

Subject: Re: percentages get a read from your team [C]
From: Vinit Sahni <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, 03 Feb 2014 17:28:14 -0500
To: Nav Gupta <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Tazia Smith <[REDACTED]>, Paul Morris <[REDACTED]>

Agree we need to monitor this. We need to watch the usd prices to treat it like a cheap option.

Vinit

On 3 Feb 2014, at 21:41, "Nav Gupta" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Am not a mtge expert but read over the weekend that GS strat prefer po's over io's. Worth checking rv with the db io trader.

Mortgage Interest Only strips have become negatively convex

Lower coupon IOS (synthetic IO total return swap instruments) currently screen as having negative convexity, meaning that the downside risk from a rate rally is larger than the upside gains from a rate sell-off. On an option adjusted basis, the IOS appear expensive. Corresponding PO (principal only) securities, by comparison, have positive convexity and option adjusted spread, offering solid yields in a falling rate path in which principal is returned quickly due to prepayments.

We expect rising rates, but downside risks exist

While our central forecast is for interest rates to rise on the back of growth in the U.S. macro-economy, we acknowledge risks to the outlook, including uncertainty about the multiplier and the extent of private demand acceleration, as well as impacts from non-domestic shocks. Such sources of rates volatility should induce caution in taking on exposure to negatively convex positions.

Pricing of IO and PO is highly model dependent

Pricing of IO is highly sensitive to modeling assumptions – one of the reasons that IO typically price at very wide option adjusted spreads. A key assumption is the rate of housing turnover expected in a rising rate scenario. If floor prepays are modeled as slow as 3 CPR, then IO do in fact offer meaningful upside potential, and PO substantial downside risk.

Either IOS or pass-throughs are mispriced

While it is possible to model IOS as fair, it is hard to model IO and pass-throughs as both fair, since a 3 CPR floor prepay assumption would imply

that the pass-through has substantial extension risk and tight OAS. We would split the difference: we view IOS as moderately expensive and pass-throughs as slightly too tight vs. treasuries.

On 3 Feb 2014, at 18:19, "Tazia Smith" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Classification: Confidential

Hello Vinit & Nav -

Paul and I spoke with JE this morning. This a proposal, from him, of putting ~100mm to work. I'm putting together some suggested tweaks on a few pieces (ex additional companies in japan, detail on the energy piece), and pricing, etc. Clearly always love your input as well Team! Please let me know if/when you have a moment to discuss, thanks! Also, recognize this is helpful in scaling ideas.

Best,
Tazia

----- Forwarded by Tazia Smith/db/dbcom on 02/03/2014 01:14 PM -----

From: Jeffrey Epstein <jeevacation@gmail.com>
To: Tazia Smith/db/[REDACTED], Paul Morris/db/[REDACTED],
Date: 02/02/2014 08:59 PM
Subject: percentages get a read from your team

<0.9E4.png>

--

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Jeffrey Epstein
Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by

return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and
destroy this communication and all copies thereof,
including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved