Performance evaluation of volatility estimation methods for Exabel

Øyvind Grotmol^{1*}, Martin Jullum², Kjersti Aas², Michael Scheuerer², ...

Abstract

Quantifying both historic and future volatility is key in portfolio risk management. This note presents and compare estimation strategies for volatility estimation in an estimation universe consisting on 28 629 unique companies from February 2010 to April 2021, with 858 different portfolios. The estimation methods are compared in terms of how they rank the volatility of the different subsets of portfolios. The overall best performing approach estimates volatility from direct entitiv returns using a GARCH model for variance estimation.

¹Exabel, Oslo, Norway

²Department for Statistical modeling, Machine learning and Artificial intelligence, Norsk Regnesentral, Oslo, Norway ***Corresponding author**: grotmol@exabel.com

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Factor model	2
3	Volatility estimation and computation	2
3.1	Target portfolio volatility	2
3.2	Estimating future portfolio volatility	2
	The direct return approach • The indirect factor based ap • Estimating the unknown quantities • Final estimation so	proach hemes
4	Data pre-processing	4
5	Portfolios	4
6	Performance evaluation	5
7	Results	5
8	Conclusion	7
	References	9
Α	Additional result tables for portfolio subsets	9

1. Introduction

The aim of this note is to describe and summarize a quantitative study comparing strategies for forecasting investment risk. The study concentrates on the investment risk of a portfolio relative to other portfolios, and uses volatility as the risk measure. Denote by $r_{k,t}$ the log-return of a company $k \in \mathbb{K} := \{1, \ldots, K\}$ on day *t* (hereafter for simplicity referred to as the return or company return). The (daily) volatility of company *k* during a time period \mathbb{T} of $|\mathbb{T}|$ trading days is then defined as the sample standard deviation

$$\operatorname{vol}_{k}(\mathbb{T}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}| - 1} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \left(r_{k,t} - \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}|} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} r_{k,t} \right)^{2}}, \qquad (1)$$

with an analogous definition for portfolios. While it is common to scale $\operatorname{vol}_k(\mathbb{T})$ to reflect the volatility over \mathbb{T} or a full

year, we omit that here as we deem daily volatility more interpretable.

As a short-term investment tool, estimates of future volatility is more useful than computations of historic volatility. In this study, we will therefore consider methods for estimating (daily) volatility over consecutive test periods \mathbb{T} of duration 3 months. We will consider both direct approaches estimating the volatility using the historic observed returns of the companies, and indirect approaches using Exabel's factor model. We will also consider two different weighting strategies for data back in time: A naive window based approach which puts equal weight on all observations q months back in time, and an approach which puts more weight on the most recent observations according to an estimated GARCH model. Exabels's factor model is briefly described in Section 2, while all different volatility estimation methods are precisely defined in Section 3.

The estimation universe we will be working with here consists of a total of 28 629 companies from all over the world, with company information and returns ranging from February 2010 to April 2021. As some companies have only existed for a portion of the full time period, the trading days are not the same for all companies. Due to this, and other missing data complications, some data pre-processing is required. We describe the removals, imputations and other actions we take to circumvent missing data issues in Section 4.

The volatilities are estimated for a range of portfolios, consisting of different companies from the estimation universe. The portfolios are defined based on the factors described in Section 2 to reflect investment strategies following the different factors. In total we are estimating volatilities for 858 different portfolios over 97 different 3-month test periods \mathbb{T} . See Section 5 for details.

The estimation methods will be compared and measured according to their ability to rank portfolios based on their

risk. We will do this by computing Kendall's τ [1] between the estimated volatilities and the target volatilities of a set of portfolios (after the latter have been observed). Details about the performance evaluation is provided in Section 6. Different sets of portfolios are considered, and their results are presented in Section 7. Some conclusions are provided in Section 8.

