Proceedings of the World Congress on Engineering and Computer Science 2015 Vol II
WCECS 2015, October 21-23, 2015, San Francisco, USA

Measuring Systemic Risk: Vine Copula-GARCH Model

Kuan-Heng Chen and Khaldoun Khashanah

***Abstract*— We analyze each U.S. Equity sector's risk contribution ΔVaR, the difference between the Value-at-Risk of a sector and the Value-at-Risk of the system (S&P 500 Index), by using vine Copula-based ARMA-GARCH (1, 1) modeling. Vine copula modeling not only has the advantage of extending to higher dimensions easily, but also provides a more flexible measure to capture an asymmetric dependence among assets. We investigate systemic risk in 10 S&P 500 sector indices in the U.S. stock market by forecasting one-day ahead Copula VaR and Copula ΔVaR during the 2008 financial subprime crisis. Our evidence reveals vine Copula-based ARMA-GARCH (1, 1) is the appropriate model to forecast and analyze systemic risk.**

***Index Terms*—Copula, Time Series, GARCH, Systemic Risk, VaR**

I. Introduction

The definition of systemic risk from the Report to G20 Finance Ministers and Governors agreed upon among the International Monetary Fund (IMF), Bank for International Settlements (BIS) and Financial Stability Board (FSB) [3] that is *"(i) caused by an impairment of all or parts of the financial system and (ii) has the potential to have serious negative consequences for the real economy"*. Furthermore, *"G-20 members consider an institution, market or instrument as systemic if its failure or malfunction causes widespread distress, either as a direct impact or as a trigger for broader contagion."* A common factor in the various definitions of systemic risk is that a trigger event causes a chain of bad economic consequences, referred to as a *"domino effect"*. Given the definition of systemic risk quoted above, measuring systemic risk is done by estimating the probability of failure of an institute that is the cause of distress for the financial system. Therefore, we only consider the ΔCoVaR methodology proposed by Adrian and Brunnermeier [1], the difference between the VaR that the institution adds to the entire system conditional on the distress of a particular institution and the unconditional VaR of the financial system.

Because CoVaR method does not take the dependence structure of variables into account, not only did Girardi and Ergun [7] modify the CoVaR methodology by using the dynamic conditional correlation GARCH, but Hakwa [8] and Hakwa *et al.* [9] also modified the CoVaR methodology based on bivariate copula modeling. We extend their concepts and present vine Copula-based ARMA-GARCH (1, 1) VaR measure into a high dimensional analysis in systemic risk.

Sklar [21] introduced the copula, which describes the dependence structure between variables. Patton [16] defined the conditional version of Sklar's theorem, which extends the copula applications to the time series analysis. In addition, Joe [11] was the first research to introduce a construction of multivariate distribution based on pair-copula construction (PCC), while Aas *et al.* [13] were the first to recognize that the pair-copula construction (PCC) principal can be used with arbitrary pair-copulas, referred to as the graphical structure of R-vines. Furthermore, Dissmann *et al.* [6] developed an automated algorithm of jointly searching for an appropriate R-vines tree structures, the pair-copula families and their parameters. Accordingly, a high dimensional joint distribution can be decomposed to bivariate and conditional bivariate copulas arranged together according to the graphical structure of a regular vine. Besides, Rockinger and Jondeau [17] was the first to introduce the copula-based GARCH modeling. Afterwards, Huang *et al.* [10] estimated the portfolio's VaR by using the copula-based GARCH model, and Lee and Long [14] concluded that copula-based GARCH models outperform the dynamic conditional correlation model, the varying correlation model and the BEKK model. Moreover, Reboredo and Ugolini [18] measured CoVaR in European sovereign debts based on Gaussian and Student's t copula-based TGARCH model.

In this paper, we present an application of the estimation of systemic risk in terms of the Copula ΔVaR/ΔES by using vine Copula-based ARMA-GARCH (1, 1) model, and it provides the important conclusion that it is a real-time and efficient tool to analyze systemic risk.

This paper has four sections. The first section briefly introduces existing research regarding systemic risk. The second section describes the definition of the Copula ΔVaR/ΔES, and outlines the methodology of vine Copula-based GARCH (1, 1) modeling. The third section describes the data and explains the empirical results of Copula ΔVaR/ΔES. The fourth section concludes our findings.

