in (12). Notice that  $\Delta = 0$ ,  $m = 10$ , and  $\omega = 24$ . For the purposes of our simulation, we have  $\varepsilon = 18$  and hence  $\tau = 7$ . We assigned  $p = 0.20$ . To be exhaustive, we ran a scenario with  $n = 30,000$  and 6,000 replicates. The theoretical covariance matrix calculated using Theorem A.1 was compared against the empirical covariance matrix from the simulated data. The off diagonal elements were very close to zero, and the diagonal elements match closely.

As an alternative, we can review Figure 6. The solid lines represent the true confidence intervals calculated based on knowledge of the distributions of  $X$  and  $Y$  (on a log scale). The dotted lines are the empirical equivalents over the 6,000 replications. We can see they match closely. Note that similar simulation studies were performed in the case of random truncation only; see Figure 3 of [Lautier et al. \(2021\)](#), for example. Please contact the corresponding author if additional details are desired.

Table 1: Comparison of APV, Variance, and CTE Estimators with Empirical Simulation Estimates

Formulaic Estimators			Empirical Estimates			
$\widehat{\text{APV}}_{\text{Trust}}$	$\sqrt{\widehat{\text{Var}}_n[\text{PV}_{\text{Trust}}]}$	$\widehat{\text{CTE}}_{n,\text{Trust}}$	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	CTE
14.84	32,725	14.90	14.84	14.84	32,285	14.91

Calculations performed using MBALT 2017-A trust data after 12 months of loan performance data (i.e.,  $e = 12$ ). Present values calculated with  $r = 0.01$ . The formulaic estimators correspond to formulas (10), (11), and (14). The empirical estimators correspond to a simulation with 1,000 replicates. All figures except the formulaic and empirical standard deviations are given in millions.



Figure 1: A time line of the entire lifetime of lease contract originations. A new lease contract,  $T$ , may occur at any month between  $1 \leq T \leq m$ . Lease contracts may terminate at any time between 1 and  $\omega$  months. Therefore, the last possible lease termination will occur at time  $m + \omega$ . The trust begins at time  $m + \Delta$ , and so any lease contract terminating prior to time  $m + \Delta$  will be truncated. Hence, the youngest possible lease termination time observable from trust data will be  $\Delta + 1$ . Defining  $Y = m + \Delta + 1 - T$  allows  $Y$  to serve as the truncation random variable. The time  $\varepsilon$  represents the censoring time; this is when our observation window closes. Note that it is only possible to obtain data from the trust on the lease termination time random variable  $X$  over the range  $\Delta + 1 \leq X \leq \min(\omega, \varepsilon - 1) = \xi$ .

```

1:  $E \leftarrow e$  ▷ Censoring after  $e$  mths
2:  $N \leftarrow n$  ▷  $n$  active leases of original 866 after  $e$  mths
3: Estimate  $\hat{\Lambda}_{n,r}$  from  $e$  months of data
4: Estimate  $Z(\cdot)$  from  $e$  months of data
5:  $T \leftarrow 1,000 \times (28 - E)$  empty matrix ▷ 28 mths of MBALT cf data; 1,000 simulations
6: for  $m \leftarrow 1$  to 1,000 do
7:    $M \leftarrow N \times (28 - E)$  empty matrix
8:   for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $N$  do
9:      $V \leftarrow V_i$  ▷ Vehicle value  $V_i$ 
10:     $R \leftarrow R_i$  ▷ Monthly payment  $R_i$ 
11:     $x_e \leftarrow x_i$  ▷ Lease age  $x_i$  at censor time  $e$ 
12:     $DF(\cdot)$  ▷ Conditional survival distribution from  $\hat{\Lambda}_{n,r}$  and  $x_e$ 
13:     $x_{\text{sim}} \leftarrow DF^{-1}(u)$  ▷  $u$  is a random (0,1) number
14:     $\{CF\} \leftarrow \{(x_{\text{sim}} - x_e) * R\}, V * Z(x_{\text{sim}} - 1) + R\}$  ▷ Lease  $i$  cash flow vector
15:     $M[i,] \leftarrow CF$  ▷ Row  $i$  of  $M$ 
16:   end for
17:    $T[m,] = \{\sum M[,1], \dots, \sum M[:,(28 - E)]\}$  ▷ Row  $m$  of  $T$  is a sum of each col of  $M$ 
18: end for

```

Figure 2: MBALT 2017-A Simulation Procedure




Figure 3: A comparison of the actual future MBALT 2017-A trust monthly cash flows (gray lines) against the predicted empirical mean, 97.5% upper empirical percentile, and 2.5% lower empirical percentile (dashed lines). The observation window indicates how many months of loan performance data (i.e.,  $e = 6, 12, 18, 24$  months) were used to project the remaining  $28 - e$  months of cash flows. We see that (6) captures the MBALT 2017-A cash flow pattern accurately, and the prediction improves as the number of observed months increases. Note that MBALT 2017-A was actively paying for 28 total months.




Figure 4: Empirical distribution of 1,000 simulations of APVs used in Table 1. The dashed line is the estimated kernel density resulting from the simulated APVs. The dotted line is a normal bell-shaped curve with mean and variance parameters defined by (10) and (11), respectively. The closeness of the simulated and theoretical densities suggests a we can avoid a simulation and use the properties of a normal distribution directly. This may simplify risk metric calculations, such as the ability to use (14).




Figure 5: A comparison of the actual and 95% empirical confidence intervals of cash flows from a random sample of 50 leases from MBALT 2017-A after 12 months of loan performance data (i.e.,  $e = 12$ ). We see the deterministic hazard rate empirical confidence interval (dashed line) and the random hazard rate empirical confidence interval (dotted line) differ.






Figure 6: The solid lines are the theoretical confidence interval based on the log scale equivalent with Theorem A.1. The dashed lines represent the empirical equivalent percentiles from the simulated data. The two lines match closely.