

Measuring and Analysing Marginal Systemic Risk Contribution using *CoVaR*: A Copula Approach

Brice Hakwa

Fachbereich C - Mathematik - Stochastik, Bergische Universität Wuppertal

Manfred Jäger-Ambrożewicz

Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft Köln

Barbara Rüdiger

Fachbereich C - Mathematik - Stochastik, Bergische Universität Wuppertal

Abstract

This paper is devoted to the quantification and analysis of marginal risk contribution of a given single financial institution i to the risk of a financial system s . Our work expands on the *CoVaR* concept proposed by Adrian and Brunnermeier [2] as a tool for the measurement of marginal systemic risk contribution. We first give a mathematical definition of $CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l}$. Our definition improves the *CoVaR* concept by expressing $CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l}$ as a function of a state l and of a given probability level α relative to i and s respectively. Based on Copula theory we connect $CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l}$ to the partial derivatives of Copula through their probabilistic interpretation and definitions (Conditional Probability). Using this we provide a closed formula for the calculation of $CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l}$ for a large class of (marginal) distributions and dependence structures (linear and non-linear). Our formula allows a better analysis of systemic risk using *CoVaR* in the sense that it allows to define $CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l}$ depending on the marginal distributions of the losses of i and s respectively and the copula between L^i and L^s . We discuss the implications of this in the context of the quantification and analysis of systemic risk contributions. For example we will analyse the marginal effects of L^i , L^s and C of the risk contribution of i .

Keywords: *VaR, CoVaR, Systemic risk, Copula, Conditional Probability*

AMS subject classifications: 90A09, 91B30, 91B82, 91G10, 91G40, 62H20, 62H99, 62P05.

1. Introduction

With the last crisis it became clear that the failure of certain financial institutions (the so called system relevant financial institutions) can produce an adverse impact in whole financial system. The inability of standard risk-measurement tools like Value-at-Risk (*VaR*) to capture this systemic nature of risk (since their focus is on an institution in isolation: micro risk management) poses a new risk management's challenge for the financial regulators and academics. We can summarise it into two questions:

1. How to identify System-relevant Financial Institutions ?
2. How to quantify the marginal risk contribution of one single financial institute to the system ?

As academic response to this problems, Adrian and Brunnermeier proposed *CoVaR* ([2]) as model to analyse the marginal adverse financial effect of a distressed single financial institution on the financial system. They defined the risk measure *CoVaR* as the Value at Risk (*VaR*) of the financial system conditional on the state of the loss of a single institution and quantify the institution's marginal risk contribution (how much an institution adds to

Email addresses: hakwa@uni-wuppertal.de (Brice Hakwa), jaeger@iwkoeln.de (Manfred Jäger-Ambrożewicz), ruediger@uni-wuppertal.de (Barbara Rüdiger)

the risk of the systemic) by the measure $\Delta CoVaR$, which is defined as the difference between $CoVaR$ conditional on the institution being under distress and the $CoVaR$ conditional on the institution being in a normal state.

The implementation of $CoVaR$ involves thus variables characterizing single finance institution i (e.g. L^i) and the finance system s (e.g. L^s) respectively and variables characterizing the interdependency structure within the financial system and between single financial institution and the financial system s . This macro dimension of $CoVaR$ allows to go beyond micro risk management (idiosyncratic risk) and to capture (risk) contagion effects among financial institutions. The $CoVaR$ concept can be thus used by regulatory institutions as macro prudential tool (or as a basis for the development of other tools) to identify systemically relevant financial institutions and to set the adequate capital requirements. But its admission as standard model presents some problems, since a general closed formula for its calculation has apparently never been presented. Although some approximate solutions and statistic based approaches have been proposed, Adrian and Brunnermeier proposed for example in [2] an estimation method based on "linear quantile regression", Céline Gauthier and Alfred Lehar (cf. [27]) adopted a simulation based approach, Manfred Jäger-Ambrożewicz developed in [34] a closed formula for the special case that the joint distribution of financial system characteristic variable is of the Gaussian type. In all these approaches there are some difficulties to model in a flexible way the stochastic behaviors of financial institution's specific variables and their dependence structure (interconnection) within a financial system, since only linear dependence are considered.

Our aim is thus to provide a more flexible framework for the implementation of the $CoVaR$ concept which allows the integration of stylized features of marginal losses like skewness, fat tails and interdependence properties like linear, non-linear and positive or negative tail dependence. To do this we first propose an improved definition of $CoVaR$ which makes it mathematically tractable (see Def. 3 on the following page), and based on copula's theory we propose a general analytical formula for $CoVaR$ (see Theorem 5 on page 6). We use our formula to make some theoretical analysis and computations related to $CoVaR$.

We conclude this article by applying our formula to compute the $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ in the Gaussian copula (Section 5.1), t-copula (Section 5.2), and Gumbel copula setting (Section 5.3) respectively. We discuss the results of our computation and draw from this some interesting related relations. We also give a general formula for $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ in the Archimedean copula setting (Section 5.4).

1.1. Definition of $CoVaR$ and $\Delta CoVaR$

We recall here the definition of the value at risk (VaR) in order to define the $CoVaR^{s|i}$ as a conditional VaR following Adrian and Brunnermeier ([2]).

Definition 1 (Value at Risk). *Given some confidence level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ the VaR of a portfolio at the confidence level α is given by the smallest number l such that the probability that the loss L exceeds l is no larger than $(1 - \alpha)$. Formally*

$$\begin{aligned} VaR_\alpha &:= \inf \{l \in \mathbb{R} : Pr(L > l) \leq 1 - \alpha\} \\ &= \inf \{l \in \mathbb{R} : Pr(L \leq l) \geq \alpha\}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to give a probabilistic interpretation of VaR_α , we will employ the notation of quantiles as provided in the following definition (cf. [41] Def. 2.12).

Definition 2 (Generalized inverse and quantile function).

1. *Given some increasing function $T : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the generalized inverse of T is defined by $T(y) := \inf \{x \in \mathbb{R} : T(x) \geq y\}$.*
2. *Given some distribution function F , the generalized inverse F^\leftarrow is called the quantile function of F . For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we have*

$$q_\alpha(F) = F^\leftarrow(\alpha) := \inf \{x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) \geq \alpha\}.$$

Note that, if F is continuous and strictly increasing, we simply have

$$q_\alpha(F) = F^{-1}(\alpha), \tag{1}$$

where F^{-1} is the (ordinary) inverse of F . Thus suppose that the distribution F of the loss L is continuous and strictly increasing. It follows

$$VaR_\alpha = F^{-1}(\alpha). \quad (2)$$

We note that typical values taken for α are 0.99 or 0.995.

Assumption 1. *In subsequent we consider only random variables which have strictly positive density function. Also in case we consider a bivariate joint distribution $H(x, y)$ we assume that it has a density and its marginal distributions have strictly positive densities.*

So due to this assumption all considered distribution functions F are continuous and strictly increasing. Such a F is thus invertible and F^{-1} denotes the unique inverse of F . Let L^i be the loss of the financial institution i and L^s the loss of the system s without the institution i . At least since the financial crisis it is clear that the dependency between the system and the institution i must be analysed more seriously. A step towards such an analysis is done by defining explicitly $CoVaR$. Adrian and Brunnermeier denote by $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|C(L^i)}$ the value of an institution s (or a financial system) conditional on some event $C(L^i)$ depending on the loss L^i of an institution i . Thus $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|C(L^i)}$ can be implicitly defined as the α -quantile of the conditional probability of the system's loss.

$$Pr\left(L^s \leq CoVaR_\alpha^{s|C(L^i)} | C(L^i)\right) = \alpha. \quad (3)$$

They analysed in their work [2] the case that the condition $C(L^i)$ refers to the loss L^i of institution i being exactly at its value at risk or more generally being exactly at some specific value l . We have in this case in the context of (3) the following expression,

$$Pr\left(L^s \leq CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l} | L^i = l\right) = \alpha. \quad (4)$$

Due to assumption 1

$$Pr(L^i = l) = 0, \text{ for any } l \in \mathbb{R}.$$

However we can define in the context of assumption 1, a conditional probability of the form: $Pr(L^s \leq h | L^i = l)$ for fixed l as a function of h as follows [cf. [12] P. 72) or [23] P. 71].

$$\begin{aligned} Pr(L^s \leq h | L^i = l) &=: R_l(h) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^h \frac{f(l, y)}{f_i(l)} dy. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Where $f_i(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(x, y) dy$ is the marginal density of L^i .

Note that (5) is defined only when $f_i(l) \neq 0$; however, if $\mathcal{S} = \{(l, y) : f_i(l) \neq 0\}$, then $Pr((L^i, L^s) \in \mathcal{S}) = 0$.

Remark 1. Due to assumption 1 we have that,

- the functions R_l is well defined. (since $f_i(l) > 0, \forall l \in \mathbb{R}$),
- $R_l(h)$ is strictly increasing and continuous.

As $R_l(h)$ is strictly increasing, it follows that its is invertible. Based on this we provide a alternative definition for $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ which is more tractable from a mathematical point of view than that proposed by Adrian and Brunnermeier.