II. Methodology

A. Risk Methodology

The definition of Value-at-Risk (VaR) is that the maximum loss at most is $(1-\alpha)$ probability over a pre-set horizon [19]. People usually determines α as 95%, 99%, or 99.9% to

Kuan-Heng Chen is the Ph.D. candidate with the Department of Financial Engineering at Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, NJ 07030 USA (phone: 201-744-3166; e-mail: kchen3@stevens.edu).

Khaldoun Khashanah is the director with the Department of Financial Engineering at Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, NJ 07030 USA. (e-mail: kkhashan@stevens.edu).

be their confidence level. Adrian and Brunnermeier [1] defined ΔCoVaR as the difference between the VaR if the institution is added to the system conditional on the distress of a particular institution and the unconditional VaR of the system. In our paper, we modified the concept of CoVaR [1] [8] [9]. We use the Copula-based ARMA-GARCH (1, 1) methodology to obtain the VaR from each sector, named Copula VaR. We denote $\Delta VaR_{1-\alpha}^{i\to j}$, the sector $i's$ risk contribution to the system j (S&P 500 index) at the confidence level α, by

$$Copula\ \Delta VaR_{1-\alpha}^{i\to j} = Copula\ VaR_{1-\alpha}^{i} - Copula\ VaR_{1-\alpha}^{j}$$

The positive $\Delta VaR_{1-\alpha}^{i\to j}$ presents the sector is the risk receiver from the system, while the negative $\Delta VaR_{1-\alpha}^{i\to j}$ interprets the sector is the risk provider to the system. In addition, the methodology can be easily extended from VaR to expected shortfall (ES).

B. *Univariate ARMA-GARCH Model*

Engle is the first researcher to introduce the ARCH model, which deals with the volatility clustering, usually referred to as conditional heteroskedasticity. Bollerslev [4] extended the ARCH model to the generalized ARCH (GARCH) model. We employ ARMA (p, q)-GARCH (1, 1) with the Student's t distributed innovations for the marginal to account for the time-varying volatility, and ARMA (p, q)-GARCH (1, 1) with Student's t distributed innovation can then be written as

$$r_t = \mu_t + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \varphi_i r_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1}^{q} \theta_j \epsilon_{t-j} + \epsilon_t,$$
$$\epsilon_t = \sigma_t z_t,$$
$$\sigma_t^2 = \gamma_t + \alpha_t \sigma_{t-1}^2 + \beta_t \epsilon_{t-1}^2$$

where r_t is the log return, μ_t is the drift term, ϵ_t is the error term, and the innovation term z_t is Student's t distribution with $\nu>2$ degrees of freedom.

In addition, an overwhelming feature of Copula-based ARMA-GARCH model is the ease with which the correlated random variables can be flexible and easily estimated.

C. *Sklar's theory*

Sklar's Theorem [21] states that given random variables $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ with continuous distribution functions $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n$ and joint distribution function H, and there exists a unique copula C such that for all $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in R^n$

$$H(x) = C\big(F_1(x_1), F_2(x_2), \dots, F_n(x_n)\big)$$

If the joint distribution function is n-times differentiable, then taking the n[th] cross-partial derivative of the equation:

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \frac{\partial^n}{\partial x_1 \dots \partial x_n} H(x)$$
$$= \frac{\partial^n}{\partial u_1 \dots \partial u_n} C\big(F_1(x_1), \dots, F_n(x_n)\big) \prod_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x_i)$$
$$= c(F_1(x_1), \dots, F_n(x_n)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x_i)$$

where u_i is the probability integral transform of x_i.

For the purpose of estimating the VaR or ES based on time series data, Patton [16] defined the conditional version of Sklar's theorem. Let $F_{1,t}$ and $F_{2,t}$ be the continuous conditional distriubtions of $X_1|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ and $X_2|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, given the conditioning set $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, and let H_t be the joint conditional bivariate distribution of $(X_1, X_2|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})$. Then, there exists a unique conditional copula C_t such that

$$H_t(x_1, x_2|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = C_t(F_{1,t}(x_1|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}), F_{2,t}(x_2|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})$$

D. *Parametric Copulas*

Joe [12] and Nelsen [15] gave comprehensive copula definitions for each family.

(1) The bivariate Gaussian copula is defined as:

$$C(u_1, u_2; \rho) = \Phi_\rho\big(\Phi^{-1}(u_1), \Phi^{-1}(u_2)\big)$$

where Φ_ρ is the bivariate joint normal distribution with linear correlation coefficient ρ and Φ is the standard normal marginal distribution.

(2) The bivariate student's t copula is defined by the following:

$$C(u_1, u_2; \rho, \nu) = t_{\rho,\nu}\big(t_\nu^{-1}(u_1), t_\nu^{-1}(u_2)\big)$$

where ρ is the linear correlation coefficient and ν is the degree of freedom.

(3) The Clayton generator is given by $\varphi(u) = u^{-\theta} - 1$, its copula is defined by

$$C(u_1, u_2; \theta) = (u_1^{-\theta} + u_2^{-\theta} - 1)^{-\frac{1}{\theta}}, \text{with } \theta \in (0, \infty)$$

(4) The Gumbel generator is given by $\varphi(u) = (-\ln u)^\theta$, and the bivariate Gumbel copula is given by

$$C(u_1, u_2; \theta) = \exp(-[(-\ln u_1)^\theta + \Big(-\ln u_2)^\theta]^{\frac{1}{\theta}}\Big), \text{with } \theta \in [1, \infty)$$

(5) The Frank generator is given by $\varphi(u) = ln(\frac{e^{-\theta u}-1}{e^{-\theta}-1})$, and the bivariate Frank copula is defined by

$$C(u_1, u_2; \theta) = -\frac{1}{\theta} log\left(1 + \frac{\big(e^{-\theta u_1} - 1\big)\big(e^{-\theta u_2} - 1\big)}{e^{-\theta} - 1}\right),$$
$$\text{with } \theta \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \infty)$$

(6) The Joe generator is $\varphi(u) = u^{-\theta} - 1$, and the Joe copula is given by

$$C(u_1, u_2) = 1 - (\overline{u_1}^\theta + \overline{u_2}^\theta - \overline{u_1}^\theta \overline{u_2}^\theta)^{\frac{1}{\theta}},$$
$$\text{with } \theta \in [1, \infty)$$

(7) The BB1 (Clayton-Gumbel) copula is given by

$$C(u_1, u_2; \theta, \delta) = (1 + [(u_1{}^{-\theta} - 1)^\delta + (u_2{}^{-\theta} - 1)^\delta]^{\frac{1}{\delta}})^{\frac{-1}{\theta}},$$
$$\text{with } \theta \in (0, \infty) \cap \delta \in [1, \infty)$$

(8) The BB6 (Joe-Gumbel) copula is

$$C(u_1, u_2; \theta, \delta) = 1 - (1 - \exp\{-[\Big(-lo\,g\big(1 - \overline{u_1}^\theta\big)\Big)^\delta + \big(-log(1 - \overline{u_2}^\theta)\big)^\delta]^{\frac{1}{\delta}}\})^{\frac{1}{\theta}},$$
$$\text{with } \theta \in [1, \infty) \cap \delta \in [1, \infty)$$

(9) The BB7 (Joe-Clayton) copula is given by

$$C(u_1, u_2; \theta, \delta) = 1 - (1 - [(1 - \overline{u_1}^\theta)^{-\delta} + (1 - \overline{u_2}^\theta)^{-\delta} - 1]^{-\frac{1}{\delta}})^{\frac{1}{\theta}},$$
$$\text{with } \theta \in [1, \infty) \cap \delta \in [0, \infty)$$

(10) The BB8 (Frank-Joe) copula is

$$C(u_1, u_2; \theta, \delta) = \frac{1}{\delta}(1 - [1 - \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \delta)^\theta}(1 - \big(1 - \delta u_1\big)^\theta\big)\Big(1 - \big(1 - \delta u_2\big)^\theta\big)]^{\frac{1}{\theta}}\Big),$$
$$\text{with } \theta \in [1, \infty) \cap \delta \in (0, 1]$$

E. *Vine Copulas*

Even though it is simple to generate multivariate Archimedean copulas, they are limited in that there are only one or two parameters to capture the dependence structure.

Vine copula method allows a joint distribution to be built from bivariate and conditional bivariate copulas arranged together according to the graphical structure of a regular vine, which is a more flexible measure to capture the dependence structure among assets. It is well known that any multivariate density function can be decomposed as

$$f(x_1,\dots,x_n)=f(x_1)\cdot f(x_2|x_1)\cdot f(x_3|x_1,x_2)\cdots f(x_n|x_1,\dots,x_{n-1})$$

Moreover, the conditional densities can be written as copula functions. For instance, the first and second conditional density can be decomposed as

$$f(x_2|x_1)=c_{1,2}\big(F_1(x_1),F_2(x_2)\big)\cdot f_2(x_2),$$

$$\begin{aligned}f(x_3|x_1,x_2)&=c_{2,3|1}\left(F_{2|1}(x_2|x_1),F_{3|1}(x_3|x_1)\right)\cdot f_3(x_3|x_1)\\&=c_{2,3|1}\left(F_{2|1}(x_2|x_1),F_{3|1}(x_3|x_1)\right)\\&\quad\cdot c_{1,3}(F_1(x_1),F_3(x_3))\cdot f_3(x_3)\end{aligned}$$

After rearranging the terms, the three dimensional joint density can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}f(x_1,x_2,x_3)=&c_{2,3|1}\left(F_{2|1}(x_2|x_1),F_{3|1}(x_3|x_1)\right)\\&\cdot c_{1,2}(F_1(x_1),F_2(x_2))\\&\cdot c_{1,3}(F_1(x_1),F_3(x_3))\cdot f_1(x_1)\cdot f_2(x_2)\\&\cdot f_3(x_3)\end{aligned}$$

Bedford and Cooke [2] introduced canonical vine copulas, in which one variable plays a pivotal role. The summary of vine copulas is given by Kurowicka and Joe [13]. The general n-dimensional canonical vine copula can be written as

$$c(x_1,\dots,x_n)=\prod_{i=1}^{n-1}\prod_{j=1}^{n-i}c_{i,i+j|1,\dots,i-1}\big(F(x_i|x_1,\dots,x_{i-1}),F\big(x_{i+j}|x_1,\dots,x_{i-1}\big)\big)$$

Similarly, D-vines are also constructed by choosing a specific order for the variables. The general n-dimensional D-vine copula can be written as

$$c(x_1,\dots,x_n)=\prod_{i=1}^{n-1}\prod_{j=1}^{n-i}c_{j,j+i|j+1,\dots,j+i-1}\big(F(x_j|x_{j+1},\dots,x_{j+i-1}),F\big(x_{j+i}|x_{j+1},\dots,x_{j+i-1}\big)\big)$$

Dissmann *et al.* [6] proposed that the automated algorithm involves searching for an appropriate R-vine tree structure, the pair-copula families, and the parameter values of the chosen pair-copula families, which is summarized in Table 1.

TABLE I
SEQUENTIAL METHOD TO SELECT AN R-VINE MODEL HE COEFFICIENTS OF TAIL DEPENDENCY

Algorithm. Sequential method to select an R-Vine model

1. Calculate the empirical Kendall's tau for all possible variable pairs.
2. Select the tree that maximizes the sum of absolute values of Kendall's taus.
3. Select a copula for each pair and fit the corresponding parameters.
4. Transform the observations using the copula and parameters from Step 3. To obtain the transformed values.
5. Use transformed observations to calculate empirical Kendall's taus for all possible pairs.
6. Proceed with Step 2. Repeat until the R-Vine is fully specified.

