

AMATH 546/ECON 589  
Risk Measures

Eric Zivot

April 5, 2012

## **Outline**

- Profit, Loss and Return Distributions
- Risk measures
- Risk measure properties
- Portfolio risk measures and risk budgeting

## **Reading**

- FRF chapter 4
- QRM chapter 2, sections 1 and 2; chapter 6
- FMUND chapter 8
- SADFE chapter 19

## Profits and Losses

- $V_t$  = value (price) of an asset at time  $t$  (assumed known) measured in \$
- $V_{t+1}$  = value (price) of an asset at time  $t+1$  (typically unknown) measured in \$
- $\Pi_{t+1} = V_{t+1} - V_t$  = profit measured in \$ over the holding period
- $L_{t+1} = -\Pi_{t+1}$  = loss measured in \$ over the holding period

## Remarks

- $\Pi_{t+1} > 0$  (positive profit)  $\implies L_{t+1} < 0$  (negative loss)
- $\Pi_{t+1} < 0$  (negative profit)  $\implies L_{t+1} > 0$  (positive loss)
- Risk measures are typically defined in terms of losses. Hence a large positive value for a risk measure indicates a large positive loss.

## Returns

- $R_{t+1} = \frac{V_{t+1} - V_t}{V_t}$  = simple return between times  $t$  and  $t + 1$
- $\Pi_{t+1} = V_t R_{t+1} = V_{t+1} - V_t$
- $L_{t+1} = -V_t R_{t+1}$

*Example* (do on white board)

## Profit, Loss and Return Distributions

- $\Pi_{t+1}$ ,  $L_{t+1}$  and  $R_{t+1}$  are random variables because at time  $t$  the future value  $V_{t+1}$  is not known.
- For the random variable  $X = \Pi_{t+1}, L_{t+1}$  and  $R_{t+1}$ , let  $F_X$  denote the CDF and  $f_X$  denote the pdf
- The distributions of  $\Pi_{t+1}$ ,  $L_{t+1}$  and  $R_{t+1}$  are obviously linked
- Assume (unless otherwise specified) that  $F_X$  and  $f_X$  are known and are continuous functions

*Example* (do on white board)

## Risk Measurement

Goal: Make risk comparisons across a variety of assets to aid decision making of some sort.

- Determination of risk capital and capital adequacy
- Management tool
- Insurance premiums

**Definition 1** (*Risk measure*) *Mathematical method for capturing risk*

**Definition 2** (*Risk measurement*) *A number that captures risk. It is obtained by applying data to a risk measure*

## Three Most Common Risk Measures

1. Volatility (vol or  $\sigma$ )
2. Value-at-Risk (VaR)
3. Expected Shortfall (ES)
  - aka Expected Tail Loss (ETL), conditional VaR (cVaR)

## Volatility

Profit/Loss volatility

$$\sigma_{\Pi} = \left( E[(\Pi_{t+1} - \mu_{\Pi})^2] \right)^{1/2} = \sigma_L = \left( E[(L_{t+1} - \mu_L)^2] \right)^{1/2}$$

Return Volatility

$$\sigma_R = \left( E[(R_{t+1} - \mu_R)^2] \right)^{1/2}$$

Relationship between  $\sigma_L$  and  $\sigma_R$

$$L_{t+1} = V_t R_{t+1} \Rightarrow \sigma_L = V_t \sigma_R$$

### *Remarks*

- volatility measures the size of a typical deviation from the mean loss or return.
- volatility is a symmetric risk measure - does not focus on downside risk.
- volatility is an appropriate risk measure if losses or returns have a normal distribution.
- volatility might not exist (i.e., might not be a finite number)

## Value-at-Risk

Let  $F_L$  denote the distribution of losses  $L_{t+1}$  on some asset over a given holding period.

**Definition 3** (*Value-at-Risk, QRM*) Given some confidence level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . The VaR on our asset at the confidence level  $\alpha$  is given by the smallest number  $l$  such that the probability that the loss  $L_{t+1}$  exceeds  $l$  is no larger than  $(1 - \alpha)$ . Formally,

$$VaR_\alpha = \inf \{l \in \mathbb{R} : \Pr(L_{t+1} > l) \leq 1 - \alpha\}$$

If  $F_L$  is continuous then  $VaR_\alpha$  can be implicitly defined using

$$\Pr(L_{t+1} \geq VaR_\alpha) = 1 - \alpha$$

or

$$F_L(VaR_\alpha) = \Pr(L_{t+1} \leq VaR_\alpha) = \alpha$$

## Remarks

- $VaR_\alpha$  is the upper  $\alpha$ -quantile of the loss distribution  $F_L$ . If  $F_L$  is continuous then  $VaR_\alpha$  can be conveniently computed using the quantile function  $F_L^{-1}$

$$VaR_\alpha = F_L^{-1}(\alpha) = q_\alpha^L$$

- Typically  $\alpha = 0.90, 0.95$  or  $0.99$ . If  $\alpha = 0.95$  then with 95% confidence we could lose  $VaR_{0.95}$  or more over the holding period.
- $VaR_\alpha$  is a *lower bound* on the possible losses that might occur with confidence level  $\alpha$ . It says nothing about the magnitude of losses beyond  $VaR_\alpha$ .

