

# **Introduction to Multi-step Forecast of Multivariate Volatility with Dynamic Factor Model**

**i4cast LLC**

February 2025

## **Table of Content**

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Model Estimation
- 3. Volatility Forecasts
- 4. Simple Forecasts as Benchmarks
- 5. Evaluation of Volatility Forecast
- 6. Dynamic Volatility Attribution
- 7. Examples
- 8. Discussion
- 9. Further Development
- Appendix A. LMDFM Algorithm
- Appendix B. YWpcAR Algorithm
- Reference

## **1. Introduction**

Making volatility forecasts using Dynamic Factor Models (DFMs) comes up with several sought-after advantages over other volatility modeling methods. Especially, a DFM volatility

model

- can make multi-step forecasts of multivariate volatilities (i.e. forecasted uncertainty levels) of a large number time-series (e.g. risk levels of numerous investable assets in many markets),
- can quantify components of forecasted volatilities attributable to variances, and vector autocovariances, of dynamic common factors (e.g. portions of volatilities caused by common economic or market conditions; and volatility jumps in panic, and drops in euphoria, markets),
- can quantify volatility components attributable to idiosyncratic variance, and serial correlations, of individual time-series (e.g. risk components due to specific trajectories of individual equity shares),
- can make multi-step forecasts of multivariate values (i.e. forecasted conditional expectations themselves, instead of uncertainties) of the time-series, with the same dynamic factor model (e.g., economic or market forecasts made by government agencies or research institutions).

In short, a volatility model based on DFM (dynamic factor model) can offer all the estimates and forecasts listed above simultaneously under the same integrated and dimension-reduced multivariate analysis framework.

Multivariate GARCH models and static factor risk models are among popular classes of volatility models, with each class making some of the above estimates or forecasts. Meanwhile, it has been traditionally difficult to estimate large scale DFMs.

The advent of new machine learning algorithms able to solve for large scale DFMs (such as many long-memory dynamic factors on large number of time-series), DFM-based volatility

models can now become a powerful tool at your disposal to attack real-world problems in real-time.

Academic literature on dynamic factor models (DFMs) is voluminous. Doz and Fuleky (2020) is among the latest best overviews on the history of DFM research and development. Alessi, Barigozzi and Capasso (2007) discusses benefits and performances of volatility forecasts by DFM vs. multivariate GARCH.

Following is a brief introduction to DFM-based “Dynamic Factor Variance-Covariance Model” (DFVCM, [https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-yvaulquatt3v2?sr=0-3&ref\\_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa](https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-yvaulquatt3v2?sr=0-3&ref_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa)) for making multi-step forecasts in multivariate volatilities.

## **2. Model Estimation**

We denote observed multivariate time-series as vector time-series  $y_t$ , which is time-series of  $n \times 1$  vector, representing  $n$  individual time-series.

To make multi-step forecasts of multivariate volatilities of the vector time-series  $y_t$ , we first estimate all coefficients and attributes of a dynamic factor model representation of  $y_t$  expressed as follows:

$$y_t = \mu_t + X_{t,0} f_t + u_t, \quad (2.1)$$

$$f_t = A_{t,1} f_{t-1} + A_{t,2} f_{t-2} + \cdots + A_{t,p} f_{t-p} + v_t, \quad (2.2)$$

$$u_t = g_t + r_t, \quad (2.3)$$

$$g_t = D_{t,1} g_{t-1} + D_{t,2} g_{t-2} + \cdots + D_{t,q} g_{t-q} + e_t, \quad (2.4)$$

where (random and non-random) variables

- $y_t$  is time-series of  $n \times 1$  vector of observed data,

- $\mu_t$  is time-series of  $n \times 1$  vector of mean values of  $y_t$ ,
- $f_t$  is time-series of  $m \times 1$  vector of common dynamic factor scores,
- $X_{t,0}$  is  $n \times m$  matrix of factor loadings of dynamic factors  $f_t$ ,
- $A_{t,j}$  are  $m \times m$  matrixes of VAR (vector autoregressive) coefficients of factors  $f_t$ , here  $n > or \gg m$ ,
- $v_t$  is time-series of  $m \times 1$  vector of VAR prediction errors of factors  $f_t$ ,
- $u_t$  is time-series of  $n \times 1$  vector of idiosyncratic components of individual observed time-series,
- $g_t$  is time-series of  $n \times 1$  vector of unobserved dynamic components (UDCs) of idiosyncratic components  $u_t$ ,
- $D_{t,k}$  are  $n \times n$  diagonal matrixes of AR (autoregressive) coefficients of UDCs  $g_t$ ,
- $e_t$  is time-series of  $n \times 1$  vector of AR prediction errors of UDCs  $g_t$ , and
- $r_t$  is time-series of  $n \times 1$  vector of residual random errors.