Definition 3. *Assume that L^s and L^i have density which satisfy assumption 1. Then for a given $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and for a fixed l , $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ is defined as:*

$$\begin{aligned} CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l} &:= \inf \{h \in \mathbb{R} : Pr(L^s > h | L^i = l) \leq 1 - \alpha\} \\ &:= \inf \{h \in \mathbb{R} : Pr(L^s \leq h | L^i = l) \geq \alpha\} \\ &= R_l^{-1}(\alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Definition 4 ($\Delta CoVaR_\alpha^{s|i}$). *Adrian and Brunnermeier denote by $\Delta CoVaR_\alpha^{s|i}$ the difference between $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|C(L^i)}$ condition on the institution i being under distress and the $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|C(L^i)}$ condition on the institution having mean loss.*

$$\Delta CoVaR_\alpha^{s|i} = CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=VaR_\alpha^i} - CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=E(L^i)}. \quad (7)$$

$\Delta CoVaR_\alpha^{s|i}$ is used as measure to quantify the marginal risk contribution of a single institution i to the risk of the system.

We will find in the next a closed analytical formula in terms of copula in the context of definition 3 on the preceding page (see Theorem. 5 on page 6).

2. A Brief Introduction to Copulas

In this section we introduce the notion of copula and give some basic definitions and important properties needed later. Our focus is on properties that will be helpful when connecting copulas to conditional probabilities and analyzing $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ and $\Delta CoVaR_\alpha^{s|i}$ (for detailed analysis of copulas, we refer the reader to e.g. [35], [41], [43] or [46] and the references therein).

2.1. Preliminary

In order to introduce the concept of a copula, we recall some important remarks upon which it is built.

Remark 2.

1. **Quantile transformation.** If $U \sim U(0, 1)$ is standard uniform distributed, then

$$Pr(F^{-1}(U) \leq x) = F(x).$$

2. **Probability transformation.** Assume F is a distribution function such that its inverse function F^{-1} is well defined. Let X be a random variable with distribution function F , then $F(X)$ has a uniform standard distribution

$$F(X) \sim U(0, 1).$$

2.2. Definition and basic properties of Copula

Definition 5 (2-dimensional copula (cf. [43] Def. 2.2.2)). *A 2-dimensional copula is a (distribution) function $C : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with the following satisfying:*

- *Boundary conditions:*

- 1) *For every $u \in [0, 1] : C(0, u) = C(u, 0) = 0.$*
- 2) *For every $u \in [0, 1] : C(1, u) = u$ and $C(u, 1) = u.$*

- *Monotonicity condition:*

- 3) *For every $(u_1, u_2), (v_1, v_2) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ with $u_1 \leq u_2$ and $v_1 \leq v_2$ we have*

$$C(u_2, v_2) - C(u_2, v_1) - C(u_1, v_2) + C(u_1, v_1) \geq 0.$$

Conditions (1) and (3) implies that the so defined 2-copula C is a bivariate joint distribution function (cf. [43] Def. 2.3.2) and condition (2) implies that the copula C has standard uniform margins. We present now some important basic properties of copulas which we will use below (cf. [43] Chap. 2).

Lemma 1. For any u_1 and u_2 satisfying $0 \leq u_1 \leq u_2 \leq 1$ the map

$$v \mapsto C(u_2, v) - C(u_1, v) \quad (8)$$

is increasing on $[0, 1]$. Similarly, for any v_1 and v_2 satisfying $0 \leq v_1 \leq v_2 \leq 1$ the map

$$u \mapsto C(u, v_2) - C(u, v_1) \quad (9)$$

is increasing on $[0, 1]$.

(8) and (9) are immediate consequences of the monotonicity. In fact let u_1, u_2, v_1 and v_2 satisfying the same conditions as in lemma 1. Then because of the monotonicity condition we have

$$\begin{aligned} C(u_2, v_2) - C(u_2, v_1) - C(u_1, v_2) + C(u_1, v_1) &\geq 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow C(u_2, v_2) - C(u_1, v_2) &\geq C(u_2, v_1) - C(u_1, v_1) \\ \Leftrightarrow C(u_1, v_1) - C(u_1, v_2) &\geq C(u_2, v_1) - C(u_2, v_2). \end{aligned}$$

The last two inequalities prove 8 and 9 respectively. It follows from lemma 1 that bivariate copulas are increasing with respect to each its arguments i.e. for every u and $v \in [0, 1]$ the maps

$$\begin{aligned} v &\mapsto C(u, v) \\ u &\mapsto C(u, v) \end{aligned}$$

are increasing. To see this set $u_1 = 0$ and $v_1 = 0$ in (8) and (9) respectively. Based on the above results it possible to draw the continuity of copulas via the Lipschitz condition. In fact due to lemma 1 we have for every $u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq C(u_2, v) - C(u_1, v) \leq u_2 - u_1 \\ 0 &\leq C(u, v_2) - C(u, v_1) \leq v_2 - v_1 \\ |C(u_2, v_2) - C(u_1, v_1)| &\leq |u_2 - u_1| + |v_2 - v_1|. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the above inequality that copulas are Lipschitz continuous (absolutely continuous) with Lipschitz constant 1. Note that the monotonicity condition of copula implies that they are derivable with respect to Lebesgue measure almost everywhere, and since copula is increasing (with respect to each parameter) those derivatives are positive where they exist. As copulas are Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant 1 it follows that their partial derivatives are bounded by 1. All this is summarised in the following theorem.

Theorem 2 (cf. [43] Thm. 2.2.7). *Let C be a copula. For any $v \in [0, 1]$, the partial derivative $\partial C(u, v) / \partial u$ exists for almost all u , and for such v and u*

$$0 \leq \frac{\partial C(u, v)}{\partial u} \leq 1.$$

Similarly, for any $u \in [0, 1]$, the partial derivative $\partial C(u, v) / \partial v$ exists for almost all v , and for such u and v

$$0 \leq \frac{\partial C(u, v)}{\partial v} \leq 1.$$

Furthermore, the functions $u \mapsto \partial C(u, v) / \partial v$ and $v \mapsto \partial C(u, v) / \partial u$ are defined and non-decreasing everywhere on $[0, 1]$.

The following theorem makes the copula theory attractive as tool for stochastic modeling because it links joint distributions to one-dimensional marginal distributions.

Theorem 3 (Sklar's theorem, cf. [43] Thm. 2.3.3). *Let H be a joint distribution function with marginal distribution functions F and G . Then there exists a copula C such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\} \cup \{+\infty\}$*

$$H(x, y) = C[F(x), G(y)]. \quad (10)$$

If F and G have density, then C is unique. Conversely, if C is a copula and F and G are distribution functions, then the function H defined by (10) is a joint distribution function with margins F and G .

This theorem is very important because it asserts that, using copula function, it is possible to represent each bivariate distribution function as a function of univariate distribution function. Thus, we can use the copula to extract the dependence structure among the components X and Y of the vector (X, Y) , independently of the marginal distribution F and G . This allows to model the dependence structure and marginals separately.

Remark 3. Assume (X, Y) is a bivariate random variables with copula C and joint distribution H satisfying assumption 1, with marginals distribution function F and G . Then the transformed random variables $U = F(X)$ and $V = F(Y)$ have standard uniform distribution and $C(U, V)$ is the joint distribution of (U, V) . In fact

$$C(u, v) = C(\Pr\{U \leq u\}, \Pr\{V \leq v\}).$$

Corollary 4 (cf. e.g. [43] Co. 2.3.7). *Let H denotes a bivariate distribution function with margins F and G satisfying assumption 1. Then there exist a unique copula C such that for all $(u, v) \in [0, 1]^2$ it holds:*

$$C(u, v) = H(F^{-1}(u), G^{-1}(v)). \quad (11)$$

3. Computing and Analysing systemic Risk Contribution with $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$: A Copula Approach

In this section we provide a copula based framework for the calculation and the theoretical analysis of $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ as tool for the measurement of systemic risk contribution. To do this we will relate the notion of conditional probability to copulas and rewrite the implicit definition of $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ in term of copula. Based on this we will derive some useful results. Especially, we will obtain a closed formula which provide a general framework for the flexible calculation and analysis of $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ in many stochastic settings. Based on this formula we will highlight some important properties of $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ and $\Delta CoVaR_\alpha^{s|i}$.

3.1. Computation of $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ using Copula

We propose here in the following theorem a general framework for computing $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ analytically. Our approach is based on the copula representation of conditional probability.

Theorem 5. *Let L^s and L^i be two random variables representing the loss of the system s and institution i with marginal distribution functions F_s and F_i respectively. Let H be the joint distribution of L^s and L^i with the corresponding bivariate copula C , i.e.*

$$H(x, y) = C(F_i(x), F_s(y)).$$

Let us assume assumption 1 on page 3 and

$$g(v, u) := \frac{\partial C(u, v)}{\partial u}$$

is invertible with respect to the parameter v . Then for all $l \in \mathbb{R}$ $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ at level α , $0 < \alpha < 1$ is given by

$$CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}(\alpha) = F_s^{-1}(g^{-1}(\alpha, F_i(l))) \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, 1]. \quad (12)$$

PROOF. Recall that the implicit definition of $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(L^s \leq CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l} | L^i = l) &= \alpha \\ \Leftrightarrow \Pr(F_s(L^s) \leq F_s(CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}) | F_i(L^i) = F_i(l)) &= \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Let $V = F_s(L^s)$, $U = F_i(L^i)$, $v = F_s(CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l})$ and $u = F_i(l)$ i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(L^s \leq CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l} | L^i = l) &= \Pr(F_s(L^s) \leq F_s(CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}) | F_i(L^i) = F_i(l)) \\ &= \Pr(V \leq v | U = u). \end{aligned}$$