F. Tail dependence

Tail dependence looks at the concordance and discordance in the tail, or extreme values of u_1 and u_2. It concentrates on the upper and lower quadrant tails of the joint distribution function. Given two random variables $u_1 \sim F_1$ and $u_2 \sim F_2$ with copula C, the coefficients of tail dependency are given by [5] [12] [15]

$$\lambda_L \equiv \lim_{u\to 0+} P[F_1(u_1)<u|F_2(u_2)<u]=\lim_{u\to 0+}\frac{C(u,u)}{u},$$

$$\lambda_U \equiv \lim_{u\to 1-} P[F_1(u_1)>u|F_2(u_2)>u] = \lim_{u\to 1-}\frac{1-2u+C(u,u)}{1-u}$$

where C is said to have lower (upper) tail dependency $iff\ \lambda_L \neq 0\ (\lambda_U \neq 0)$. The interpretation of the tail dependency is that it measures the probability of two random variables both taking extreme values shown as table 2 [5] [12] [15].

TABLE II
THE COEFFICIENTS OF TAIL DEPENDENCY

Family	Lower tail dependence	Upper tail dependence
Gaussian	*	*
Student's t	$2t_{\nu+1}(-\sqrt{\nu+1}\sqrt{\frac{1-\theta}{1+\theta}})$	$2t_{\nu+1}(-\sqrt{\nu+1}\sqrt{\frac{1-\theta}{1+\theta}})$
Clayton	$2^{-\frac{1}{\theta}}$	*
Gumbel	*	$2-2^{\frac{1}{\theta}}$
Frank	*	*
Joe	*	$2-2^{\frac{1}{\theta}}$
BB1 (Clayton-Gumbel)	$2^{-\frac{1}{\theta\delta}}$	$2-2^{\frac{1}{\delta}}$
BB6 (Joe-Gumbel)	*	$2-2^{\frac{1}{\theta\delta}}$
BB7 (Joe-Clayton)	$2^{-\frac{1}{\delta}}$	$2-2^{\frac{1}{\theta}}$
BB8 (Frank-Joe)	*	$2-2^{\frac{1}{\theta}}\ if\ \delta = 1,\ otherwise\ 0$

Note: * represents that there is no tail dependency.

G. Estimation method

Generally, the two-step separation procedure is called the inference functions for the margin method (IFM) [12]. It implies that the joint log-likelihood is simply the sum of univariate log-likelihoods and the copula log-likelihood shown is as below.

$$\log f(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} log f_i(x_i)+log c(F_1(x_1),\dots,F_n(x_n))$$

Therefore, it is convenient to use this two-step procedure to estimate the parameters by maximum log-likelihood, where marginal distributions and copulas are estimated separately.

III. DATA AND EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

A. Data Representation

We use indices prices instead of other financial instruments or financial accounting numbers. One of the main reasons is that an index price could reflect a timely financial environment in contrast to financial accounting numbers that are published quarterly. Furthermore, indices can easily be constructed and tell us which sector contributes more risk to the entire market. Standard and Poor separates the 500 members in the S&P 500 index into 10 different sector indices based on the Global Industrial Classification Standard (GICS). All data is acquired from Bloomberg, sampled at daily frequency from January 1, 1995 to June 5, 2009. We separate sample into two parts, the in-sample estimation period is from January 1, 1995 to December 31, 2007 (3721 observations) and the out-of-sample forecast validation period is from January 1, 2008 to June 5, 2009 (360 observations). The summary statistics of these indices is listed in table 3 as well as the statistical hypothesis testing. The results of Jarque-Bera (J-B) test reject the distributions of returns are normality, and the results of LM test show that indices' returns present conditional heteroscedasticity. In addition, we assign the identify numbers to each sector.