2. Factor model

With a factor model we would like to explain the returns of all companies in \mathbb{K} as well as possible through a small number of interpretable factors, i.e. attributes of a company which appear to influence its return. The factor loading $X_{k,t}^*$ of company k quantifies its exposure to a particular factor * at day t. Three different types of factor loadings are considered in Exabel's factor model:

- *Style*-loadings $X_{k,t}^s$, $s \in \mathbb{S}$ (set of style factors) *Country*-loadings $X_{k,t}^c$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$ (set of countries)
- *Industry*-loadings $X_{k,t}^i$, $i \in \mathbb{I}$ (set of industries)

Using a cross-sectional regression model, we then want to estimate (separately for each day) factor returns $f_t^s, s \in \mathbb{S}, f_t^c, c \in$ \mathbb{C} , and $f_t^i, i \in \mathbb{I}$ together with the overall market return f_t^m :

$$r_{k,t} = f_t^m + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} X_{k,t}^s f_t^s + \sum_{c \in \mathbb{C}} X_{k,t}^c f_t^c + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} X_{k,t}^i f_t^i + \varepsilon_{k,t}, \quad (2)$$

where $\varepsilon_{k,t} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{k,t}^2)$ is the residual term that accounts for the fraction of the return $r_{k,t}$ not explained by the company's exposure to the different factors. In Exabel's factor model, the factor loadings $X_{k,t}^*$ are updated on a monthly basis, i.e. they are constant within every month. All style factors $X_{k,t}^s$ are market cap centered, meaning that they satisfy $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{K}} mc_{k,t} X_{k,t}^s$ where $mc_{k,t}$ denotes the market capitalization of company k. Furthermore, the estimates \hat{f}_t^* for the factor f_t^* are obtained using a constrained weighted least squares approach where the companies are weighted by $mc_{k,t}$. See [2] for further details about Exabel's factor model.

In total there are l = 77 different factors. Using matrix notation, (2) can be written as

$$r_{k,t} = \mathbf{X}_{k,t}^{\top} \mathbf{f}_t + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{k,t}, \tag{3}$$

where \mathbf{f}_{t} is the *l*-dimensional vector of all factor returns, and $\mathbf{X}_{k,t}$ is the *l*-dimensional vector of all factor loadings (we define $X_{k,t}^m = 1$).

3. Volatility estimation and computation

As mentioned, the purpose of this note is to compare different methods for estimating the future volatility of portfolios. In this section we extend the single company volatility definition in (1) to the volatility of a portfolio, and describe the different methods we will be using for estimating these ahead in time. All quantities in this section are specific to a portfolio $\mathbb{P} =$

 $\{k_1,\ldots,k_p\}$ of p companies, with corresponding portfolio weights $w_{k,t}$ for company k at day t. Every portfolio has the property that $\sum_{k=1}^{p} |w_{k,t}| = 1$ for all t. To simplify notation, we will, however, often omit \mathbb{P} . When it is clear from the context, we will also sometimes omit the test period \mathbb{T} from our notation.

3.1 Target portfolio volatility

We start by defining the target portfolio volatility, i.e. the future volatility that the different estimation methods will attempt to predict. As mentioned in the introduction, we will consider consecutive 3-months test periods \mathbb{T} , and shall for simplicity assume that all portfolios have fixed portfolio weights $w_{k,t}$ within each of the test periods \mathbb{T} , i.e. $w_{k,t} = w_k$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}, k \in \mathbb{P}$. With these simplifications in place, we define the target portfolio volatility for time period \mathbb{T} as

$$\operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{T}) = \sqrt{\mathbf{w}^{\top} \Sigma(\mathbb{T}) \mathbf{w}},\tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_p)^{\top}$ is the vector of portfolio weights in time period \mathbb{T} . Furthermore, $\Sigma(\mathbb{T})$ is the $p \times p$ -dimensional sample covariance matrix of the daily returns in time period \mathbb{T} , for the companies in \mathbb{P} .

An alternative to the portfolio volatility definition in (4) would be to compute the daily returns of the portfolio first, and then compute the variance of these returns across \mathbb{T} . This is, however, deemed more sensitive to missing company returns, as missing a single return for one day with nonzero weight would leave the portfolio return for that day undefined. See Section 4 for how we handle missing company returns when estimating the covariance matrix $\Sigma(\mathbb{T})$.

3.2 Estimating future portfolio volatility

In this section we discuss methods to estimate the target portfolio volatility in Section 3.1 using historical data. We will discuss two types of approaches. The first uses the actual returns directly, while the second is an indirect approach which uses the factor model discussed in Section 2. Both approaches uses the portfolio volatility formula in (4) to estimate the future portfolio volatility, except that the (future) sample covariance matrix $\Sigma(\mathbb{T})$ (which is unknown at the estimation time point) is replaced with an estimate. In the subsequent subsections, we first present general formulae for the two types of estimating approaches, before we provide precise estimation methods for the unknown quantities.