Due to assumption 1 it follows from remark 2 on page 4 that V and U are standard uniform distributed. In this case we can refer to ([12] Eq. (4.4)) and compute the conditional probability $Pr(V \leq v|U = u)$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
Pr(V \leq v|U = u) &= \lim_{\Delta u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{Pr(V \leq v, u \leq U \leq u + \Delta u)}{Pr(u \leq U \leq u + \Delta u)} \\
&= \lim_{\Delta u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{Pr(U \leq u + \Delta u, V \leq v) - Pr(U \leq u, V \leq v)}{Pr(U \leq u + \Delta u) - Pr(U \leq u)} \\
&= \lim_{\Delta u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C(u + \Delta u, v) - C(u, v)}{\Delta u} \\
&= \frac{\partial C(u, v)}{\partial u} = g(u, v).
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Now we are able to draw the explicit expressions of $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ provided that, the function g is invertible with respect to the "non-conditioning" variable v . In this case we can write v as a function of α, u as follow

$$v = g^{-1}(\alpha, u).$$

Using $v = F_s(CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l})$ and $u = F_i(l)$ we obtain

$$F_s(CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}) = g^{-1}(\alpha, F_i(l)).$$

Thus

$$CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l} = F_s^{-1}(g^{-1}(\alpha, F_i(l))). \quad \blacksquare$$

In practice the conditional level l for the financial institution i is implicitly defined by a given confidence level β such that

$$l = F_i^{-1}(\beta), \tag{14}$$

β is specified by the regulatory institution. It represents the probability with which the financial institution i remains solvent over a given period of time horizon. Base on this information we can express $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ as follow:

$$CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l} = F_s^{-1}(g^{-1}(\alpha, \beta)). \tag{15}$$

We remark that for a given marginal distribution of the system's losses F_s the above expression of $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ has as input parameter only α and β . This motivates the following definition.

Definition 6.

$$CoVaR_\alpha^\beta := CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l} \tag{16}$$

Remark 4. Equation (15) is very important because it asserts that in the practice $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ (or $CoVaR_\alpha^\beta$) in opposite to standard risk-measurement tools like Value-at-Risk (VaR) does not depend of the marginal distribution F_i but depend only on the marginal distribution of the system's losses F_s and the copula between the financial institution i and the financial system s .

Remark 5. We can see from equation (12) that $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ is nothing other than a quantile of the loss distribution F_s of the system s at the level $\tilde{\alpha} = g^{-1}(\alpha, F_i(l))$ i.e.

$$CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l} = F_s^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}). \tag{17}$$

Equation (17) asserts that $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ is just a value at risk of the whole financial system at a transformed level $\tilde{\alpha} = g^{-1}(\alpha, F_i(l))$. This fact motivates the following corollary, which connects $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ to the value at risk at the level α of the financial system (VaR_α^s).

Recall that under assumption 1 the value at risk of the system at the level $\tilde{\alpha}$ of L^s is in this case given by

$$VaR_{\tilde{\alpha}}^s = F_s^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}).$$

That is

$$CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l} = VaR_{\tilde{\alpha}}^s$$

Corollary 6. *Provided that the function $g(v, u) := \frac{\partial C(u, v)}{\partial u}$ is invertible with respect to the "non-conditioning" variable v , the equivalent confidence level $\tilde{\alpha}$, which makes the Value at Risk of a financial system VaR^s equivalent to the $CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l}$ at level α is given by:*

$$\tilde{\alpha} = g^{-1}(\alpha, u) \quad \text{with } u = F_i(l). \quad (18)$$

Hence, in general, given a condition quantile at the level α , we can find the corresponding unconditional quantile by transforming the conditional level α to a unconditional level $\tilde{\alpha}$ through the transformation function g^{-1} . Based on the fact that $CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l}$ can be expressed as a quantile. We can simplify the expression of $CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l}$ in a linear function when L^s is assumed to have a univariate normal distribution. In fact if a random variable X follows a normal distribution with mean μ and standard deviation σ . Then the transformed random variable $Z = \frac{X-\mu}{\sigma}$ is standard normal distributed. This motivates the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *If the loss of the financial system L^s is assumed to be normal distributed with mean μ_s and standard deviation σ_s . Then*

$$CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l} = \sigma_s \Phi^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}) + \mu_s, \quad (19)$$

with $\tilde{\alpha}$ defined like in equation (18). Where Φ denotes the standard normal distribution function.

That means $CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l}$ is in this case a linear function with respect to the transformation $\Phi^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha})$.

PROOF. Assume that L^s is normal distributed with mean μ_s and standard deviation σ_s . Let N_s be the distribution function of L^s then from (17) we have

$$\begin{aligned} CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l} &= N_s^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}) \\ \Leftrightarrow N_s\left(CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l}\right) &= \tilde{\alpha} \\ \Leftrightarrow \Phi\left(\frac{CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l} - \mu_s}{\sigma_s}\right) &= \tilde{\alpha} \\ \Leftrightarrow \left(\frac{CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l} - \mu_s}{\sigma_s}\right) &= \Phi^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}) \\ \Leftrightarrow CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l} &= \sigma_s \Phi^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}) + \mu_s \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 7. *Under the same conditions as the previous proposition, $\Delta CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|i}$ can be compute as follow*

$$\Delta CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|i} = \sigma_s \left(\Phi^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}_d) - \Phi^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}_m) \right) \quad (20)$$

Where $\tilde{\alpha}_d$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_m$ are the transformed level defining according to the corollary 6 when institution i being under distress and institution having mean loss respectively.

In the following remark we summarise some properties of $CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l}$ as monetary measures of risk with particular attention to the concept of coherent risk measures [[6] [24] Def. 4.5]. This summaries according to [6], properties that a good risk measure should have.

Remark 6. As $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ can be expressed as quantile of the distribution of the system's loss F_s with respect to the transformed level $\tilde{\alpha}$. It follows that $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ as function of $\tilde{\alpha}$ have the same properties like a value at risk as a function of a level α . In particular following properties:

- $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ as a function of $\tilde{\alpha}$ is a coherent measure of risk when L^s has an elliptical distribution (cf. [41] Ex. 6.7)
- $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ increases when the marginal distribution of the system (F_s) has leptokurtosis (heavy-tailed) and positive skewness. (cf. [5] IV.2.8.1)

One important advantage of our formula is that, the expression of $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ (see Eq. (12)) can be separated into two distinct components.

1. On the one hand the marginal distributions F_s and F_i of the loss of the whole system L^s and the single institution i respectively, which represent the purely univariate features of the system s and the single institution i respectively.
2. On the other hand the function g^{-1} , which represents the dependency structure between the single financial institution i and the system s .

This separation is very important for the analysis of systemic risk property of our formula. First, because it describes how the systemic contribution of one given financial institution depend on its marginal distributions F_i and the marginal of the financial system F_s . Second, because it allows to appreciate the effect of the copula of the systemic risk contribution.

4. Tail Events and Systemic Crisis

It is an evidence that systemic crisis and extreme (tail) event are related. Indeed, the default which produces the panic and the spillover-effect in the financial system corresponds generally to a shock relative to the expected loss of one financial institute. This can be characterized by an extreme value which appears in the tail of the losses distribution of a given financial institute. It is also clear that the behavior of tail losses and tail comovements during the crises is different from the behavior of other observations. In the fact we can observe that during crisis time, the tail dependence between individual financial institution's loss and the loss of the system increases (cf. e.g. [49]). This phenomena appears to amplify the concentration of the financial system leading to an increase of the probability that single financial institutions fail together with the whole financial system or that a large number of financial institutions fail simultaneously (like illustrated in Figure 4). This phenomenon is analysed for example in [19] and [26]. It is therefore important when analysing systemic risk




Figure 1: Bank Failures in the United States, 1934 \ 2009 (Source: [42] P. 443)

to choose copulas, which are appropriate to describe extreme dependence structure (tail-dependence), i.e. copula with positive tail dependence measure (e.g. t copula and gumbel copula) in order to capture tail comovements in the financial system.

Definition 7 (cf. [41] Def. 5.30). Let (U, V) be a bivariate random variable with marginal distribution functions F and G , respectively. The upper tail dependence coefficient of U and V is the limit (if it exists) of the conditional probability that V is greater than the $100q$ -th percentile of G given that U is greater than the $100q$ -th percentile of F as q approaches 1, i.e.

$$\lambda_u = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} Pr [V > G^{-1}(q) | U > F^{-1}(q)]. \quad (21)$$

If $\lambda_u \in (0, 1]$ then (U, V) is said to show upper tail dependence or extremal dependence in the upper tail; if $\lambda_u = 0$, they are asymptotically independent in the upper tail.