TABLE III
THE SUMMARY STATISTICS OF THE IN-SAMPLE AND STATISTICAL HYPOTHESIS TESTINGS

ID	Sector	Mean	Sigma	Skew	Kurt	J-B test	LM test	min / Max
1	S5FINL Index Financials	0.041 %	1.41%	0.0725	6.0779	1	1	-8.04%/8.39%
2	S5INFT Index Technology	0.044 %	1.99%	0.1825	6.7752	1	1	-10.01%/16.08%
3	S5COND Index Consumer Discretionary	0.030 %	1.24%	-0.1470	8.2310	1	1	-10.33%/8.47%
4	S5ENRS Index Energy	0.055 %	1.39%	-0.0889	4.648	1	1	-7.21%/7.94%
5	S5HLTH Index Health Care	0.043 %	1.21%	-0.1798	7.0971	1	1	-9.17%/7.66%
6	S5INDU Index Industrials	0.039 %	1.18%	-0.2272	7.4103	1	1	-9.60%/7.21%
7	S5UTIL Index Utilities	0.023 %	1.12%	-0.4085	9.6084	1	1	-9.00%/8.48%
8	S5CONS Index Consumer Staples	0.033 %	0.97%	-0.2326	9.9050	1	1	-9.30%/7.59%
9	S5MATR Index Materials	0.029 %	1.31%	0.0356	5.9286	1	1	-9.12%/6.98%
10	S5TELS Index Telecommunica tion Services	0.016 %	1.44%	-0.1004	6.6741	1	1	-10.32%/8.03%
11	S&P 500 Index	0.036 %	1.07%	-0.1355	6.4383	1	1	-7.11%/5.57%

B. Results for the marginal models

We estimate the parameters of p and q by minimizing Akaike information criterion (AIC) values for possible values ranging from zero to five. Table 4 lists the parameters which are estimated by minimum AIC values, and the statistical hypothesis testing for the unit-root based on Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test. Meanwhile, the statistical hypothesis testings for residuals are based on the Jarque-Bera (J-B) test and the LM test. The result shows that the values of 1 in ADF test rejects the null hypothesis of a unit root in a univariate time series. The result shows that using the Student's t innovation distribution for the error term is appropriately fitted to the return data because the degree of freedom is usually smaller than 15 and the result of Jarque-Bera test rejects the null hypothesis of normality. Although the parameter β is usually larger than 0.9, which indicates the conditional volatility is time-dependent, using GARCH (1, 1) model is appropriate because the result of the LM test shows no conditional heteroscedasticity in residuals.

TABLE IV
THE ESTIMATION OF THE IN-SAMPLE PARAMETERS AND STATISTICAL HYPOTHESIS TESTINGS FOR EACH MARGINAL

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**
p	2	1	2	2	5	5	2	5	4	4	5
q	2	2	1	1	3	5	1	4	4	5	4
φ_1	1.466	0.716	0.776	0.727	-1.187	0.505	-0.809	0.030	-0.346	-0.216	-0.079
φ_2	-0.631	*	-0.064	-0.043	0.296	1.017	0.010	1.135	-0.745	0.860	1.262
φ_3	*	*	*	*	0.437	-0.988	*	-0.166	0.085	-0.365	0.002
φ_4	*	*	*	*	-0.073	-0.503	*	-0.607	0.245	-0.810	-0.697
φ_5	*	*	*	*	-0.003	0.596	*	-0.056	*	*	-0.024
θ_1	-1.458	-0.712	-0.748	-0.747	1.208	-0.496	0.830	-0.064	0.386	0.190	0.055
θ_2	0.599	-0.029	*	*	-0.329	-1.059	*	-1.156	0.733	-0.872	-1.309
θ_3	*	*	*	*	-0.564	1.000	*	0.192	-0.056	0.387	-0.002
θ_4	*	*	*	*	*	0.523	*	0.625	-0.282	0.805	0.725
θ_5	*	*	*	*	*	-0.648	*	*	*	-0.057	*
μ	0.0001	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0009	0.0003	0.0011	0.0003	0.0010	0.0007	0.0004
γ	9.5e-07	7.9e-07	1.2e-06	1.3e-06	8.4e-07	1.1e-06	1.3e-06	5.8e-07	1.4e-06	8.0e-07	5.9e-07
α	0.9236	0.9434	0.9199	0.9370	0.9350	0.9229	0.8980	0.9362	0.9248	0.9496	0.9288
β	0.0746	0.0561	0.0740	0.0582	0.0609	0.0701	0.0931	0.0585	0.0696	0.0472	0.0692
ν	8.3281	12.799	8.8798	13.95	7.3847	9.0569	8.9202	7.6327	8.9985	8.1542	7.4981
LLH	9862	8777	10240	9589	10265	10362	10645	11018	9899	9725	10675
AIC	-19708	-17540	-20467	-19165	-20515	-20707	-21276	-22011	-19770	-19425	-21325
ADF test	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
J-B test	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
LM test	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

C. Results for the copula models

After the estimation of each marginal, we consider the set of standardized residuals from the ARMA-GARCH (1, 1) model and transform them to the set of uniform variables. Table 5 provides the correlation matrix of the transformed residuals and the result of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test. The result of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is 0, and it fails to reject the null hypothesis that the distribution of transformed residuals is different from the uniform distribution at the 5% significance level.