3.2.1 The direct return approach

For the direct (company) return approach, the estimate of the future covariance matrix takes the form

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{r}} = \widehat{D}_{\mathrm{r}}\widehat{R}_{\mathrm{r}}\widehat{D}_{\mathrm{r}}$$

where \widehat{R}_r is an estimate of the $p \times p$ dimensional future correlation matrix of the returns, and \widehat{D}_r is a $p \times p$ diagonal matrix with estimates of the standard deviation of the company returns on the diagonal. The portfolio volatility estimate using

the direct return approach (r) thus takes the form

$$\widehat{\operatorname{vol}}_{r}(\mathbb{T}) = \sqrt{\mathbf{w}^{\top} \widehat{\Sigma}_{r} \mathbf{w}}.$$
(5)

3.2.2 The indirect factor based approach

To write up a general volatility expression for the indirect factor based approach (f), recall the matrix formulation of the estimated factor model in (3). With estimated parameters, this factor model takes the form $\hat{r}_{k,t} = \mathbf{X}_{k,t}^{\top} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{t}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_{t}$ is the estimated analogue of \mathbf{f}_{t} . Let us also denote by *L* the $l \times p$ dimensional matrix obtained by columnwise concatenation of the *l*-dimensional vectors $\mathbf{X}_{1,t}, \mathbf{X}_{2,t}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{p,t}$. For the indirect, factor based approach, the estimate of the future covariance may then be written as

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_{\rm f} = L^{\top} \widehat{\Sigma}_{\rm f}^{\rm f} L = L^{\top} \widehat{D}_{\rm f} \widehat{R}_{\rm f} \widehat{D}_{\rm f} L, \qquad (6)$$

where $\widehat{\Sigma}_{f}^{f}$ and \widehat{R}_{f} are estimates of the $l \times l$ dimensional future covariance and correlation matrices of the factors $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{t}$. The \widehat{D}_{f} is an $l \times l$ diagonal matrix with estimates of the (future) standard deviation of the factors at the diagonal.

When using the factor model to estimate the volatility, we also need to account for the idiosyncratic variance $\sigma_{k,t}^2$ of the residual term $\varepsilon_{k,t}$. As the factor model assumes that the error terms are independent, the estimated portfolio variance then becomes $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{P}} w_{k,t}^2 \widehat{\sigma}_{k,t}^2$, which in matrix form may be written $\mathbf{w}^\top \widehat{\sigma}_{\mathbb{P}}^2 \mathbf{w}$, where $\widehat{\sigma}_{\mathbb{P}}^2$ is the $p \times p$ -dimensional diagonal matrix with estimates for the variances of the companies in the portfolio \mathbb{P} on the diagonal. Combining the insertion of $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\mathrm{f}}$ for $\Sigma(\mathbb{T})$ in (4) with the additional residual variance term, we get the following general formula for the portfolio volatility estimate using the factor based approach (f):

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{\mathrm{f}}(\mathbb{T}) = \sqrt{\mathbf{w}^{\top} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathrm{f}} \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{w}^{\top} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_{\mathbb{P}}^{2} \mathbf{w}}.$$
 (7)

Furthermore, by pre-computing a $l \times p$ -dimensional portfolio factor loading matrix $L_{\mathbb{P}} = \mathbf{w}^{\top} L^{\top}$, we don't need to compute the full $p \times p$ dimensional $\hat{\Sigma}_{f}$, but only the $l \times l$ -dimensional $\hat{\Sigma}_{f}^{f}$. Thus, (7) can also be written as

$$\widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{\mathrm{f}}(\mathbb{T}) = \sqrt{L_{\mathbb{P}}^{\top} \widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\mathrm{f}} L_{\mathbb{P}} + \mathbf{w}^{\top} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_{\mathbb{P}}^{2} \mathbf{w}}, \qquad (8)$$

which is computationally more efficient for portfolios with many companies.

3.2.3 Estimating the unknown quantities

The formulae for the estimated volatility in (5) and (8) requires specification of the estimated covariance matrices $\hat{\Sigma}_{\rm r} = \hat{D}_{\rm r} \hat{R}_{\rm r} \hat{D}_{\rm r}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{\rm f}^{\rm f} = \hat{D}_{\rm f} \hat{R}_{\rm f} \hat{D}_{\rm f}$, respectively. We will provide two different methods for estimating each of them based on historic data, in addition to an estimation method for the residual variances in the factor model.