Similarly, the lower tail dependence coefficient λ_l is the limit (if it exists) of the conditional probability that V is less than or equal to the $100q$ -th percentile of G given that U is less than or equal to the $100q$ -th percentile of F as q approaches 0, i.e.

$$\lambda_l = \lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} Pr [V \leq G^{-1}(q) | U \leq F^{-1}(q)]. \quad (22)$$

If (U, V) does not show tail dependence (upper and lower) the extreme events of U and V appear to occur independently in each margin. Hence, (U, V) is not appropriate to model the joint behavior of the extreme loss of the system s and the single institution i that characterizes the contagion effect during a crisis. This is the reason why we connect the $CoVaR$ concept to copula in order to develop a closed formula for $CoVaR^{s|L^i=l}$ allowing the analysis and the computation of systemic risk contribution for a more general stochastic setting than only the bivariate Gaussian setting as already done in ([34]). Note that the copula associated with the bivariate Gaussian distribution is the bivariate Gaussian copula. One can show that the bivariate Gaussian copula does not have upper tail dependence when the corresponding correlation coefficient ρ is smaller than one (see 32). As can be seen in Figure 5, regardless of how high a correlation we choose, if we go far enough into the tail, extreme events appear to occur independently in L^i and L^s (that is exactly the opposite of what we observe in crisis times). Thus the Gaussian copula is not a good tool for modeling of dependence when the systemic risk contagion is analysed. So we have to explore alternative copulas with positive tail dependence coefficient like for example t-copula. Let us first compute here lower and upper tail dependence coefficient λ_l and λ_u . As we assume assumption 1 we can derive a simple expressions for λ_u and λ_l in terms of the copula C of U and V using conditional probability.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_l &= \lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} Pr [V \leq G^{-1}(q) | U \leq F^{-1}(q)] \\ &= \lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{Pr [V \leq G^{-1}(q), U \leq F^{-1}(q)]}{Pr [U \leq F^{-1}(q)]} \\ &= \lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C(G(G^{-1}(q)), F(F^{-1}(q)))}{F(F^{-1}(q))} \\ &= \lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C(q, q)}{q} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_u &= \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} Pr [V > G^{-1}(q) | U > F^{-1}(q)] \\
&= \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{Pr [V > G^{-1}(q), U > F^{-1}(q)]}{Pr [U > F^{-1}(q)]} \\
&= \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{Pr [V > G^{-1}(q)] - Pr [V > G^{-1}(q), U \leq F^{-1}(q)]}{1 - Pr [U \leq F^{-1}(q)]} \\
&= \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1 - G(G^{-1}(q)) - (Pr [U \leq F^{-1}(q)] - Pr [V \leq G^{-1}(q), U \leq F^{-1}(q)])}{1 - F(F^{-1}(q))} \\
&= \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1 - G(G^{-1}(q)) - Pr [U \leq F^{-1}(q)] + Pr [V \leq G^{-1}(q), U \leq F^{-1}(q)]}{1 - F(F^{-1}(q))} \\
&= \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1 - q - q + C(G(G^{-1}(q)), F(F^{-1}(q)))}{1 - q} \\
&= \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1 - 2q + C(q, q)}{1 - q}. \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

The previous expressions of tail dependence coefficients λ_u and λ_s depends of the expressions of a given Copula. This poses a problem if the given copulas has no simple closed form. However based on the fact that $Pr(V \leq v | U = u) = \frac{\partial C(u, v)}{\partial u}$ for U and V satisfying assumption 1 (see Eq. 13 on page 7). We can develop an alternative expressions of tail dependence coefficients.

Theorem 8. *Let (U, V) be a bivariate random vector with marginal distribution functions F and G and corresponding copula C . Let us assume that U and V satisfy assumption 1. Then*

$$\lambda_u = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} (Pr(V > q | U = q) + Pr(U > q | V = q)), \text{ and} \tag{25}$$

$$\lambda_l = \lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} [Pr(V \leq q | U = q) + Pr(U \leq q | V = q)] \tag{26}$$

provided that the limits exist.

PROOF. Similarly to [20] P. 16-17 we consider equation (24) and apply elementary calculus rule namely the l'Hopital's and differential calculus rule. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_u &= \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1 - 2q + C(q, q)}{1 - q} \\
&= \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{d(1 - 2q + C(q, q))}{d(1 - q)} \\
&= - \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} -2 + \frac{dC(q, q)}{dq} \\
&= - \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \left(-2 + \frac{\partial C(x, q)}{\partial x} \Big|_{x=q} + \frac{\partial C(q, y)}{\partial y} \Big|_{y=q} \right) \\
&= - \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} (-2 + Pr(V \leq q | U = q) + Pr(U \leq q | V = q)) \\
&= \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} (Pr(V > q | U = q) + Pr(U > q | V = q)). \tag{27}
\end{aligned}$$

Analog by considering equation (23) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_l &= \lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C(q, q)}{q} \\
&= \lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{dC(q, q)}{dq} \\
&= \lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} \left(\frac{\partial C(x, q)}{\partial x} \Big|_{x=q} + \frac{\partial C(q, y)}{\partial y} \Big|_{y=q} \right) \\
&= \lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} [Pr(V \leq q | U = q) + Pr(U \leq q | V = q)]. \quad \blacksquare \tag{28}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that, if the Copula C is symmetric, then

$$Pr(V \leq v|U = u) = Pr(U \leq u|V = u) \quad (\text{cf. [41] Eq. 5.19}) \quad (29)$$

In this case we can express λ_u and λ_l as follow.

Corollary 9. *Assume that F and G satisfies assumption 1 . If the Copula C is symmetric then*

$$\lambda_u = 2 \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} [Pr(V > q|U = q)], \quad (30)$$

$$\lambda_l = 2 \lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} [Pr(V \leq q|U = q)]. \quad (31)$$

5. Applications

In this section we apply the result developed in section 3 to compute and analyse $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ and $\Delta CoVaR$ in some probabilistic settings. We first consider a general case where the joint behavior of L^i and L^s is modeled by a bivariate Gaussian copula. In particular we will analyse here the case where the margins L^i and L^s are assumed to be univariate normal distributed. This special case (Gauss copula and Gaussian margins) was already considered in [34] but in a different approach. In fact the author reduces the financial system to a portfolio consisting of two components (namely, the single financial institute i and the system s) and assumes that the random vector (L^i, L^s) follows a bivariate Gaussian distribution. Then, based on the properties of the conditional bivariate Gaussian distribution (cf. e.g. [23] Eq. 2.6), he develops a closed formula for $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$. This approach imposes thus the univariate normality of both margins (L^i and L^s). The method provided in this article is more flexible because it allows each margins independently of other to take a large class of distributions functions (for example we can assume that L^i is normal distributed and that L^s is t -distributed). One other restriction of the formula proposed in [34] and also the method presented in [2] is that, both do not take into account tail events and tail comovements since the Gaussian is asymptotically independent in both tails i.e. $\lambda_u = \lambda_l = 0$. In fact we have (cf. [20] P. 17).

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_u &= 2 \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \left[1 - \Phi \left(\frac{q - \rho q}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \right) \right] \\ &= 2 \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \left[1 - \Phi \left(\frac{q\sqrt{1 - \rho}}{\sqrt{1 + \rho}} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

from which it follows that

$$\lambda_u = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \rho < 1 \\ 1 & \text{if } \rho = 1. \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

This presents a big gap since both phenomenons (tail events and tail comovements) are supposed to be the main features of systemic crisis (cf. [49]). Our formula covers this gap by allowing to consider other dependence models, especially those which are appropriate for the modeling of the simultaneous (tail) behavior of losses during a financial crisis. So will also consider the case where the dependence between L^i and L^s is modeled by t -Copula. At the end of this section we will describe how to develop a closed formula for the computation of $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ for Archimedean copula.

5.1. Computation of $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ in a Gaussian Copula Setting

We assume here that the interdependence structure between L^i and L^s is describe by a bivariate Gaussian copula. The bivariate Gaussian copula is defined as follows (cf. [43] Eq. 2.3.6):

$$C_\rho(u, v) = \Phi_2 \left(\Phi(u)^{-1}, \Phi(v)^{-1} \right), \quad (34)$$




Figure 2: $\lambda_u(q)$ for bivariate Gaussian Copula

where Φ_2 denotes the bivariate standard normal distribution with linear correlation coefficient ρ , and Φ the univariate standard normal distribution.

Hence,

$$C_\rho(u, v) = \int_{-\infty}^{\Phi^{-1}(u)} \int_{-\infty}^{\Phi^{-1}(v)} \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \exp\left(\frac{2\rho st - s^2 - t^2}{2(1-\rho^2)}\right) ds dt.$$

In order to simplify the computation of the function g , we express $C_\rho(u, v)$ in the following way.

Theorem 10. *The bivariate Gaussian copula is given by:*

$$C_\rho(u, v) = \int_0^u \Phi\left(\frac{\Phi^{-1}(v) - \rho\Phi^{-1}(t)}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}}\right) dt. \quad (35)$$

PROOF. Let $X = (U, V)$ a standard Gaussian random vector with correlation ρ . Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_2(u, v) &= Pr\{U \leq u, V \leq v\} \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^u \int_{-\infty}^v \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \exp\left(\frac{2\rho st - s^2 - t^2}{2(1-\rho^2)}\right) ds dt \end{aligned}$$

this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Phi_2(u, v)}{\partial u} &= \int_{-\infty}^v \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \exp\left(\frac{2\rho ut - u^2 - t^2}{2(1-\rho^2)}\right) ds \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^v \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \exp\left(\frac{-(s-u\rho)^2 + \rho^2 u^2 - u^2}{2(1-\rho^2)}\right) ds \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^v \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \exp\left(\frac{-(s-u\rho)^2 - u^2(1-\rho^2)}{2(1-\rho^2)}\right) ds \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^v \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \exp\left(\frac{-u^2}{2} + \frac{-(s-u\rho)^2}{2(1-\rho^2)}\right) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(\frac{-u^2}{2}\right) \int_{-\infty}^v \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \exp\left(\frac{-(s-u\rho)^2}{2(1-\rho^2)}\right) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(\frac{-u^2}{2}\right) \int_{-\infty}^v \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}(1-\rho^2)} \exp\left(\frac{-(s-u\rho)^2}{2(1-\rho^2)}\right) ds \\ &= \phi(u) \cdot \Phi\left(\frac{v-u\rho}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where ϕ denotes the density of the standard univariate normal distribution. Therefore we have,

$$\Phi_2(u, v) = \int_{-\infty}^u \phi(x) \cdot \Phi\left(\frac{v - x\rho}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}}\right) dx, \quad (37)$$

