

# Test Plan

This section describes the core tests that will validate each VaR/ES module. Tests can be automated with `pytest` or run interactively.

---

## 1. Flat-Price Unit Test

### Purpose:

Verify that when prices never change, VaR and ES outputs are zero for all modules (except ES for the EWM module, which is not implemented).

### Data Setup:

- A `pandas.Series` of constant values (e.g. 100.0) over at least one window's length ( $\geq 1,260$  trading days).

### Test Steps:

1. Call `compute_var` and `compute_es` on the flat series for:
  - `parametric5yr` (both VaR & ES)
  - `historical` (both VaR & ES)
  - `montecarlo` (both VaR & ES)
2. Call `compute_var` (only) on the EWM module.
3. Assert that all returned VaR and ES series are identically zero.

### Pass Criteria:

- VaR and ES series for `parametric5yr`, `historical`, `montecarlo` are zero.
  - EWM VaR series is zero.
- 

## 2. Parametric Closed-Form Consistency

### Purpose:

Check that `parametric5yr`'s VaR and ES match the analytical GBM formulas when  $\sigma=0$  (deterministic drift).

### Data Setup:

- Simulate a deterministic GBM path of length  $\geq 6 \times 252$  days with known drift  $\mu$  and  $\sigma=0$ , so that log-returns =  $(\mu - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)/252$  each day.

### Test Steps:

1. Compute the theoretical 5-day VaR and ES in closed form, using the same daily-drift scaling your code uses.
2. Call `parametric5yr.compute_var(prices, var_level)` and `compute_es(prices, es_level)`.
3. Compare the last value of each series to the theoretical value.

**Pass Criteria:**

Exact match (within floating-point tolerance) between code output and theory.

---

### 3. Backtest Exception Frequency

**Purpose:**

Validate the nominal exception rate for `parametric5yr` VaR on a stochastic GBM path.

**Data Setup:**

- Simulate 10 years ( $\approx 2,520$  trading days) of GBM daily prices with moderate volatility.

**Test Steps:**

1. Compute the 5-day VaR series at 99% with `parametric5yr.compute_var`.
2. Compute realized 5-day P&L:

```
pnl5 = prices.shift(-5) - prices
```

3. Count exceptions where `pnl5 < -VaR`.
4. Compute frequency = exceptions / number\_of\_tests.

**Pass Criteria:** Exception frequency within  $\pm 0.005$  of 0.01.

---

### 4. Monte Carlo vs. Parametric Deterministic Agreement

**Purpose:** On a deterministic GBM ( $\sigma=0$ ), ensure `montecarlo.compute_var` matches `parametric5yr.compute_var` exactly.

**Data Setup:**

- Use the same deterministic GBM path from Test 2 ( $\sigma=0$ , length  $\geq 6 \times 252$ ).

**Test Steps:**

1. Compute `v_param = parametric5yr.compute_var(prices, var_level)`.
2. Compute `v_mc = montecarlo.compute_var(prices, var_level, window_days=5*252, n_sims=1_000)`.
3. Assert the two series are identical.

**Pass Criteria:** `pd.testing.assert_series_equal(v_param, v_mc)` passes without error.

### 5. Portfolio Consistency Visualization Test

**Purpose:**

Ensure that for the actual multi-stock portfolio, the VaR and ES time-series from all four methods evolve similarly, with no method showing a drastic divergence.

**Data Setup:**

1. Load the provided CSV (`software/data/portfolio.csv`) with dates as index and stock price columns.
2. Compute the portfolio series, e.g.:

```
portfolio = df.sum(axis=1)
```

### Test Steps:

1. Compute the full VaR and ES series at the chosen levels (e.g. 99% VaR, 97.5% ES) for each method:
  - `parametric5yr`
  - `parametric_ewm`
  - `historical`
  - `montecarlo`
2. Plot **one** overlaid time-series graph of VaR and **one** of ES, with all four methods labeled.

```
plt.figure()
for series, label in [(var1, 'Parametric5yr'), ...]:
    plt.plot(series.index, series.values, label=label)
plt.legend(); plt.title('5-day VaR @ 99%');
plt.savefig('test_var_plot.png')
```

and similarly for ES.

3. Visually inspect (or programmatically check) that no curve deviates sharply from the others—e.g., the pointwise ratios between any two methods remain within a moderate band (e.g.  $\pm 20\%$ ) over time.

### Pass Criteria:

- Two plot files (`test_var_plot.png`, `test_es_plot.png`) are generated.
- All four method curves remain roughly aligned (no method shows a sustained, drastic deviation beyond  $\pm 20\%$  of the group median at any date).