Naive window estimation method

The simplest way to estimate a covariance matrix for future companies/factors is to use the sample covariance matrix for

data in a window covering a certain number of days back in time. This is a naive estimation method which weights all company/factor returns within the window equally. If the window is too long one risks that the oldest company/factor returns are not representative, while a too short window risks giving unstable estimates as there is not enough data. Let us denote by $\widehat{\Sigma}_{r,naive}(q)$ and $\widehat{\Sigma}_{f,naive}^{f}(q)$ the company/factor return sample covariance matrices with a window covering q months prior to the test period \mathbb{T} .

GARCH model for variance estimation

The naive method above has the problem of requiring a rather long period (large q) in order to get stable and good estimates, while at the same time such a long period makes it react rather slow to changes in the volatility over time. One way to overcome this is to put more weight on the more recent observations than the older ones. Our approach in that direction is to modify the estimation of the covariance matrices by combining the naive window method for the correlation structure R_r and R_f with separate univariate GARCH models [3] for the variances of the companies $(D_r \text{ and } D_f)$. There exists multivariate GARCH models that could estimate covariance structure directly, but in the high dimensional settings present here, that would be computationally infeasible. GARCH stands for generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity, and is essentially an autoregressive moving average (ARMA) model on the error variance of a time series model. Here we will just assume a constant mean model, and use both autoregressive (AR) and moving average (MA) terms of order 1 for the variance. This is the most commonly used GARCH form within financial modelling [3]. For company k, this GARCH model takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} r_{k,t} &= \mu_k + \varepsilon_{G,k,t}, \\ \varepsilon_{G,k,t} | \varepsilon_{G,k,t-1}, \sigma_{G,k,t-1}^2 \sim N(0, \sigma_{G,k,t}^2), \\ \sigma_{G,k,t}^2 &= \omega_k + \alpha_k \varepsilon_{G,k,t-1}^2 + \beta_k \sigma_{G,k,t-1}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu_k, \omega_k, \alpha_k$ and β_k are parameters that have to be estimated. For the factor model, the formulation is completely analogous, except that company returns $r_{k,t}$ are replaced by the fitted factor returns \hat{f}_t^* . When estimating the parameters in these model specifications, we will always use a history of 3 years prior to the test period T. The diagonal matrices $\hat{D}_r = \hat{D}_{r,GARCH}$ and $\hat{D}_f = \hat{D}_{f,GARCH}$ are then filled with the modelled company/factor return variances for the latest observed day. Combining these diagonal variance matrices with naive window based estimators for the correlation structure (i.e. $\hat{R}_{r,naive}(q)$ and $\hat{R}_{f,naive}(q)$), we get

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_{r,GARCH}^{f}(q) = \widehat{D}_{r,GARCH} \widehat{R}_{r,naive}(q) \widehat{D}_{r,GARCH}, \widehat{\Sigma}_{f,GARCH}^{f}(q) = \widehat{D}_{f,GARCH} \widehat{R}_{f,naive}(q) \widehat{D}_{f,GARCH}.$$

Factor model residual variance

Regardless of whether the naive window method or the GARCH model is used to estimate $\hat{\Sigma}_{f}^{f}$ for the factor models, we use the

basic sample variance of the factor residuals $\varepsilon_{k,t}$ for t in a window q months prior to \mathbb{T} as an estimate of $\sigma_{k,t}^2, k \in \mathbb{P}$. We use the same window length q as for $\widehat{\Sigma}_{f,naive}^f(q)$ and $\widehat{\Sigma}_{f,GARCH}^f(q)$, and denote the estimate of the residual variance diagonal matrix $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbb{P}}^2$ by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_{\mathbb{P}}^2 = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_{\mathbb{P},naive}^2(q)$.

3.2.4 Final estimation schemes

To summarize, we have the following types of estimation schemes for the portfolio variance

$$\begin{split} \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{\mathrm{r,GARCH}}(q) &= \sqrt{\mathbf{w}^{\top}\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{r,GARCH}}(q)\mathbf{w}},\\ \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{\mathrm{r,naive}}(q) &= \sqrt{\mathbf{w}^{\top}\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{r,naive}}(q)\mathbf{w}},\\ \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{\mathrm{f,GARCH}}(q) &= \sqrt{L_{\mathbb{P}}^{\top}\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{f,GARCH}}^{\mathrm{f}}(q)L_{\mathbb{P}} + \mathbf{w}^{\top}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_{\mathbb{P},\mathrm{naive}}^{2}(q)\mathbf{w}},\\ \widehat{\mathrm{vol}}_{\mathrm{f,naive}}(q) &= \sqrt{L_{\mathbb{P}}^{\top}\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{f,naive}}^{\mathrm{f}}(q)L_{\mathbb{P}} + \mathbf{w}^{\top}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_{\mathbb{P},\mathrm{naive}}^{2}(q)\mathbf{w}}, \end{split}$$

which will be combined with different window lengths q.