The expression of the bivariate Gaussian copula is then

$$\begin{aligned} C_\rho(u, v) &= \Phi_2(\Phi^{-1}(u), \Phi^{-1}(v), \rho) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\Phi^{-1}(u)} \phi(x) \cdot \Phi\left(\frac{\Phi^{-1}(v) - x\rho}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}}\right) dx \end{aligned}$$

By making the substitution $t = \Phi(x)$, we obtain

$$C_\rho(u, v) = \int_0^u \Phi\left(\frac{\Phi^{-1}(v) - \rho\Phi^{-1}(t)}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}}\right) dt. \quad \blacksquare$$

It is now easier to derive the expression of the $g(v, u)$ the partial derivative with respect to u of the copula $C_\rho(u, v)$. Namely:

$$\begin{aligned} g(v, u) &= \frac{\partial C_\rho(u, v)}{\partial u} \\ &= \frac{\partial \left(\int_0^u \Phi\left(\frac{\Phi^{-1}(v) - \rho\Phi^{-1}(t)}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}}\right) dt \right)}{\partial u} \\ &= \Phi\left(\frac{\Phi^{-1}(v) - \rho\Phi^{-1}(u)}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The function $g(v, u)$ is strictly monotone with respect to v . To compute its inverse, we set




Figure 3: Conditional Quantile Function of the Bivariate Gaussian Copula with $\rho = 0.5$

$g(v, u) = \alpha$ and solve for v .

$$v = g^{-1}(\alpha, u) = \Phi\left(\rho\Phi^{-1}(u) + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha)\right). \quad (39)$$

Remark 7. If we set in the above equation $\rho = 0$, we obtain $v = \alpha$ for all $u \in [0, 1]$ (see Figure 5.1 on the next page)). This is not a surprise because zero correlation means independence under the normal copula setting.

So according to theorem 5 on page 6 we have the following formula for $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ when the dependence is modeled by a Gaussian copula

$$CoVaR^{s|L^i=l} = F_s^{-1}\left(\Phi\left(\rho\Phi^{-1}(F_i(l)) + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha)\right)\right). \quad (40)$$




Figure 4: g^{-1} of the Bivariate Gaussian Copula

Thus, in the context of remark 5 on page 7, we have according to equation (17) that

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \Phi \left(\rho \Phi^{-1} (F_i (l)) + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) \right).$$

Note that we can assume F_i and F_s in (40) be any univariate distribution function satisfying the assumption 1 on page 3.

Let us suppose as a particular case that L^s and L^i are Gaussian, that is $F_i = N_i$ and $F_s = N_s$ (Where N_s and N_i are Gaussian distributions of the losses L^s and L^i with expected values μ_s, μ_i and standard deviation σ_s, σ_i). We obtain the following closed analytical expression of $CoVaR^s|L^i=l$:

$$CoVaR^s|L^i=l = N_s^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(\rho \Phi^{-1} (N_i (l)) + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) \right) \right) \quad (41)$$

and

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \Phi \left(\rho \Phi^{-1} (N_i (l)) + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) \right). \quad (42)$$

Proposition 2. *In the Gaussian setting (Gaussian Copula and Gaussian Margins). $CoVaR^s|L^i=l$ is given by*

$$CoVaR^s|L^i=l = \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} (l - \mu_i) + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \sigma_s \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) + \mu_s. \quad (43)$$

PROOF.

$$\begin{aligned} CoVaR^s|L^i=l &= N_s^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(\rho \Phi^{-1} (N_i (l)) + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) \right) \right) \\ &= N_s^{-1} \left(N_s \left(\sigma_s \rho \Phi^{-1} (N_i (l)) + \sigma_s \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) + \mu_s \right) \right) \\ &= \sigma_s \rho \Phi^{-1} (N_i (l)) + \sigma_s \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) + \mu_s \\ &= \sigma_s \rho \Phi^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(\frac{l - \mu_i}{\sigma_i} \right) \right) + \sigma_s \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) + \mu_s \\ &= \sigma_s \rho \left(\frac{l - \mu_i}{\sigma_i} \right) + \sigma_s \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) + \mu_s \\ &= \sigma_s \rho \frac{l}{\sigma_i} - \sigma_s \rho \frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i} + \sigma_s \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) + \mu_s \\ &= \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} l - \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \mu_i + \sigma_s \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) + \mu_s \\ &= \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} l - \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \mu_i + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \sigma_s \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) + \mu_s \\ &= \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} (l - \mu_i) + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \sigma_s \Phi^{-1} (\alpha) + \mu_s. \quad \blacksquare \quad (44) \end{aligned}$$

Remark 8. The formula in proposition 2 is equivalent to that proposed in [34].

Corollary 11. Assume that L^s and L^i are Gaussian distributed and centered at zero then.

$$\begin{aligned} CoVaR^{s|L^i=l} &= \left(\rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \right) l + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \sigma_s \Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \\ &= \left(\rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \right) VaR_\beta^i + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} VaR_\alpha^s \quad \text{when } l = VaR_\beta^i \end{aligned}$$

Remark 9. If $\rho = 0$ then $CoVaR^{s|L^i=VaR^i} = VaR_\alpha^s$.

Let l be the value at risk of the single institution at the level β i.e. $l = VaR_\beta^i = F_i(\beta)$. Then we have the following expression of $CoVaR_\alpha^\beta$ (see Def. 6 on page 7).

Corollary 12. In the Gaussian setting, we have

$$CoVaR_\alpha^\beta = \rho \sigma_s \Phi^{-1}(\beta) + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \sigma_s \Phi^{-1}(\alpha) + \mu_s. \quad (45)$$

PROOF.

$$\begin{aligned} CoVaR_\alpha^\beta &= h \cdot VaR_\beta^i - h \cdot \mu_i + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \sigma_s \Phi^{-1}(\alpha) + \mu_s. \\ &= \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} (\sigma_i \Phi^{-1}(\beta) + \mu_i) - \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \mu_i + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \sigma_s \Phi^{-1}(\alpha) + \mu_s \\ &= \rho \sigma_s \Phi^{-1}(\beta) + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \sigma_s \Phi^{-1}(\alpha) + \mu_s. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Remark 10. We remark that unlike in proposition 2 on the previous page the expression of $CoVaR_\alpha^\beta$ does not depend of the loss distribution's characteristic (e.g. standard deviation σ_i and mean μ_i) of the focused financial institution i .

Corollary 13. In the Gaussian setting. The map

$$(\alpha, \beta) \longmapsto CoVaR_\alpha^\beta$$

is increasing with respect to its both parameters.

Now we refer to definition 4 on page 4 to compute $\Delta CoVaR_\alpha^{s|i}$. The result of our computation is provided in the following proposition.

Proposition 3. In the Gaussian setting, $\Delta CoVaR_\alpha^{s|i}$ is given by

$$\Delta CoVaR_\alpha^{s|i} = \rho \sigma_s \Phi(\beta)^{-1}. \quad (46)$$

PROOF. According to definition 4 on page 4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} CoVaR_\alpha^\beta &= CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=VaR_\beta^i} - CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=\mu_i} \\ &= \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \cdot VaR_\beta^i - \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \cdot \mu_i + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} VaR_\alpha^s - \left[\rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \cdot \mu_i - \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \cdot \mu_i + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} VaR_\alpha^s \right] \\ &= \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \cdot VaR_\beta^i - \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \cdot \mu_i \\ &= \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \cdot (VaR_\beta^i - \mu_i) \\ &= \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \cdot (\sigma_i \Phi^{-1}(\beta) + \mu_i - \mu_i) \\ &= \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} \cdot (\sigma_i \Phi^{-1}(\beta)) \\ &= \rho \sigma_s \Phi(\beta)^{-1}. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Remark 11. From equation (46) we observe that if the financial institution i and the financial system s are not correlated, the risk contribution of i to s is zero.

Let us impose now that, the loss of the financial system L^s alone follows normal univariate distribution. Then according to proposition 1 on page 8, we have

$$CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l} = \sigma_s \Phi^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}) + \mu_s.$$

Additionally if we also assume that L^i is normal distributed. Then we have from equation 42 that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\alpha} &= \Phi\left(\rho\Phi^{-1}(N_i(l)) + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha)\right) \\ &= \Phi\left(\rho\Phi^{-1}(\beta) + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Together we have

$$\begin{aligned}CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l} &= \sigma_s \left(\Phi^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(\rho\Phi^{-1}(N_i(l)) + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \right) \right) \right) + \mu_s \\ &= \sigma_s \left(\rho\Phi^{-1}(N_i(l)) + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \right) + \mu_s \\ &= \sigma_s \left(\rho\Phi^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(\frac{l-\mu_i}{\sigma_i} \right) \right) + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \right) + \mu_s \\ &= \sigma_s \left(\rho \left(\frac{l-\mu_i}{\sigma_i} \right) + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \right) + \mu_s \\ &= \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_i} (l-\mu_i) + \sigma_s \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) + \mu_s\end{aligned}\tag{47}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}CoVaR_\alpha^\beta &= \sigma_s \left(\Phi^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(\rho\Phi^{-1}(\beta) + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \right) \right) \right) + \mu_s \\ &= \sigma_s \left(\rho\Phi^{-1}(\beta) + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \right) + \mu_s \\ &= \sigma_s \rho\Phi^{-1}(\beta) + \sigma_s \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) + \mu_s.\end{aligned}\tag{48}$$