For  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  and  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , variances and autocovariances of common dynamic factors and idiosyncratic UDCs are estimated as:

$$V_{(t-j),0} = Var(f_{t-j}) = E(f_{t-j} f_{t-j}^T), \quad (2.5)$$

$$V_{(t-j),k} = Cov(f_{t-j}, f_{t-j-k}) = E(f_{t-j} f_{t-j-k}^T), \quad (2.6)$$

$$W_{(t-j),0} = Var(g_{t-j}) = E(g_{t-j} g_{t-j}^T), \quad (2.7)$$

$$W_{(t-j),k} = Cov(g_{t-j}, g_{t-j-k}) = E(g_{t-j} g_{t-j-k}^T), \quad (2.8)$$

where estimated matrixes

- $V_{(t-j),0}$  are  $m \times m$  diagonal matrixes of variance of dynamic factors  $f_t$ ,

- $V_{(t-j),k}$  are  $m \times m$  matrixes of  $k$ -lag autocovariance of factors  $f_t$ ,
- $W_{(t-j),0}$  are  $n \times n$  diagonal matrixes of variance of UDCs  $g_t$ , and
- $W_{(t-j),k}$  are  $n \times n$  diagonal matrixes of  $k$ -lag autocovariance of UDCs  $g_t$ .

Variances of random errors are estimated as:

$$R_t^{(v)} = \text{Var}(v_t), \quad (2.9)$$

$$R_t^{(e)} = \text{Var}(e_t), \quad (2.10)$$

$$R_t^{(r)} = \text{Var}(r_t), \quad (2.11)$$

where estimated matrixes

- $R_t^{(v)}$  is time-series of  $m \times m$  diagonal matrix of variances of VAR prediction errors  $v_t$ ,
- $R_t^{(e)}$  is time-series of  $n \times n$  diagonal matrix of variances of AR prediction errors  $e_t$ , and
- $R_t^{(r)}$  is time-series of  $n \times n$  diagonal matrix of variances of residual errors  $r_t$ .

The DFM estimations summarized above can be performed jointly by two models: (1)

LMDFM (long-memory dynamic factor model,

[https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-da6ffrp4mlogp?sr=0-](https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-da6ffrp4mlogp?sr=0-1&ref_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa)

[1&ref\\_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa](https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-da6ffrp4mlogp?sr=0-1&ref_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa)) estimated by an implementation of dynamic

principal components analysis (DPCA) with 2-dimensional discrete Fourier transforms (2D-

DFTs) (detailed in Appendix A) for estimates of common components, including  $X_{t,0}$ ,  $f_t$ ,  $A_{t,j}$ ,

$R_t^{(v)}$ ,  $V_{(t-j),0}$ ,  $V_{(t-j),k}$  and  $u_t$ ; and (2) YWpcAR (Yule-Walker-PCA autoregression,

[https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-prndys7tr7go6?sr=0-](https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-prndys7tr7go6?sr=0-4&ref_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa)

[4&ref\\_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa](https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-prndys7tr7go6?sr=0-4&ref_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa)) estimated by an implementation of principal

components analysis (PCA) on Yule-Walker (YW) equation (detailed in Appendix B) for estimates of idiosyncratic components, including  $g_t$ ,  $D_{t,k}$ ,  $R_t^{(e)}$ ,  $W_{(t-j),0}$ ,  $W_{(t-j),k}$  and  $R_t^{(r)}$ .

In estimation of all of the above coefficients and attributes, we applied following assumptions widely proposed, accepted and practiced in dynamic factor model research literature:

- mean value (of observed vector time-series)  $\mu_t = 0$ ,
- covariance matrix (of dynamic factor scores)  $V_{(t-j),0}$  is diagonal matrix,
- covariance matrix (of idiosyncratic components)  $W_{(t-j),0}$  is approximated by diagonal matrix, ignoring allowed but “mild” cross-correlation,
- assuming all cross- and serial-correlations between common factors  $f_t$  and idiosyncratic UDCs  $g_t$  are 0's.