4. Data pre-processing

In this section we briefly describe the data in our estimation universe, and list the data processing steps which filter or adjusts the original data.

Our data set consists of daily returns and monthly factor loadings for a total of 28 629 unique companies from February 2010 to April 2021. From these, we have estimated factor returns corresponding to Exabel's factor model, described in Section 2, with further details in [2].

We have made the following adjustments and filtering of our data:

- Missing industry and country loadings $X_{k,t}^c$ and $X_{k,t}^i$ are filled with 0.
- Missing factor returns $f_{k,t}^*$ are filled with 0.
- Missing market caps are replaced by the square of the factor loading company weights.
- Companies with no registered factor loadings for a certain month are excluded from the study that entire month.
- Companies with no registered company return a certain month are excluded from the study that entire month.
- All sample covariance/correlation matrices are estimated pairwise using daily data, after removing all missing pairs. Non-estimable variances or covariances (due to completely missing data) are replaced by 0.
- We use the naive sample variance instead of the GARCH estimate for single companies/factors when there is either less than 100 observed company/factor returns, the GARCH model does not converge, or it is not able to produce an estimate for other reasons.

• When estimating the covariance/correlation matrices pairwise, and adjusting non-estimable elements one may end up with covariance/correlation matrices which are not (computationally) positive definite. In such cases, we replace it by the nearest positive definite matrix using the algorithm of [4].

As a consequence of the above filtration and adjustments, companies that have missing observations in the entire estimation window (q months) contribute with zero volatility to the portfolios they are involved in.

5. Portfolios

This section describes and summarizes the portfolios we use in our study. The portfolios are constructed based on the factors described in Section 2 and the market cap mc, to reflect different investment strategies. We construct a total of 286 different portfolios for the entire time span. These consist of both unrestricted, region restricted and subregion restricted factor based portfolios. We consider the following regions: America, Asia and Europe, and the following subregions: Latin America and the Caribbean, Northern America, Eastern Asia, South Eastern Asia, Southern Asia, Western Asia, Northern Europe, Southern Europe, and Western Europe. The regions are defined using the ISO 3166 country codes and region/subregion definitions. Each portfolio has a minimum of 40, and a maximum of 300 companies in each test period \mathbb{T} . The portfolio weights $w_{k,t}$ for company k and $t \in \mathbb{T}$ are based on the factor loadings the last month before \mathbb{T} . In the portfolios, long positions have positive weights, while short positions have negative weights. We will both consider portfolios with purely long positions, and market neutral portfolios where $\sum_{k=1}^{p} w_{k,t} = 0$. All portfolios are scaled such that $\sum_{k=1}^{p} |w_{k,t}| = 1$. We only allow companies which have a market cap of at least \$200 million. All long/short portfolios are required to have at least 20 companies with positive weight and 20 companies with negative weight.

When constructing the portfolios below, we will be filtering and weighting companies based on both factor loadings and the market cap $mc_{k,t}$. Although mc has no factor loading, we will use that term also there to simplify the description. Thus, when construction portfolios weighted by mc below, the term 'factor loading' and the notation $X_{k,t}^*$ will refer to $mc_{k,t}$. All portfolio weights are constructed using factor loadings $X_{k,t}^*$ at the last time point t prior to each test period \mathbb{T} . Our portfolios are constructed as follows:

- Long, unrestricted portfolios, all factors + mc: For each test period \mathbb{T} and each of the 77 factors + mc, we filter out all companies without a *positive* factor loading $X_{k,t}^*$. Out of these, we keep the (maximum) 300 companies with the largest market cap. For the remaining companies, the portfolio weight $w_{k,t}$ is set proportional to $X_{k,t}^*$.
- Long/short, unrestricted portfolios, all style factors: For each test period \mathbb{T} and each of the $|\mathbb{S}| = 11$ style



Figure 1. Histogram with number of companies per test period \mathbb{T} and original portfolio.

factors, we filter out all companies without a *nonzero* factor loading $X_{k,t}^*$. Out of these, we keep the (maximum) 300 companies with the largest market cap. For the remaining companies, the portfolio weight $w_{k,t}$ is set proportional to $X_{k,t}^s$.