Analogue we can compute $\Delta CoVaR_\alpha^{s|i}$ in this case according to corollary 7 on page 8. Recall

$$\Delta CoVaR_\alpha^{s|i} = \sigma_s \left(\Phi^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}_d) - \Phi^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}_m) \right).$$

From equation 42 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\alpha}_m &= \Phi\left(\rho\Phi^{-1}(0.5) + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha)\right) \\ &= \Phi\left(\sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha)\right)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{\alpha}_d = \Phi\left(\rho\Phi^{-1}(\beta) + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha)\right).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta CoVaR_\alpha^{s|i} &= \sigma_s \left(\Phi^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(\rho\Phi^{-1}(\beta) + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \right) \right) - \Phi^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(\sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \right) \right) \right) \\ &= \sigma_s \left(\left(\rho\Phi^{-1}(\beta) + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \right) - \left(\sqrt{1-\rho^2}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \right) \right) \\ &= \sigma_s \rho\Phi^{-1}(\beta).\end{aligned}\tag{49}$$

5.2. t-copula

Definition 8 (bivariate t distribution). *The distribution function of a bivariate t-distributed random variable with correlation coefficient ρ is given by:*

$$t_{\rho,\nu}(u,v) = \int_{-\infty}^u \int_{-\infty}^v \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \left(1 + \frac{s^2+t^2-2\rho st}{\nu(1-\rho^2)} \right)^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} dsdt,\tag{50}$$

where ν is the number of degrees of freedom.

Definition 9. *The bivariate t copula, $C_{\rho,\nu}^t$ is defined as*

$$\begin{aligned}C_{\rho,\nu}^t(u,v) &= t_{\rho,\nu}(t_\nu^{-1}(u), t_\nu^{-1}(v)) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{t_\nu^{-1}(u)} \int_{-\infty}^{t_\nu^{-1}(v)} \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \left(1 + \frac{s^2+t^2-2\rho st}{\nu(1-\rho^2)} \right)^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} dsdt.\end{aligned}$$

The following property plays a important role by the analysis of bivariate t-copula (cf. [41] 5.30).

Proposition 4. *Let (X, Y) be a bivariate standard t-distributed random variable i.e. $(X, Y) \sim t_{\rho\nu}$. Then conditional on $X = x$ we have:*

$$\left(\frac{\nu + 1}{\nu + x^2} \right)^{1/2} \frac{Y - \rho x}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \sim t_{\nu+1}. \quad (51)$$

Using this we can express the t copula $C_{\rho,\nu}^t(u, v)$ as follows:

$$C_{\rho,\nu}^t(u, v) = \int_0^u t_{\nu+1} \left(\left(\frac{\nu + 1}{\nu + [t_{\nu}^{-1}(u)]^2} \right)^{1/2} \frac{t_{\nu}^{-1}(v) - \rho t_{\nu}^{-1}(t)}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \right) dt. \quad (52)$$

See Appendix A for the prove. Now following theorem 5 on page 6 we compute the expression of $g(v, u)$. Namely:

$$\begin{aligned} g(v, u) &= \frac{\partial C_{\rho,\nu}^t(u, v)(u, v)}{\partial u} \\ &= \frac{\partial \left(\int_0^u t_{\nu+1} \left(\left(\frac{\nu + 1}{\nu + [t_{\nu}^{-1}(u)]^2} \right)^{1/2} \frac{t_{\nu}^{-1}(v) - \rho t_{\nu}^{-1}(t)}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \right) dt \right)}{\partial u} \\ &= t_{\nu+1} \left(\left(\frac{\nu + 1}{\nu + [t_{\nu}^{-1}(u)]^2} \right)^{1/2} \frac{t_{\nu}^{-1}(v) - \rho t_{\nu}^{-1}(u)}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

As $Pr(V > v|U = u) = \frac{\partial C_{\rho,\nu}^t(u, v)(u, v)}{\partial u}$ we can also use the above result to compute tail dependence coefficient of the t copula (see Figure 5). Because of the symmetric property of t distribution we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_u &= 2 \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} [Pr(V > q|U = q)] \\ &= 2 - 2 \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} t_{\nu+1} \left(\left(\frac{\nu + 1}{\nu + [t_{\nu}^{-1}(q)]^2} \right)^{1/2} \frac{t_{\nu}^{-1}(q) - \rho t_{\nu}^{-1}(q)}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \right) \\ &= 2 - 2t_{\nu+1} \left(\left(\frac{(\nu + 1)(1 - \rho)}{1 + \rho} \right)^{1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From which it follows that,

$$\lambda_u = \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{if } \rho > -1 \\ 0 & \text{if } \rho = -1. \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

This show that the bivariate t copula is able to capture the dependent of extreme values provided that $\rho > -1$. Note that the coefficient of tail upper is increasing in ρ . This is very important by the characterisation of the concept of "Too interconnected to fail" which is a key concept by the analyses of systemic risk. We also see that it is decreasing in ν . The function g is invertible and its inverse is obtain by solving the equation

$$g(v, u) = t_{\nu+1} \left(\left(\frac{\nu + 1}{\nu + [t_{\nu}^{-1}(u)]^2} \right)^{1/2} \frac{t_{\nu}^{-1}(v) - \rho t_{\nu}^{-1}(u)}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \right) = \alpha$$

for v . This leads to,

$$v = g^{-1}(\alpha, u) = t_{\nu} \left(\rho t_{\nu}^{-1}(u) + \sqrt{\frac{(1 - \rho^2)(\nu + [t_{\nu}^{-1}(u)]^2)}{\nu + 1}} t_{\nu+1}^{-1}(\alpha) \right). \quad (55)$$




Figure 5: Tail Dependence Coefficient for t-Student Copula

Hence according to theorem 5 on page 6 we get following formula for $CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l}$ when the dependence is modeling by a t-copula

$$\begin{aligned} CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l} &= F_s^{-1} \left(g^{-1}(\alpha, F_i(l)) \right) \\ &= F_s^{-1} \left(t_{\nu} \left(\rho t_{\nu}^{-1}(F_i(l)) + \sqrt{\frac{(1-\rho^2)(\nu + [t_{\nu}^{-1}(F_i(l))]^2)}{\nu+1}} t_{\nu+1}^{-1}(\alpha) \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

In the context of equation (15) we have

$$CoVaR_{\alpha}^{s|L^i=l} = F_s^{-1} \left(t_{\nu} \left(\rho t_{\nu}^{-1}(\beta) + \sqrt{\frac{(1-\rho^2)(\nu + [t_{\nu}^{-1}(\beta)]^2)}{\nu+1}} t_{\nu+1}^{-1}(\alpha) \right) \right). \quad (57)$$

where β denotes the regulatory risk level of the financial institution i . Note that the dependence in the Gaussian and t-copulas setting are essentially determined by the correlation coefficient ρ (elliptical copula). The correlation coefficient is often considered as being poor tool for describing dependence when the margins are for non-normal, in particular for their extremal dependence (cf. [41]). This motivates the next section.

5.3. Gumbel copula

Definition 10. The bivariate Gumbel Copula function is given by (cf. [43] Ex. 4.25)

$$C_{\theta}^{Gu}(u, v) = \exp \left(- \left[(-\ln u)^{\theta} + (-\ln v)^{\theta} \right]^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \right), \quad 1 \leq \theta < \infty, \quad (58)$$

,here θ represents the strength of dependence. Note that:

- For $\theta = 1$ we have no dependency copula. i.e. $C_{\theta}^{Gu}(u, v) = uv$
- For $\theta \rightarrow \infty$ we have the perfect dependence i.e. $C_{\theta}^{Gu}(u, v) = \min(u, v) = M(u, v)$ with m and M represented the Frchet-Hoeffding lower and upper bound respectively.

The bivariate Gumbel belong to the A special subclass of bivariate Archimedean copulas, which can be represented in the following form ([43] P. 121):

$$C(u, v) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(u) + \varphi(v)), \quad (59)$$

where φ is a C^2 , decreasing and convex function (i.e. $\varphi'(u) < 0$ and $\varphi''(u) \geq 0 \forall 0 \leq u \leq 1$) with $\varphi(1) = 0$ and $\varphi(0) = \infty$. The function φ is called generator of the copula C . The generator of the Gumbel copula is given by $\varphi_{\theta}(t) = (-\ln t)^{\theta}$ for $\theta \geq 1$. Such that we can represent the Gumbel copulas as:

$$C_{\theta}(u, v) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(u) + \varphi(v)).$$

We can compute the lower and upper tail dependence coefficient of the Gumbel copula using following corollary ([43] Co. 5.4.3).

Corollary 14. *Let C be an Archimedean copula with a continuous, strictly, decreasing and convex generator φ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_u &= 2 - \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1 - \varphi^{-1}(2x)}{1 - \varphi^{-1}(x)} \\ \lambda_l &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - \varphi^{-1}(2x)}{1 - \varphi^{-1}(x)}\end{aligned}$$

For the gumbel copula we have

$$\lambda_u = 2 - \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1 - \varphi^{-1}(2x)}{1 - \varphi^{-1}(x)} = 2 - 2^{\frac{1}{\theta}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_l = 0.$$

Following theorem 5 on page 6 and based on theorem 3 we can compute the expression of $g(v, u)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}g(v, u) &= \frac{\partial C(u, v)}{\partial u} \\ &= \frac{\partial \exp\left(-\left[(-\ln u)^\theta + (-\ln v)^\theta\right]^{\frac{1}{\theta}}\right)}{\partial u} \\ &= \exp\left(-\left[(-\ln u)^\theta + (-\ln v)^\theta\right]^{\frac{1}{\theta}}\right) \times \\ &\quad \left((- \ln u)^\theta + (-\ln v)^\theta\right) \times \\ &\quad \frac{(-\ln u)^{\theta-1}}{u}.\end{aligned}\tag{60}$$

Note that the function $g(v, u)$ is a strictly increasing with respect to v . Its inverse $g^{-1}(\alpha, u)$ is thus well defined. But its inverse $g^{-1}(\alpha, u)$ can not be express in an explicit form. Hence we can not derive $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ analytically, but we can use in this case numerical methods.