In order to make multi-step forecast of multivariate volatility in the next section, we need past autocovariance matrix of dynamic factor scores  $f_t$ , and diagonal matrix of past autocovariance of UDC  $g_t$ , with two separate time lags,  $j$  and  $k$ . When  $0 \leq j \leq k$ , the past autocovariance matrix of  $f_t$ ,

$$E(f_{t-j} f_{t-k}^T) = V_{[t-\text{Min}(j,k)], \text{Abs}(j-k)}, \quad (2.12)$$

When  $j \geq k \geq 0$ , the past autocovariance of  $f_t$ ,

$$E(f_{t-j} f_{t-k}^T) = E(f_{t-k} f_{t-j}^T)^T = V_{[t-\text{Min}(j,k)], \text{Abs}(j-k)}^T. \quad (2.13)$$

The diagonal matrix of past autocovariance of  $g_t$ ,

$$E(g_{t-j} g_{t-k}^T) = W_{[t-\text{Min}(j,k)], \text{Abs}(j-k)}. \quad (2.14)$$

### **3. Volatility Forecasts**

According to the factor model representation discussed in the Section 2 above,  $s$ -step

forecasts of time-series,  $f_t$ ,  $g_t$  and  $y_t$ , based on data observed until time  $t$  can be made by dynamic equations as

$$f_{(t+s)|t} = A_{t,1} f_{t+s-1} + A_{t,2} f_{t+s-2} + \cdots + A_{t,p} f_{t+s-p} + v_{t+s} \quad (3.1)$$

$$g_{(t+s)|t} = D_{t,1} g_{t+s-1} + D_{t,2} g_{t+s-2} + \cdots + D_{t,q} g_{t+s-q} + e_{t+s} \quad (3.2)$$

$$y_{(t+s)|t} = X_{t,0} f_{(t+s)|t} + g_{(t+s)|t} + r_{t+s} \quad (3.3)$$

where  $s = 1, 2, \dots$ . The random errors  $v_{t+s}$ ,  $e_{t+s}$  and  $r_{t+s}$  cannot be forecasted, but can be characterized by assumed diagonal variance matrixes as

$$R_{t+s}^{(v)} = R_t^{(v)} \quad (3.4)$$

$$R_{t+s}^{(e)} = R_t^{(e)} \quad (3.5)$$

$$R_{t+s}^{(r)} = R_t^{(r)} \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore,  $s$ -step forecast of diagonal variance-covariance matrix of dynamic factor scores  $f_t$  is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{[(t+s)|t],0} &= \text{Var}(f_{(t+s)|t}) = E(f_{(t+s)|t} f_{(t+s)|t}^T) \\ &= \text{Diag}(E((\sum_{j=1}^p A_{t,j} f_{t+s-j})(\sum_{k=1}^p A_{t,k} f_{t+s-k})^T)) + R_t^{(v)} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p \text{Diag}(A_{t,j} E(f_{t+s-j} f_{t+s-k}^T) A_{t,k}^T) + R_t^{(v)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where  $s = 1, 2, \dots$ , and variance and autocovariance of factors,  $E(f_{t+s-j} f_{t+s-k}^T)$ , are evaluated by estimates Eqs. (2.5) and (2.6), or by “earlier-step” forecasts Eqs. (3.7) and (3.8). Then,  $s$ -Step forecast of  $k$ -lag autocovariance matrix of dynamic factor scores  $f_t$  is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{[(t+s)|t],k} &= \text{Cov}(f_{(t+s)|t}, f_{t+s-k}) = E(f_{(t+s)|t} f_{t+s-k}^T) \\ &= E(\sum_{j=1}^p A_{t,j} f_{t+s-j} f_{t+s-k}^T) = \sum_{j=1}^p A_{t,j} E(f_{t+s-j} f_{t+s-k}^T) \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where  $s = 1, 2, \dots$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , and, again, variance and autocovariance,  $E(f_{t+s-j} f_{t+s-k}^T)$ , are evaluated by estimates Eqs. (2.5) and (2.6), or by earlier forecasts Eqs. (3.7) and (3.8). The

evaluation of Eqs. (3.7) and (3.8) can be simplified by the separate time lag autocovariance Eqs. (2.12) and (2.13).