- Long, region/subregion portfolios, style factors + mc: For each test period \mathbb{T} , each region/subregion and each of the $|\mathbb{S}| = 11$ style factors + mc, we filter out all companies without a positive country factor loading $X_{k,t}^c$ for at least one of the countries in the relevant region/subregion. We then filter out all companies without a *positive* factor loading $X_{k,t}^*$. Out of these, we keep the (maximum) 300 companies with the largest market cap. For the remaining companies, the portfolio weight $w_{k,t}$ is set proportional to $X_{k,t}^*$.
- Long/short, region/subregion portfolios, style factors: For each test period T, each region/subregion and each of the |S| = 11 style factors, we filter out all companies without a positive country factor loading X^c_{k,t} for at least one of the countries in the relevant region/subregion. When then filter out all companies without a *nonzero* factor loading X^{*}_{k,t}. Out of these, we keep the (maximum) 300 companies with the largest market cap. For the remaining companies, the portfolio weight w_{k,t} is set proportional to X^s_{k,t}.

The number of companies per test period \mathbb{T} vary between 40 and 300 as shown in the histogram in Figure 1. Table 1 shows the number of portfolios of each type.

For each of the 286 portfolios above, we generate two additional 'random' portfolios. Each of these are constructed by sampling 50 companies with replacement from the original portfolio, using $w_{k,t}$ as sampling weights. This gives 584 additional portfolios, such that we end up with a total of 876 unique portfolios. The purpose of including the additional 'random' portfolios is to control the sensitivity to strictly factor based portfolio definitions.

For the random portfolios, the number of companies per test period \mathbb{T} vary between 18 and 50 as shown in the histogram in Figure 2.

Long/short	Restriction	Туре	#
Long	Unrestricted	country	27
Long	Unrestricted	industry	12
Long	Unrestricted	style $+mc$	12
Long/short	Unrestricted	style	11
Long	3 regions	style $+mc$	36
Long/short	3 regions	style	33
Long	9 subregions	style $+mc$	79
Long/short	9 subregions	style	76

Table 1. The number of original portfolios of each type.



Figure 2. Histogram with number of companies per test period \mathbb{T} and random portfolio.

6. Performance evaluation

In this section we describe how we evaluate the performance of the volatility estimation methods described in Section 3. When comparing different volatility estimation methods, we are mainly interested in their ability to correctly rank the portfolios according to their volatility (i.e. their investment risk). As a consequence, we will evaluate the performance of the estimation methods by computing Kendall's τ [1] between the estimated volatilities and the target volatilities for sets of portfolios within each test period \mathbb{T} . Kendall't τ measures the ordinal association between the estimated and target volatilities by comparing their sorting order, and thereby ignoring the actual numeric values. It takes the value 1 if the ordering is exactly the same, and 0 if there is no association between their orderings. We use Kendall's τ -b, which also accounts for ties in the ordering, see e.g. [5]. Since long and long/short portfolios are fundamentally different, we will compare these portfolio sets separately. We will evaluate the rankings of the full set of portfolios (still long and long/short separately), but also various subsets of portfolios. In particular we will perform separate computations for the original and random portfolios to check to what extent the results generalize. The performance across all test periods \mathbb{T} will be summarized by taking the mean of the Kendall's τ 's over all test periods.

7. Results

In this section we summarize the results from the performance study. We compare the direct return and factor model ap-



Figure 3. Estimated volatility compared to target volatility across test periods for a portfolio based on long term momentum. The upper and lower panels shows, respectively, the volatilities corresponding to the q = 1 and q = 6 month estimation windows.

proaches, using both the naive window and GARCH based estimators. This gives us the 4 types of approaches listed in Section 3.2.4, each combined with estimation window lengths q = 1, 3, 6 and 12 months. This gives us a total of 16 different estimation methods. These will be compared across a total of 97 test periods \mathbb{T} of duration 3 months. The first test period \mathbb{T} covers February 2013 to April 2013, the second covers March 2013 to May 2013, and so on, until the 97th test period which covers February 2021 to April 2021. Although we focus on the ordering ability of the different methods, we first provide a figure showing how well the different methods estimate the target volatility for an unrestricted long portfolio weighted based on the long term momentum style factor, see Figure 3. When investigating this plot, it is important to be aware two concepts 1) The x-axis shows the start of the 3 month period, i.e. the 2020 mark indicates the volatility during the period Jan 2020 throughout March 2020. 2) Volatilities are computed over consecutive 3-month periods, meaning that increased volatility in a single month will be spread out on three time periods. From Figure 3 we see see that the estimation schemes has a natural delay in the reaction to changes in the target volatility. For the naive window method, we see as expected that the curve for q = 6 months is less erratic, and holds onto a higher volatility level longer than the curve q = 1 month. While the GARCH and naive window methods are quite similar for this portfolio, the GARCH model reacts faster and does not seem to overcompensate, see in particular the late reaction to reduced volatility for q = 6 in the middle of 2020, and the overcompensation for q = 1 early in 2020.

