Risk factors driving risk measures

Susan Thomas

March 1, 2011

Susan Thomas Risk factors driving risk measures

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

E 900

Recap

- Focus of risk measurement on
 - "loss" measurement,
 - If a portfolios of one given set of asset class,
 - If or portfolios including multiple types of asset classes.
- Need a focus on "coherent risk measures" to implement the above.
- Traditional measures typically work when assuming an underlying distribution. Difficult to know.
- Out of the recent measures:
 - VaR is a good candidate with known flaws.
 - 2 *CVaR* or *ETL* is more applicable.
 - Stress test results are the best of the above.
- In all cases, it is important to identify *forecasts* of risk.

ヘロン 人間 とくほ とくほ とう

Risk measured as sensitivity to factors

Susan Thomas Risk factors driving risk measures

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

 Some risk measures focus on loss arising out of the risk of the portfolio.

These ignore that the factors driving that risk are themselves prone to change.

E.g., *VaR* for a portfolio using the past returns on the portfolio.

 Some risk measures capture the sensitivity of the portfolio to the risk of the underlying risk *factor*.
 E.g., VaR of a portfolio calculated as a function of the *B* of

E.g., *VaR* of a portfolio calculated as a function of the β of the portfolio wrt market index.

 Most stark demonstration of this: equity vs. bond portfolio VaR.

Equity is infinitely lived; bonds have finite maturity.

Risk measures of these two are apparently fundamentally different.

・ロト ・ 同ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨト … ヨ

Loss on a bond: recap from last course

A ZC bond which pays Rs.100 at T has price as f(r_T), ZC rate at T:

$$B_t = \frac{100}{(1+r_t)^t}$$

• Then, $r_t = \log(B_t/B_{t-1})$ is tracked as:

$$\log\left(\frac{100}{(1+r_t)^T}\frac{(1+r_{t-1})^T}{100}\right)$$

which comes to:

$$-T(\log(1 + r_t) - \log(1 + r_{t-1}))$$

the change in the interest rate r_T from t - 1 to t.

 Thus, the VaR of a ZC bond today can be calculated as a function of σ_{r_τ}, which is change in the underlying factor.

< ⊒ >

Loss on a coupon bond

- A coupon bond contains a series of rates.
- Traditional measure: collapse it into changes at one rate y_D, where D is the duration of the bond.
- Then the "return" on the bond becomes log(*dB*) where

$$dB = -(D * B) imes dy_D$$

- Here, the risk measure as a historical *sigma* of the same bond *cannot* apply.
- Problems:
 - Duration is a summary measure of a set of rates which also changes needs to be recalculated for each bond.
 - How does it apply in a multi-instrument setting how do durations of different bonds correlated with each other?
- Alternative: treat all coupon bonds as a portfolio of ZC bonds. VaR is then a multivariate problem on distribution of interest rates at different maturities.

- Search for factors in equity portfolios were driven by learnings from portfolio optimisation.
 - Diversification means all risk is not important.
 - Operationalising the Markowitz optimisation for large N components in equity portfolio is difficult enough to render the exercise futile.
- Identify factors driving risk.
 Portfolio risk becomes a function of the factor risk.
- **Problem:** No consensus from theory on what are the expected optimal risk factors.
- Two well-known alternatives:

ヘロト ヘアト ヘビト ヘビト

Selection of risk measures

Susan Thomas Risk factors driving risk measures

◆□> ◆□> ◆豆> ◆豆> ・豆 ・ のへで

- Comparison frameworks are entrenched in the application domain of the risk measure.
- Two main approaches in comparing risk measures:
 - Traders/securities markets regulators banks, trading firms.
 Objective? Minimising the impact of an "unexpected loss" over a very short horizon.
 - Portfolio fund managers mutual funds, pension funds, insurance companies.

Objective? Maximise future portfolio performance over long time horizons.

- Securities markets: VaR, ETL.
- Fund managers: "Sharpe's Ratio" of the portfolio, tracking error, Treynor's alpha.

・ロ・ ・ 同・ ・ ヨ・ ・ ヨ・