5.4. Bivariate Archimedean Copulas

We can give in this section a general expression of the $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ for some Archimedean Copulas. Archimedean copulas are often used in practice because of their analytical property, and ability to reproduce a large spectrum of dependence structures. Differently from the elliptical copulas, The definition of a bivariate copula are not derived from a given bivariate distribution. The construction of Archimedean copulas is based on special function (the so called *generator*). The generator of a Archimedean copula is a convex and strictly decreasing continuous function φ from $[0, 1]$ to $[0, \infty]$ with $\varphi(1) = 0$.

Definition 11 (pseudo-inverse, cf. [41] Def. 5.41). *define a pseudo-inverse of φ with domain $[0, \infty]$ by*

$$\varphi^{[-1]}(t) = \begin{cases} \varphi^{-1}(t) & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \varphi(0) \\ 0 & \text{if } \varphi(0) < t \leq \infty. \end{cases}\tag{61}$$

Note that the composition of the pseudo-inverse with the generator gives the identity i.e.

$$\varphi^{[-1]}(\varphi(t)) = t. \quad \forall t \in [0, \infty].$$

If $\varphi(0) = \infty$ the generator is said to be strict and it is equivalent to the ordinary functional inverse φ^{-1} .

Given a generator φ we can construct the corresponding Archimedean copula as follows

$$C(u, v) = \varphi^{[-1]}(\varphi(u) + \varphi(v)).\tag{62}$$

Proposition 5. *Let C be an Archimedean copula with a continuous, strictly, decreasing and convex generator φ i.e.*

$$C(u, v) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(u) + \varphi(v)).\tag{63}$$

Then the function g defined as in theorem 5 on page 6 is given by (cf. [43] Thm. 4.3.8):

$$g(v, u) = \frac{\partial C(u, v)}{\partial u} = \frac{\varphi'(u)}{\varphi'(\varphi^{-1}[\varphi(u) + \varphi(v)])}. \quad (64)$$

Set $g(v, u) = \alpha$ and solve for v , we obtain the inverse of g . Namely:

$$g^{-1}(\alpha, u) = \varphi^{-1} \left(\varphi \left(\varphi'^{-1} \left(\frac{\varphi'(u)}{\alpha} \right) \right) - \varphi(u) \right). \quad (65)$$

Based on theorem 5 on page 6 we derive the following proposition, which gives the expression of $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ for some Archimedean copulas

Proposition 6. *Let C be an Archimedean copula with a continuous, strictly, decreasing and convex functions generator φ . Let L^s and L^i be two random variables representing the loss of the system s and institution i with joint distribution defined by a bivariate copula C with marginal distribution functions F_s and F_i respectively i.e.*

$$F_{L^i, L^s}(x, y) = C(F_i(x), F_s(y)).$$

If C is an Archimedean copula with a continuous, strictly, decreasing and convex functions generator φ , then the explicit (or closed) formula for the $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ at level α , $0 < \alpha < 1$ for a certain fixed value l of L^i is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l} &= F_s^{-1} \left(g^{-1}(\alpha, F_i(l)) \right). \\ &= F_s^{-1} \left(\varphi^{-1} \left(\varphi \left(\varphi'^{-1} \left(\frac{\varphi'(F_i(l))}{\alpha} \right) \right) - \varphi(F_i(l)) \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Proposition 7.

$$CoVaR_\alpha^\beta = F_s^{-1} \left(\varphi^{-1} \left(\varphi \left(\varphi'^{-1} \left(\frac{\varphi'(\beta)}{\alpha} \right) \right) - \varphi(\beta) \right) \right). \quad (67)$$

5.4.1. Clayton Copula

We consider for example the Clayton copula, its generator is given by:

$$\varphi(t) = t^{-\theta} - 1. \quad (68)$$

According to proposition 7 we have the following expression for the $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$

$$CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l} = F_s^{-1} \left(\left[\left(\alpha^{-\frac{\theta}{1+\theta}} - 1 \right) (F_i(l))^{-\theta} + 1 \right]^{-\frac{1}{\theta}} \right). \quad (69)$$

6. Conclusion

Managing and regulating the systemic risk is a fundamental problem for financial regulators and risk managers especially in the context of the actual crisis. The most important challenge here is the modeling and the quantification of the potential contribution of one given individual financial institution to the financial system. One of the main approaches to solve this problem is the *covar* method proposed by Adrian and Brunnermeier in [2]. Where the financial system is defined as a portfolio of two items such that the loss of the system is represented by a random vector (L^i, L^s) where L^i is the loss of the focused financial institution i and L^s the loss of the financial system s , and the marginal risk contribution of the bank i to systemic risk s is quantified by the risk measure $\Delta CoVaR^{s|i}$ which is defined as the difference between $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=VaR_i}$ and $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=E(L^i)}$ (see Def. 4 on page 4). The problem of the computation and the analysis of the term $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ for a given l is thus very important for the implementation of *CoVaR* especially in the non-Gaussian world, but still we do not get any definite solution. no definitive answer. As an answer to this problem, we have developed our method, based on copula theory, an analytical framework for the implementation of the *CoVaR* methodology where the risk measure $CoVaR_\alpha^{s|L^i=l}$ is expressed in a closed form in terms of the marginal distributions F_s and F_i separately

and the copula C between the focused financial institution i and the financial system s . This framework provides an effective computation and analysis tools for the systemic risk using $CoVaR$ for a widely used class of distribution function and co-movement dynamic (see Theorem 5 on page 6), which captures not only linear correlation but also nonlinear tail dependencies between the banks in one financial system (which summarise the main features of loss distribution) as opposite to the "linear quantile regression" and the formula in [34] where the dependence is modeled only by the linear correlation coefficient. In fact our approach allows to analyse the marginal effect of F_i , F_s and C of the systemic risk. We show for example the systemic risk contribution of i is independent of F_i (see (15)) and highlight in remark 6 on page 9 some properties of $CoVaR$ according to the nature of F_s . Our approach can also be used to develop closed formulas for the computation of related macro risk measures like $CoVaR^{i|s}$ (cf. [2]), $\Delta CoVaR^{s|i}$, $\Delta CollVaR^{s|i}$ (cf. [34]), and $\Delta CondVaR^{s|i}$ (cf. [34]).

Appendix A. Proof of Proposition 4 on page 18

Proposition 4

Let (X, Y) be a bivariate standard t -distributed random variable i.e. $(X, Y) \sim t_{\rho\nu}$. Then conditional on $X = x$ we have:

$$\left(\frac{\nu + 1}{\nu + x^2} \right)^{1/2} \frac{Y - \rho x}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \sim t_{\nu+1}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

PROOF. The proof based on the transformation rule for density function [cf. [37] Thm. 1.101] namely:

Theorem 15 (Transformation formula (cf. [37] Thm. 1.101)). *Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R} that has a continuous (or piecewise continuous) density $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ That is*

$$\mu((-\infty, x]) = \int_{-\infty}^x f(t) dt \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}$$

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open or a closed subset of \mathbb{R} with $\mu(\mathbb{R} \setminus A) = 0$. Further, let $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ open or closed. Finally, assume that $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$ is a continuously differentiable bijection with derivative φ' Then the image measure $u \circ \varphi^{-1}$ has the density

$$f_{\varphi(X)}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{f(\varphi^{-1}(x))}{|\det(\varphi'(\varphi^{-1}(x)))|}, & \text{if } x \in B \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus B \end{cases}.$$

For a prove see [37] Thm. 1.101.