The factor model and the direct return estimation schemes are also quite similar for this portfolio, perhaps with a mild tendency towards less erratic behavior for the direct return approach, at least for q = 6. Note that the picture may look completely different for other portfolios.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.576
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.570
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.558
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.554
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.539
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.539
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.519
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.492
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.470
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.470
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.464
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.463
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.458
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.456
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.434
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.422

Table 2. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group 'All long'. q denotes the window length in months for the correlation structure (and also the variance structure for the naive window method)

Turning to the ordering ability of the different methods,



Figure 4. Kendall's τ between target and estimated volatility across test periods for all the 498 long portfolios. Only the results for the best performing window lengths are shown for each type of approach.

we first consider the ability to order all the 498 different long portfolios (both original and random portfolios, which are either unrestricted or restricted to certain regions/subregions). Figure 4 shows Kendall's τ across all test periods. Only the best performing window length q (measured by $\operatorname{avg}(\tau)$) is plotted for each of the 4 approaches. We see that except for a few test periods, such as those around the turn of the year 2019/2020, the direct return approach performs better than the factor model. For both estimation schemes, the GARCH volatility model almost always performs better than the naive window approach. Table 2 shows the average of the Kendall's τ across all the test periods \mathbb{T} . It shows that overall, all direct approaches perform better than the factor models.

Similar results are also obtained for the subset of all the 360 long/short portfolios, see Figure 5 and Table 3.

While the factor model is not able to rank these large sets of portfolios as well as the direct return approach, it does perform comparably and sometimes better for other, smaller subsets of portfolios. Figure 6 and Table 4 show corresponding results for 12 style based portfolios restricted to North America. While Table 4 shows the factor model is not as good as the direct approach overall, the performance differences are not big. From Figure 6, we see that at least starting from 2016, the performance of the factor model is generally as good as that of the direct approaches. Further, in the first half of 2018, it is performing significantly better.

In addition to the three portfolio subsets we have looked at above, we have performed analysis for 12 additional portfolio subsets. The tables with average τ values for these are provided in Appendix A. The results for subsets containing only original portfolios and only random portfolios which otherwise are of the same type, are largely similar. This indicates that the results are not very sensitive to the companies included in the original portfolios and their specific weights.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.645
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.645
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.639
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.629
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.624
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.620
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.587
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.573
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.570
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.569
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.569
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.566
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.560
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.556
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.552
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.549

Table 3. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group 'All long/short'. q denotes the window length in months for the correlation structure (and also the variance structure for the naive window method)

8. Conclusion

In this note we have described a set of volatility estimation methods, and studied their ability to rank portfolios according to their future volatility. This included both a direct return approach and using Exabel's factor model, combined with either a GARCH or naive window based volatility modelling approach. In the estimation universe considered here, we have seen that the direct return approach is the overall best method. However, for some portfolios the factor model has similar or even slightly better performance over some time periods.



Figure 5. Kendall's τ between target and estimated volatility across test periods for the all the 360 long/short portfolios. Only the best performing window lengths are plotted for each type of approach.



Figure 6. Kendall's τ between target and estimated volatility across test periods for the 12 original North American style based portfolios. Only the best performing window lengths are plotted for each type of approach.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.761
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.756
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.753
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.751
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.747
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.745
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.745
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.730
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.729
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.728
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.725
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.722
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.718
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.712
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.694
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.684

Table 4. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group 'North America original long'. q denotes the window length in months for the correlation structure (and also the variance structure for the naive window method)

It is also clear from the analysis that a GARCH model is almost always preferable over a naive window based volatility modelling approach. The best performing window length qused for the correlation structure (and also the variance for the naive window based approach), seems to vary quite a bit between portfolio subsets. This is expected as the fluctuations in the volatility might be very different in different portfolio types. For most of the portfolio subsets considered here, window lengths of q = 6 or 12 months are the best performing ones.