Similarly,  $s$ -Step forecast of variance of unobserved dynamic components (UDCs)  $g_t$  is

$$\begin{aligned} W_{[(t+s)|t],0} &= \text{Var}(g_{(t+s)|t}) = E(g_{(t+s)|t} g_{(t+s)|t}^T) \\ &= \text{Diag}(E((\sum_{j=1}^q D_{t,j} g_{t+s-j})(\sum_{k=1}^q D_{t,k} g_{t+s-k})^T)) + R_t^{(e)} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^q \text{Diag}(D_{t,j} E(g_{t+s-j} g_{t+s-k}^T) D_{t,k}) + R_t^{(e)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

where  $s = 1, 2, \dots$ , and variance and autocovariance of UDCs,  $E(g_{t+s-j} g_{t+s-k}^T)$ , are evaluated by estimates Eqs. (2.7) and (2.8), or by “earlier-step” forecasts Eqs. (3.9) and (3.10).

Then,  $s$ -step forecast of  $k$ -lag autocovariance of UDC  $g_t$  is

$$\begin{aligned} W_{[(t+s)|t],k} &= \text{Cov}(g_{(t+s)|t}, g_{t+s-k}) = E(g_{(t+s)|t} g_{t+s-k}^T) \\ &= \text{Diag}(E(\sum_{j=1}^q D_{t,j} g_{t+s-j} g_{t+s-k}^T)) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^q \text{Diag}(D_{t,j} E(g_{t+s-j} g_{t+s-k}^T)) \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where  $s = 1, 2, \dots$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , and, again, variance and autocovariance,  $E(g_{t+s-j} g_{t+s-k}^T)$ , are evaluated by estimates Eqs. (2.7) and (2.8), or by earlier forecasts Eqs. (3.9) and (3.10). The evaluation of Eqs. (3.9) and (3.10) can be simplified by the separate time lag autocovariance Eq. (2.14).

Having

- estimated factor loadings matrix  $X_{t,0}$  in Eq. (2.1),
- forecasted diagonal variance matrix  $V_{[(t+s)|t],0}$  of dynamic factor scores  $f_t$  by Eq. (3.7),
- forecasted diagonal variance matrix  $W_{[(t+s)|t],0}$  of unobserved dynamic components (UDCs)  $g_t$  by Eq. (3.9), and
- “forecasted” diagonal variance matrix of residual errors  $r_t$  by Eq. (3.6),



$s$ -step forecast of variance-covariance matrix of the observed vector time-series  $y_t$  is

$$\begin{aligned} C_{(t+s)|t} &= \text{Var}(y_{(t+s)|t}) = E(y_{(t+s)|t} y_{(t+s)|t}^T) \\ &= X_{t,0} V_{[(t+s)|t],0} X_{t,0}^T + W_{[(t+s)|t],0} + R_t^{(r)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Where forecast step  $s = 1, 2, \dots$ .

#### **4. Simple Forecasts as Benchmarks**

There are two classes of simple forecasts widely practiced for multivariate variance-covariance matrix of observed vector time-series  $y_t$ .

The simplest calculated forecast is to use a sample-based variance-covariance matrix as forecasted matrix:

$$C_t^{(Sample)} = K^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^K (y_{t-k} - \mu_t) (y_{t-k} - \mu_t)^T \quad (4.1)$$

$$C_{(t+s)|t}^{(Sample)} = C_t^{(Sample)} \quad (4.2)$$

where forecast step  $s = 1, 2, \dots$ .

A factor-based “forecast” is to use a variance-covariance matrix estimated by a static factor model as forecasted matrix:

$$C_t^{(Estimate)} = X_t V_t X_t^T + W_t + R_t \quad (4.3)$$

$$C_{(t+s)|t}^{(Estimate)} = C_t^{(Estimate)} \quad (4.4)$$

where  $s = 1, 2, \dots$ ; and factor loadings matrix  $X_t$ , diagonal factor variance matrix  $V_t$ , diagonal UDC variance matrix  $W_t$  and diagonal residual error variance matrix  $R_t$  are estimated coefficients and attributes of a static factor model expressed as follows:

$$y_t = \mu_t + X_t f_t + u_t$$

$$u_t = g_t + r_t$$

$$V_t = \text{Var}(f_t) = E(f_t f_t^T)$$

$$W_t = \text{Var}(g_t) = E(g_t g_t^T)$$

$$R_t = \text{Var}(r_t) = E(r_t r_t^T)$$

Another widely practiced class of static factor models is “fundamental risk factor analysis”, in which factor loadings matrix is pre-determined based on certain fundamental analysis theory or framework ahead of factor model estimation. Therefore, fundamental factor analysis is able to make meaningful explanations about multivariate volatility structure, but variance-covariance matrix of fundamental factor score time-series is not diagonal.