## Alternative Definitions of VaR

Unfortunately, there is no universally accepted definition of  $VaR_\alpha$

- Some authors define  $\alpha$  as the *probability of loss*. In this case, for continuous  $F_L$ , we have

$$\Pr(L_{t+1} \geq VaR_\alpha) = \alpha \text{ so that } VaR_\alpha = F_L^{-1}(1 - \alpha) = q_{1-\alpha}^L$$

For example, if  $\alpha = 0.05$ , then with 5% probability we could lose  $VaR_{0.05}$  or more over the holding period.

- Some authors (e.g. FRF) define  $VaR$  using the distribution of profits. Since  $\Pi_{t+1} = -L_{t+1}$  we have (using  $\alpha$  as confidence level)

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(L_{t+1} \geq VaR_\alpha) &= 1 - \alpha \\ &= \Pr(-\Pi_{t+1} \geq VaR_\alpha) = 1 - \alpha \\ &= \Pr(\Pi_{t+1} \leq -VaR_\alpha) = 1 - \alpha\end{aligned}$$

Following FRF, if  $VaR$  is defined using probability of loss then use  $\alpha = p$  to denote loss probability and write  $VaR_p$ . Then

$$\Pr(\Pi_{t+1} \leq -VaR_p) = p$$

- Some authors define  $VaR$  using the distribution of returns. Since  $L_{t+1} = -V_t R_{t+1}$  we have (using  $\alpha$  as confidence level)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Pr(L_{t+1} \geq VaR_\alpha) &= 1 - \alpha \\
 &= \Pr(-V_t R_{t+1} \geq VaR_\alpha) = 1 - \alpha \\
 &= \Pr(-R_{t+1} \geq \frac{VaR_\alpha}{V_t}) = 1 - \alpha
 \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\frac{VaR_\alpha}{V_t} = q_\alpha^{-R}$  is the upper  $\alpha$ -quantile of the (negative) returns.

## Steps to Calculating VaR

Example: Calculating VaR when losses/returns follow a normal distribution

Let  $L_{t+1} \sim N(\mu_L, \sigma_L^2)$  where  $\mu_L$  and  $\sigma_L$  are known. The pdf and CDF are given by

$$f_L(l; \mu_L, \sigma_L) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_L^2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{l-\mu_L}{\sigma_L}\right)^2}$$
$$F_L(l; \mu_L, \sigma_L) = \Pr(L_{t+1} \leq l) = \int_{-\infty}^l f_L(x; \mu_L, \sigma_L) dx$$

Then, for a given confidence level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$VaR_\alpha = F_L^{-1}(\alpha; \mu_L, \sigma_L) = q_\alpha^L$$

where  $F_L^{-1}(\cdot; \mu_L, \sigma_L)$  is the quantile function for the normal distribution with mean  $\mu_L$  and sd  $\sigma_L$ .

Note:  $F_L^{-1}(\cdot; \mu_L, \sigma_L)$  does not have a closed form solution but can be easily computed numerically in software (e.g. `qnorm()` in R).

Example: R Calculations

```
> mu = 10
> sigma = 100
> alpha = 0.95
> VaR.alpha = qnorm(alpha, mu, sigma)
> VaR.alpha
[1] 174.4854
```

Result: If  $L_{t+1} \sim N(\mu_L, \sigma_L^2)$  then

$$VaR_\alpha = q_\alpha^L = \mu_L + \sigma_L \times q_\alpha^Z$$

where  $q_\alpha^Z$  is the  $\alpha$ -quantile of the standard normal distribution defined by

$$F_Z^{-1}(\alpha) = \Phi^{-1}(\alpha) = q_\alpha^Z \text{ s.t. } \Phi(q_\alpha^Z) = \alpha$$

where

$$F_Z(x) = \Phi(x) = \Pr(Z \leq x) \text{ and } Z \sim N(0, 1)$$

The proof is easy:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(L_{t+1} \geq q_\alpha^L) &= \Pr(L_{t+1} \geq \mu_L + \sigma_L \times q_\alpha^Z) \\ &= \Pr\left(\frac{L_{t+1} - \mu_L}{\sigma_L} \geq q_\alpha^Z\right) \\ &= \Pr(Z \geq q_\alpha^Z) = \Phi(q_\alpha^Z) = \alpha \end{aligned}$$

Example: R calculations

```
> VaR.alpha = mu + sigma*qnorm(alpha,0,1)
> VaR.alpha
[1] 174.4854
```

### Expected Shortfall

Let  $F_L$  denote the distribution of losses  $L_{t+1}$  on some asset over a given holding period and assume that  $F_L$  is continuous.

**Definition 4** (*Expected Shortfall, ES*). The expected shortfall at confidence level  $\alpha$  is the expected loss conditional on losses being greater than  $VaR_\alpha$  :

$$ES_\alpha = E[L_{t+1} | L_{t+1} \geq VaR_\alpha]$$

In other words, ES is the expected loss in the upper tail of the loss distribution.