TABLE V
THE PEARSON CORRELATION MATRIX AND KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOV (KS) TEST FROM THE IN-SAMPLE DATA

ID / Correlation	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**
1	1	0.5571	0.7549	0.4038	0.5928	0.7836	0.4678	0.5911	0.6099	0.5626	0.8564
2	0.5571	1	0.6483	0.2574	0.3833	0.6529	0.2455	0.2849	0.4191	0.5132	0.8089
3	0.7549	0.6483	1	0.3974	0.5692	0.8167	0.3997	0.5564	0.6474	0.5786	0.8699
4	0.4038	0.2574	0.3974	1	0.3945	0.4631	0.4699	0.3987	0.5007	0.3306	0.5255
5	0.5928	0.3833	0.5692	0.3945	1	0.6056	0.4011	0.6595	0.4448	0.437	0.6954
6	0.7836	0.6529	0.8167	0.4631	0.6056	1	0.4579	0.6008	0.7216	0.5716	0.8934
7	0.4678	0.2455	0.3997	0.4699	0.4011	0.4579	1	0.433	0.4022	0.3785	0.5048
8	0.5911	0.2849	0.5564	0.3987	0.6595	0.6008	0.433	1	0.5085	0.4254	0.6388
9	0.6099	0.4191	0.6474	0.5007	0.4448	0.7216	0.4022	0.5085	1	0.422	0.6771
10	0.5626	0.5132	0.5786	0.3306	0.437	0.5716	0.3785	0.4254	0.422	1	0.6902
11	0.8564	0.8089	0.8699	0.5255	0.6954	0.8934	0.5048	0.6388	0.6771	0.6902	1
KS test	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Due to our benchmark using the Student's t copula, the parameters are the correlation matrix shown in table 5 and the degree of freedom 8.0748. Table 6 shows that using vine copula-based model has a better performance than using the Student's t copula-based model based on AIC values, and the evidence supports that vine copula-based model is an appropriate method to apply to high-dimensional modeling.

TABLE VI
THE ESTIMATION FOR THE COPULA MODELS FROM THE IN-SAMPLE DATA

	Number of parameters	Log-likelihood	AIC
t copula	56	17102	-34092
Vine copula	99	17211.33	-34225

The catalogue of pair-copula families includes elliptical copulas such as Gaussian and Student's t, single parameter Archimedean copulas such as Clayton, Frank, and Gumbel, as well as two parameter families such as BB1, BB6, BB7, and BB8. All various copulas we implement are in the

ISBN: 978-988-14047-2-5
ISSN: 2078-0958 (Print); ISSN: 2078-0966 (Online)

VineCopula library in R [20].

D. Results for the Copula VaR/ES and Copula ΔVaR/ΔES

We empirically examine which sector dominates more risk contributions on systemic risk with 10000 Monte Carlo simulations in each time interval using vine Copula-based ARMA-GARCH (1, 1) modeling. The results of Copula VaR are not surprising and are shown in figure 1. As seen in figure 2 and figure 3 below, we realize that the financial sector caused more risk distribution during the subprime crisis from 2008 to 2009, while the consumer staples sector is the major risk receiver. The results present that this measure is a simplified and efficient methodology to analyze systemic risk.



Fig. 1. The one-day ahead Copula VaR for each sector index



Fig. 2. The one-day ahead Copula ΔVaR



Fig. 3. The one-day ahead Copula ΔES

IV. Conclusion

The evidence in our paper shows that not only that vine Copula-based ARMA-GARCH (1, 1) has a better performance than the Student's *t* copula-based ARMA-GARCH (1, 1) based on AIC values, but also that vine Copula-based ARMA-GARCH (1, 1) is a useful and efficient way to estimate systemic risk by using sector indices. In addition, using vine Copula-based ARMA-GARCH (1, 1) model to forecast one-day ahead Copula VaR and Copula ΔVaR, we develop a real-time and flexible resolution without lagging financial accounting data. Moreover, the ΔVaR/ΔES provides the information of the risk contribution from each sectors. This approach is very general and can be tailored to any underlying country and financial market easily. In further research, we would like to investigate copula-based modeling in systemic risk in different financial market.