Since we have already estimated a dynamic factor model, we can replace estimates of a static factor model by nowcasts (not forecasts) of our dynamic factor model as follows:

$$C_t^{(Nowcast)} = X_{t,0} V_{t,0} X_{t,0}^T + W_{t,0} + R_t^{(r)} \quad (4.5)$$

$$C_{(t+s)|t}^{(Nowcast)} = C_t^{(Nowcast)} \quad (4.6)$$

where  $s = 1, 2, \dots$ .

The above simple forecasts, Eq. (4.2), (4.4) or (4.6), can serve as benchmarks in evaluation of our multi-step forecast in multivariate volatility by dynamic factor model.

## **5. Evaluation of Volatility Forecast**

Directly examining quality or accuracy of the forecasted variance-covariance matrix  $C_{(t+s)|t}$  itself is a complicated undertaking in theory and difficult (for a large number of time-series) task in practice.

A widely practiced evaluation technique is to measure quality or accuracy of forecasted variance of a weighted aggregation of the time-series, with forecasted variance of the aggregate made by the forecasted variance-covariance matrix, as

$$(\sigma_{(t+s)|t}^{(w)})^2 = w^T C_{(t+s)|t} w. \quad (5.1)$$

where  $w$  is a  $n \times 1$  vector of weights for aggregation and  $(\sigma_{(t+s)|t}^{(w)})^2$  is forecasted variance of aggregated time-series

$$y_t^{(w)} = w^T y_t = y_t^T w, \quad (5.2)$$

The vector of weights,  $w$ , is set according to relevant application(s) of business or research. If one of the elements in the vector  $w$  is 1 and all others are 0s, the weighted aggregate,  $y_t^{(w)}$ , is essentially a selected individual time-series.

To measure the accuracy of forecasted variance  $(\sigma_{(t+s)|t}^{(w)})^2$  by Eq. (5.1), a “realized z-score squared of the forecasts” defined by

$$(z_{(t+s)|t}^{(w)})^2 = (y_{t+s}^{(w)} - \mu_{t+s}^{(w)})^2 / (\sigma_{(t+s)|t}^{(w)})^2, \quad (5.3)$$

is handy, where observation  $y_{t+s}^{(w)}$  and estimate  $\mu_{t+s}^{(w)}$  are made at time  $t + s$ , while forecast  $(\sigma_{(t+s)|t}^{(w)})^2$  is made at earlier time  $t$ . According to Litterman and Winkelmann (1998), Patton (2011), Menchero, Morozov and Pasqua (2013) and Fan, Furger and Xiu (2015), the accuracy of portfolio volatility forecasts over a given time period  $(t + 1) \in [t_1, t_2]$  can be measured by bias statistic  $BS_{t_1, t_2}^{(w)}$ , log-likelihood  $LL_{t_1, t_2}^{(w)}$ , and Q-statistic  $QS_{t_1, t_2}^{(w)}$  defined as

$$BS_{t_1, t_2}^{(w)} = \left[ \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} \sum_{t=t_1-1}^{t_2-1} (z_{t+1|t}^{(w)})^2 \right]^{1/2}, \quad (5.4)$$

$$LL_{t_1, t_2}^{(w)} = - \frac{1/2}{t_2 - t_1 + 1} \sum_{t=t_1-1}^{t_2-1} [\ln(2\pi) + (z_{t+1|t}^{(w)})^2 + \ln(\sigma_{t+1|t}^{(w)})^2], \quad (5.5)$$

$$QS_{t_1, t_2}^{(w)} = \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1 + 1} \sum_{t=t_1-1}^{t_2-1} [(z_{t+1|t}^{(w)})^2 - \ln(\sigma_{t+1|t}^{(w)})^2], \quad (5.6)$$

where  $sd_{t=t_1}^{t_2}(\cdot)$  denotes sample standard deviation and  $w_{t+1|t}^{(QP)}$  is time-varying stock weights of the minimum variance portfolio obtained by quadratic programming (QP) using the predicted

covariance matrix  $C_{t+1|t}$ . A bias statistic  $BS_{t_1,t_2}^{(w)} > 1$  or  $BS_{t_1,t_2}^{(w)} < 1$  shows an under- or over-prediction of volatility. A higher log-likelihood  $LL_{t_1,t_2}^{(w)}$  or a lower Q-statistic  $QS_{t_1,t_2}^{(w)}$  indicates more accurate forecasts.