References

- M. G. Kendall. A new measure of rank correlation. *Biometrika*, 30(1/2):81–93, 1938.
- [2] Ø. Grotmol, M. Scheuerer, K. Aas, and M. Jullum. Exabel's factor model, 2021.
- T. Bollerslev. Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity. *Journal of econometrics*, 31(3):307–327, 1986.
- [4] N. J. Higham. Computing the nearest correlation matrix—a problem from finance. *IMA journal of Numerical Analysis*, 22(3):329–343, 2002.
- [5] A. Agresti. *Analysis of ordinal categorical data*, volume 656. John Wiley & Sons, 2010.

A. Additional result tables for portfolio subsets

In Tables 5- 15, we provide result with average τ values for 12 additional portfolio subsets. The subsets (with number of portfolios in parenthesis) are: "All original long" (166), "All original long/short" (120), "All random long" (332), "All random long/short" (240), "Unrestricted original long" (51), "Unrestricted original long/short" (11), "Unrestricted random long/short" (22), "North America original long" (12), "North America original long/short" (11), "North America random long" (24), "North America random long/short" (22).

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.587
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.580
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.568
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.561
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.548
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.546
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.532
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.505
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.471
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.471
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.467
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.464
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.461
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.456
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.435
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.423

Table 5. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group 'All originallong'.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.570
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.564
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.552
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.550
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.534
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.534
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.511
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.485
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.468
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.468
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.461
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.461
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.455
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.453
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.432
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.419

Table 7. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group 'All randomlong'.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.667
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.665
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.657
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.649
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.642
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.638
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.615
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.601
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.538
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.535
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.533
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.530
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.524
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.522
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.516
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.512

Table 6. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group 'All originallong/short'.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.591
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.590
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.590
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.575
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.573
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.569
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.524
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.522
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.521
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.518
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.516
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.511
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.509
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.505
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.498
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.494

Table 8. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group 'All randomlong/short'.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.575
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.569
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.558
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.546
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.538
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.530
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.512
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.484
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.447
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.440
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.439
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.437
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.433
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.431
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.414
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.404

Table 9. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group'Unrestricted original long'.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.551
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.547
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.535
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.529
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.517
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.515
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.485
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.461
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.436
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.431
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.430
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.428
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.422
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.422
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.406
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.399

Table 11. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group'Unrestricted random long'.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$\operatorname{avg}(\tau)$
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.692
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.676
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.676
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.671
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.655
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.649
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.636
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.626
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.622
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.616
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.612
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.610
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.594
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.593
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.564
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.551

Factor model	Naive window	1	0.551	
Table 10. Average	Kendall tau for portf	folio grou	p	
'Unrestricted original long/short'.				,

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.592
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.579
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.579
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.575
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.556
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.552
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.543
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.541
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.534
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.530
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.524
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.524
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.492
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.484
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.480
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.475

Table 12. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group'Unrestricted random long/short'.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.761
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.756
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.753
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.751
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.747
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.745
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.745
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.730
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.729
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.728
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.725
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.722
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.718
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.712
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.694
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.684

Table 13. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group 'NorthAmerica original long'.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.707
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.706
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.705
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.704
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.702
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.698
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.696
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.692
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.687
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.686
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.680
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.680
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.667
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.656
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.655
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.644

Table 15. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group 'NorthAmerica random long'.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$\operatorname{avg}(\tau)$
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.732
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.731
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.730
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.728
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.726
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.722
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.697
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.696
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.637
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.633
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.623
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.622
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.609
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.606
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.598
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.590

Table 14. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group 'NorthAmerica original long/short'.

Data/Model	Volatility modelling	q	$avg(\tau)$
Direct return	Naive window	6	0.653
Direct return	GARCH	6	0.645
Direct return	GARCH	12	0.638
Direct return	Naive window	12	0.638
Direct return	GARCH	3	0.628
Direct return	Naive window	3	0.626
Direct return	GARCH	1	0.586
Direct return	Naive window	1	0.570
Factor model	GARCH	6	0.564
Factor model	Naive window	6	0.564
Factor model	GARCH	12	0.552
Factor model	Naive window	12	0.551
Factor model	Naive window	3	0.546
Factor model	GARCH	3	0.545
Factor model	GARCH	1	0.515
Factor model	Naive window	1	0.510

Table 16. Average Kendall tau for portfolio group 'North America random long/short'.