References

[1] Adrian, Tobias, and Markus K. Brunnermeier. *CoVaR*. No. w17454. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2011.

[2] Bedford, Tim, and Roger M. Cooke. "Vines: A new graphical model for dependent random variables." *Annals of Statistics* (2002): 1031-1068.

[3] Board, Financial Stability. "International Monetary Fund and Bank for International Settlements (2009)." *Guidance to Assess the Systemic Importance of Financial Institutions, Markets and Instruments: Initial Considerations.(Background Paper. Report to the G-20 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors (October))*.

[4] Bollerslev, Tim. "Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity."*Journal of econometrics* 31, no. 3 (1986): 307-327.

[5] Cherubini, Umberto, Elisa Luciano, and Walter Vecchiato. *Copula methods in finance*. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.

[6] Dissmann, Jeffrey, Eike Christian Brechmann, Claudia Czado, and Dorota Kurowicka. "Selecting and estimating regular vine copulae and application to financial returns." *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 59 (2013): 52-69.

[7] Girardi, Giulio, and A. Tolga Ergün. "Systemic risk measurement: Multivariate GARCH estimation of CoVaR." *Journal of Banking & Finance* 37, no. 8 (2013): 3169-3180.

[8] Hakwa, Brice. "Measuring the marginal systemic risk contribution using copula." *Available at SSRN 1934894* (2011).

ISBN: 978-988-14047-2-5
ISSN: 2078-0958 (Print); ISSN: 2078-0966 (Online)

[9] Hakwa, Brice, Manfred Jäger-Ambrożewicz, and Barbara Rüdiger. "Measuring and Analysing Marginal Systemic Risk Contribution using CoVaR: A Copula Approach." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1210.4713* (2012).

[10] Huang, Jen-Jsung, Kuo-Jung Lee, Hueimei Liang, and Wei-Fu Lin. "Estimating value at risk of portfolio by conditional copula-GARCH method." *Insurance: Mathematics and economics* 45, no. 3 (2009): 315-324.

[11] Joe, Harry. "Families of m-variate distributions with given margins and m (m-1)/2 bivariate dependence parameters." *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*(1996): 120-141.

[12] Joe, Harry. *Multivariate models and multivariate dependence concepts*. CRC Press, 1997.

[13] Kurowicka, D., and H. Joe. "Dependence Modeling-Handbook on Vine Copulae." (2011).

[14] Lee, Tae-Hwy, and Xiangdong Long. "Copula-based multivariate GARCH model with uncorrelated dependent errors." *Journal of Econometrics* 150, no. 2 (2009): 207-218.

[15] Nelsen, Roger B. *An introduction to copulas*. Vol. 139. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.

[16] Patton, Andrew John. "Applications of copula theory in financial econometrics." PhD diss., University of California, San Diego, 2002.

[17] Rockinger, Michael, and Eric Jondeau. "Conditional dependency of financial series: an application of copulas." (2001).

[18] Reboredo, Juan C., and Andrea Ugolini. "A vine-copula conditional value-at-risk approach to systemic sovereign debt risk for the financial sector." *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance* 32 (2015): 98-123.

[19] *Riskmetrics: technical document*. Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York, 1996.

[20] Schepsmeier, Ulf, Jakob Stoeber, Eike Christian Brechmann, and Benedikt Graeler. "VineCopula: statistical inference of vine copulas, 2012." *URL http://CRAN. R-project. org/package= VineCopula. R package version*: 1-1.

[21] Sklar, M. *Fonctions de répartition à n dimensions et leurs marges*. Université Paris 8, 1959.

ISBN: 978-988-14047-2-5
ISSN: 2078-0958 (Print); ISSN: 2078-0966 (Online)