## **6. Dynamic Volatility Attribution**

One of the primary objectives of volatility modeling and analysis is “volatility attribution”: evaluating various (static or dynamic) sources of volatility that contribute to estimated or forecasted volatility values. A simplest classic source of volatility is an ideal random walk – assuming zero values of multivariate/individual serial-correlations. They are, however, almost non-zeros in real world. Multivariate volatility values in general are sum of contributions from two sources: variance-covariance and vector/individual autocovariances. Positive serial-correlations increase volatility levels, while negative ones decrease them. Non-zero autocovariances also make term-structure of volatility different from that of random walks which is volatility levels proportional to square root of time horizon.

Volatility analysis based on dynamic factor models jointly estimate both variance-covariance and vector autocovariances of a large number of time-series. Traditional static factor model volatility analyses, however, do not estimate autocovariances at all. Therefore, dynamic volatility attributions provide more and deeper insights than static volatility attributions.

Details in comprehensive discussions on volatility forecasts demonstrate that equations for immediate (as opposed to “forward”) one-step volatility forecasts present all volatility sources quantified by the latest data values and model estimates. According to Eq. (3.11), 1-step forecast of variance-covariance matrix of the observed vector time-series  $y_t$  is

$$C_{(t+1)|t} = X_{t,0} V_{(t+1)|t} X_{t,0}^T + W_{(t+1)|t} + R_t^{(r)}. \quad (6.1)$$

Here, by Eq. (3.7), 1-step forecast of variances of dynamic factor scores  $f_t$  is

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{(t+1)|t} &= \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p \text{Diag}(A_{t,j} V_{(t+1-j),(t+1-k)} A_{t,k}^T) + R_t^{(v)} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p \delta_{ij} \text{Diag}(A_{t,j} V_{(t+1-j),(t+1-k)} A_{t,k}^T) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p (1 - \delta_{ij}) \text{Diag}(A_{t,j} V_{(t+1-j),(t+1-k)} A_{t,k}^T) \\
&\quad + R_t^{(v)}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

where variance/autocovariance  $V_{(t+1-j),(t+1-k)} = E(f_{t+1-j} f_{t+1-k}^T)$  is evaluated by estimates Eqs. (2.5) and (2.6), and  $\delta_{ij}$  is Kronecker delta. The first term of  $k = j$ , with multiplier  $\delta_{ij}$ , represents aggregate contribution from estimated variances of dynamic factors  $f_t$ ; the second term of  $k \neq j$ , with  $(1 - \delta_{ij})$ , from estimated vector autocovariances of  $f_t$ ; and the third term, from prediction error of  $f_t$ . Similarly, by Eq. (3.9), 1-step forecast of variance of idiosyncratic UDCs  $g_t$  is

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{(t+1)|t} &= \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^q D_{t,j} W_{(t+1-j),(t+1-k)} D_{t,k} + R_t^{(e)} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^q \delta_{ij} D_{t,j} W_{(t+1-j),(t+1-k)} D_{t,k} \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^q (1 - \delta_{ij}) D_{t,j} W_{(t+1-j),(t+1-k)} D_{t,k} \\
&\quad + R_t^{(e)}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

where  $W_{(t+1-j),(t+1-k)} = \text{Diag}(E(g_{t+1-j} g_{t+1-k}^T))$  is evaluated by estimates Eqs. (2.7) and (2.8), and  $\delta_{ij}$  is Kronecker delta. The first term  $k = j$ , with multiplier  $\delta_{ij}$ , represents aggregate contribution from estimated variances of UDCs  $g_t$ ; the second term of  $k \neq j$ , with  $(1 - \delta_{ij})$ , from autocovariances of  $g_t$ ; and the third term, from prediction error of  $g_t$ .