Remark: If  $F_L$  is not continuous then  $ES_\alpha$  is defined as

$$ES_\alpha = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \int_\alpha^1 VaR_u du$$

which is the average of  $VaR_u$  over all  $u$  that are greater than or equal to  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

Note: To compute  $ES_\alpha = E[L_{t+1}|L_{t+1} \geq VaR_\alpha]$ , you have to compute the mean of the *truncated* loss distribution

$$\begin{aligned} ES_\alpha &= E[L_{t+1}|L_{t+1} \geq VaR_\alpha] \\ &= \frac{\int_{VaR_\alpha}^{\infty} l \times f_L(l) dl}{1 - \alpha} \end{aligned}$$

## Remarks

- If  $\alpha = p$  is the loss probability then

$$ES_p = E[L_{t+1}|L_{t+1} \geq VaR_p] = \frac{\int_{VaR_p}^{\infty} l \times f_L(l) dl}{p}$$

- In terms of profits,

$$ES_\alpha = -E[\Pi_{t+1}|\Pi_{t+1} \leq -VaR_\alpha]$$

- In terms of returns

$$ES_\alpha = -V_t \times E[-R_{t+1}|-R_{t+1} \leq q_\alpha^{-R}]$$

Example: Calculating ES when losses/returns follow a normal distribution

Let  $L_{t+1} \sim N(\mu_L, \sigma_L^2)$  where  $\mu_L$  and  $\sigma_L$  are known. For confidence level  $\alpha$

$$\begin{aligned} ES_\alpha &= E[L_{t+1} | L_{t+1} \geq VaR_\alpha] \\ &= \text{mean of truncated normal distribution} \\ &= \mu_L + \sigma_L \times \frac{\phi(q_\alpha^Z)}{1 - \alpha} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\phi(z) = f_Z(z)$  = pdf of  $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ .

R Calculations

```
\texttt{> mu = 10}
}
\texttt{> sigma = 100}
}
\texttt{> alpha = 0.95}
}
\texttt{> q.alpha.z = qnorm(alpha)}
}
\texttt{> ES.alpha = mu + sigma*(dnorm(q.alpha.z)/(1-alpha))}
}
\texttt{> ES.alpha}
}
\texttt{[1] 216.2713}
}
```

## Coherence

Artzner et al. (1999), "Coherent Measures of Risk," Mathematical Finance, study the properties a risk measure should have in order to be considered a sensible and useful risk measure. They identify four axioms that risk measures should ideally adhere to. A risk measure that satisfies all four axioms is termed *coherent*.

In what follows, let  $RM(\cdot)$  denote a risk measure which could be volatility, VaR or ES.

**Definition 5** (*Coherent risk measure*). Consider two random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  representing asset losses. A function  $RM(\cdot) : X, Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called a coherent risk measure if it satisfies for  $X, Y$  and a constant  $c$

1. *Monotonicity*

$$X, Y \in V \subset \mathbb{R}, X \geq Y \Rightarrow RM(X) \geq RM(Y)$$

*If the loss of  $X$  always exceeds the loss  $Y$ , the risk of  $X$  should always exceed the risk of  $Y$ .*

2. *Subadditivity*

$$X, Y, X + Y \in V \Rightarrow RM(X + Y) \leq RM(X) + RM(Y)$$

*The risk to the portfolios of  $X$  and  $Y$  cannot be worse than the sum of the two individual risks - a manifestation of the diversification principle.*

3. *Positive homogeneity*

$$X \in V, c > 0 \Rightarrow RM(cX) = cRM(X)$$

*For example, if the asset value doubles ( $c = 2$ ) then the risk doubles*

4. *Translation invariance*

$$X \in V, c \in \mathbb{R} \Rightarrow RM(X + c) = RM(X) + c$$

*For example, adding  $c < 0$  to the loss is like adding cash, which acts as insurance, so the risk of  $X + c$  is less than the risk of  $X$  by the amount of cash,  $c$ .*

**Remarks**

1. FRF define coherence using  $X, Y$  representing profits. This alters translation invariance to  $X \in V, c \in \mathbb{R} \Rightarrow RM(X + c) = RM(X) - c$
2. Positive homogeneity is often violated in practice for large  $c$
3. It can be shown that ES is a coherent risk measure
4. VaR does not always satisfy subadditivity so is not in general coherent
  - This is undesirable because it means that you cannot bound aggregate risk by the weighted sum of individual VaR values

Example: Volatility is subadditive

(do on white board)

Examples: VaR is not subadditive - Next homework assignment

## When does VaR violate subadditivity?

- When the tails of assets are super fat!
- When assets are subject to occasional very large returns
  - Exchange rates in countries that peg currency but are subject to occasional large devaluations
  - Electricity prices subject to occasional large price swings
  - Defaultable bonds when most of the time the bonds deliver a steady positive return but may occasionally default
- Protection seller portfolios - portfolios that earn a small positive amount with high probability but suffer large losses with small probabilities (carry trades, short options, insurance contracts)