Let (XY) a random vector following a bivariate t distribution. We define a news random variable by

$$R := \varphi(Y) = \left(\frac{\nu + 1}{(\nu + x^2)(1 - \rho^2)} \right)^{1/2} Y - \rho x.$$

Then because of theorem 15 we have:

$$f_{R|x}(r) = \frac{f_{Y|x} \left(r \left(\frac{\nu+1}{(\nu+x^2)(1-\rho^2)} \right)^{-1/2} + \rho x \right)}{\left(\frac{\nu+1}{(\nu+x^2)(1-\rho^2)} \right)^{1/2}} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Note that the conditional density of Y given $X = x$ is given by (cf. [38] Eq. (1.15)):

$$f_{Y|x}(y) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+2}{2})}{\sqrt{\nu\pi}(1-\rho^2)\Gamma(\frac{\nu+1}{2})} \left[1 + \frac{(y - \rho x)^2 + x^2(1 - \rho^2)}{\nu(1 - \rho^2)} \right]^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} \left[1 + \frac{x^2}{\nu} \right]^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

By setting $y = \varphi^{-1}(r)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{Y|X}(\varphi^{-1}(r)) &= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+2}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\nu\pi(1-\rho^2)}\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left[1 + \frac{\left(r\left(\frac{(1-\rho^2)(\nu+x^2)}{\nu+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 + x^2(1-\rho^2)}{\nu(1-\rho^2)} \right]^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} \left[1 + \frac{x^2}{\nu} \right]^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+2}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\nu\pi(1-\rho^2)}\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left[1 + \frac{\frac{r^2(1-\rho^2)(\nu+x^2)}{\nu+1} + x^2(1-\rho^2)}{\nu(1-\rho^2)} \right]^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} \left[1 + \frac{x^2}{\nu} \right]^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+2}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\nu\pi(1-\rho^2)}\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left[1 + \frac{r^2(\nu+x^2)}{\nu(\nu+1)} + \frac{x^2}{\nu} \right]^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} \left[1 + \frac{x^2}{\nu} \right]^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+2}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\nu\pi(1-\rho^2)}\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left[\left(1 + \frac{r^2}{\nu+1}\right) \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{\nu}\right) \right]^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} \left[1 + \frac{x^2}{\nu} \right]^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+2}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\nu\pi(1-\rho^2)}\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{\nu+1}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} \left[1 + \frac{x^2}{\nu} \right]^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+2}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\nu\pi(1-\rho^2)}\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{\nu+1}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+2}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{\nu+1}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} \left((\nu\pi(1-\rho^2)) \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{\nu}\right) \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+2}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{\nu+1}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} (\pi(1-\rho^2)(\nu+x^2))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+2}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{\nu+1}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} \left(\frac{\nu+1}{\pi(\nu+1)(1-\rho^2)(\nu+x^2)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+2}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{\nu+1}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\pi(\nu+1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\nu+1}{(1-\rho^2)(\nu+x^2)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+2}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi(\nu+1)}\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{\nu+1}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}} \left(\frac{\nu+1}{(1-\rho^2)(\nu+x^2)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies according to A.2 that

$$f_{R|X}(y) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+2}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi(\nu+1)}\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{\nu+1}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The result in the proposition 4 follows then from the fact that the density function of the univariate t distribution with the number of degrees of freedom ν is given by:

$$t_\nu(r) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\nu\pi}\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right)} \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+1}{2}}.$$

Reference

- [1] V. V. ACHARYA, L. H. PEDERSEN, T. PHILIPPON, AND M. RICHARDSON, *Measuring systemic risk*, tech. report, 2010.
- [2] T. ADRIAN AND M. K. BRUNNERMEIER, *Covar*, Working Paper 17454, National Bureau of Economic Research, October 2011.
- [3] P. ALBRECHT, *Risk measures*, Encyclopedia of Actuarial Science, (2004), pp. 1493–1501.

- [4] C. ALEXANDER, *Market Risk Analysis, Practical Financial Econometrics*, Wiley Desktop Editions, Wiley, 2008.
- [5] ———, *Market Risk Analysis, Value at Risk Models*, Wiley Desktop Editions, Wiley, 2009.
- [6] P. ARTZNER, F. DELBAEN, J.-M. EBER, AND D. HEATH, *Coherent measures of risk*, 1998.
- [7] R. B. ASH, *Real analysis and probability [by] Robert B. Ash*, Academic Press New York,, 1972.
- [8] N. BALAKRISHNAN AND C. LAI, *Continuous Bivariate Distributions*, Heidelberg Taschenbücher, Springer, 2009.
- [9] P. BILLINGSLEY, *Probability and Measure*, Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, 1995.
- [10] B. BRAHIMI, F. CHEBANA, AND A. NECIR, *Copula representation of bivariate l-moments : A new estimation method for multiparameter 2-dimentional copula models*, (2011).
- [11] B. BRAHIMI AND A. NECIR, *A semiparametric estimation of copula models based on the method of moments*, (2011).
- [12] L. BREIMAN, *Probability*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 1992.
- [13] H. BRICE, J.-A. MANFRED, AND R. BARBARA, *Measuring the marginal systemic risk contribution using copula*, SSRN eLibrary, (2011).
- [14] C. T. BROWNLEES AND R. F. ENGLE, *Volatility, Correlation and Tails for Systemic Risk Measurement*, Social Science Research Network Working Paper Series, (2010).
- [15] U. CHERUBINI, E. LUCIANO, AND W. VECCHIATO, *Copula Methods in Finance*, The Wiley Finance Series, Wiley, 2004.
- [16] W. F. DARSOW, B. NGUYEN, AND E. T. OLSEN, *Copulas and Markov processes*, Illinois J. Math., 36 (1992), pp. 600–642.
- [17] S. DEMARTA AND A. J. MCNEIL, *The t copula and related copulas*, INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL REVIEW, 73 (2005), pp. 111–129.
- [18] G. DI NUNNO AND B. ØKSENDAL, *Advanced Mathematical Methods for Finance*, Springer, 2011.
- [19] R. B. DUFFEY, *The Quantification of Systemic Risk and Stability: New Methods and Measures*, University of Chicago Press, November 2011.
- [20] P. EMBRECHTS, F. LINDSKOG, AND A. MCNEIL, *Modelling Dependence with Copulas and Applications to Risk Management*, no. 1 in Handbooks in Finance, In book; Handbook of Heavy Tailed Distributions in Finance, Springer chapter 8, 2003.
- [21] P. EMBRECHTS, A. MCNEIL, AND D. STRAUMANN, *Correlation and dependence in risk management: Properties and pitfalls*, in RISK MANAGEMENT: VALUE AT RISK AND BEYOND, Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 176–223.
- [22] R. ENGLE, *Dynamic conditional correlation: A simple class of multivariate generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity models*, Journal of Business and Economic Statistics, 20 (2002), pp. 339–350.
- [23] W. FELLER, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications*, vol. 1, Wiley, January 1968.
- [24] H. FÖLLMER AND A. SCHIED, *Stochastic Finance: An Introduction in Discrete Time*, De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, De Gruyter, second ed., 2004.

- [25] T. FONG, L. FUNG, L. LAM, AND I.-W. YU, *Measuring the interdependence of banks in hong kong*, Working Papers 0919, Hong Kong Monetary Authority, 2009.
- [26] J. GARNIER, G. PAPANICOLAOU, AND T.-W. YANG, *Large deviations for a mean field model of systemic risk*, quantitative finance papers, arXiv.org, 2012.
- [27] C. GAUTHIER, A. LEHAR, AND M. SOUISSI, *Macroprudential capital requirements and systemic risk*, Journal of Financial Intermediation, (2012).
- [28] M. GORDY, *A risk-factor model foundation for ratings-based bank capital rules*, Journal of Financial Intermediation, 12 (2003), pp. 199–232.
- [29] G. GUDENDORF AND J. SEGERS, *Extreme-Value copulas*, (2009).
- [30] M. GÜNTHER AND A. JÜNGEL, *Finanzderivate mit MATLAB: Mathematische Modellierung und numerische Simulation*, Vieweg+Teubner Verlag, 2010.
- [31] W. HÄRDLE AND L. SIMAR, *Applied Multivariate Statistical Analysis*, Springer, second ed., 2003.
- [32] J. HAUPTMANN AND R. ZAGST, *Systemic Risk*, vol. 1 of Computational Risk Management, In book; Quantitative Financial Risk Management, Springer p. 321-338, 2011.
- [33] J. HULL, *Risk Management and Financial Institutions*, Wiley Finance, Wiley, second ed., 2010.
- [34] M. JÄGER-AMBROZEWICZ, *Closed form solutions of measures of systemic risk*, SSRN eLibrary, (2010).
- [35] H. JOE, *Multivariate Models and Multivariate Dependence Concepts*, Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability, Taylor & Francis, 1997.
- [36] P. KLAASSEN AND I. VAN EEGHEN, *Economic Capital: How It Works and What Every Manager Needs to Know*, Elsevier Finance, Elsevier, 2009.
- [37] A. KLENKE, *Probability Theory: A Comprehensive Course*, Universitext, Springer, 2007.
- [38] S. KOTZ AND S. NADARAJAH, *Multivariate T-Distributions and Their Applications*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [39] E. LTKEBOHMERT AND M. B. GORDY, *Granularity adjustment for basel ii*, tech. report, 2007.
- [40] Y. MALEVERGNE AND D. SORNETTE, *Extreme Financial Risks: From Dependence to Risk Management*, Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [41] A. MCNEIL, R. FREY, AND P. EMBRECHTS, *Quantitative Risk Management: Concepts, Techniques, and Tools*, Princeton Series in Finance, Princeton University Press, 2005.
- [42] F. MISHKIN AND S. EAKINS, *Financial Markets and Institutions*, The Prentice Hall Series in Finance, Pearson/Prentice Hall, seventh edition ed., 2012.
- [43] R. B. NELSEN, *An Introduction to Copulas (Springer Series in Statistics)*, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., Secaucus, NJ, USA, 2006.
- [44] S. RACHEV, *Handbook of Heavy Tailed Distributions in Finance*, Handbooks In Finance, Elsevier, 2003.
- [45] V. ROHATGI AND A. SALEH, *An Introduction to Probability and Statistics*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [46] T. RONCALLI, *La Gestion des Risques Financiers*, Collection Gestion. Série Politique générale, finance et marketing, Economica, second ed., 2009.
- [47] A. N. SHIRYAEV, *Probability (2nd ed.)*, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., Secaucus, NJ, USA, 1995.

- [48] D. TASCHE, *Risk contributions and performance measurement*, tech. report, Research paper, Zentrum Mathematik (SCA, 2000.
- [49] C. T. W. I. VIRAL V. ACHARYA, RICHARDSON M, tech. report.
- [50] D. WU, *Quantitative Financial Risk Management*, Computational Risk Management, Springer, 2011.