Therefore, the 1-step forecast of variance-covariance matrix of the observed vector time-series  $y_t$  is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{C}_{(t+1)|t} \\
&= X_{t,0} \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p \delta_{ij} \text{Diag}(A_{t,j} V_{(t+1-j),(t+1-k)} A_{t,k}^T) X_{t,0}^T
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + X_{t,0} \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p (1 - \delta_{ij}) \text{Diag}(A_{t,j} V_{(t+1-j),(t+1-k)} A_{t,k}^T) X_{t,0}^T \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^q \delta_{ij} D_{t,j} W_{(t+1-j),(t+1-k)} D_{t,k} \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^q (1 - \delta_{ij}) D_{t,j} W_{(t+1-j),(t+1-k)} D_{t,k} \\
& + X_{t,0} R_t^{(v)} X_{t,0}^T + R_t^{(e)} + R_t^{(r)} .
\end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Here, each of the five terms represents an aggregate dynamic source of volatility, measured by contribution to variance-covariance forecast from the source:

- the first term, can be labeled as “common volatility”, is from variances of dynamic common factors;
- the second term, as “common serial-correlation”, is from vector autocovariances of dynamic common factors;
- the third term, as “idiosyncratic volatility”, is from variance of idiosyncratic UDCs;
- the fourth term, as “idiosyncratic serial-correlation”, is from autocovariance of idiosyncratic UDCs; and
- the fifth term, as “prediction error”, is from (a) dynamic factor prediction error, (b) UDC prediction error, and (c) residual error.

Dynamic volatility attribution is to tabulate portions, or weights, of total variance-covariance matrix, or total variances, attributed to these dynamic sources of volatility.

As a comparison, traditional static volatility attribution to static sources of volatility based on static factor model of volatility, is unable to provide dynamic information. In a static volatility model, nowcast (estimated current values) of volatility serves as forecast. Volatility is attributed to only two sources:

- “common”, contributions from static common factors; and

- “idiosyncratic”, from idiosyncratic randomness (or residual error).

## **7. Examples**

To test DFVCM model, an example of input data table is tabulated with publicly available real data sets. The table contains multiple weekly time-series for several years ending as of the last Friday of the most recent calendar year. Each row is of an individual time-series. There are more than 50 weekly time-series of logarithmic changes in values of investment funds publicly traded in the U.S. exchanges. The funds invested in equities, fixed incomes, financial indexes, and physical commodities.

DFVCM model estimated and forecasted variance-covariances, vector autocovariances and individual volatility levels of these input time-series.

## **8. Discussion**

The numeric example described above demonstrates that the DFM-based “Dynamic Factor Variance-Covariance Model (DFVCM)” can generate statistically good and consistent multi-step forecasts of multivariate volatilities for large number of time-series. With several statistic measures, the performance of multi-step DFVCM forecasts is consistently better than various objective benchmarks: performances of (a) sample volatility as forecast, (b) estimate, based on static factors, as forecast, and (c) nowcast (or estimate), based on dynamic factors, as forecast. Various statistic measures include (a) bias statistic, (b) log-likelihood, and (c) Q-statistic.

Dynamic attributions of forecasts by DFVCM can reveal useful information in terms of common vs. idiosyncratic factors, and cross-sectional vs. serial correlations.

## **9. Further Development**

Many real-world large sets of time-series are nonstationary. In general, a filtering approach could be among the best for analysis and forecasts on nonstationary time-series. Bayesian filters (BFs) are more adaptive filters: more powerful due to fewer restrictive assumptions and/or conditions. A variational Bayesian filtering (VBF) is the fastest one among BFs.

Our team, i4cast LLC, is an advanced developer of variational Bayesian filtering, demonstrated by our VBfFA (Variational Bayesian filtering Factor Analysis, [https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-vdwcbntcsnu72?sr=0-2&ref\\_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa](https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-vdwcbntcsnu72?sr=0-2&ref_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa)) algorithm published on AWS.

We are now working on developing a long memory dynamic factor model (LMDFM) estimated by a variational Bayesian filter, and a Yule-Walker-PCA autoregressive model (YWpcAR) estimated by a VBF as well.

## **Appendix A. LMDFM Algorithm**

Long-memory dynamic factor model (LMDFM, [https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-da6ffrp4mlogp?sr=0-1&ref\\_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa](https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-da6ffrp4mlogp?sr=0-1&ref_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa)) is estimated by an implementation of dynamic principal components analysis (DPCA), reviewed by Doz and Fuleky (2020). Here the DPCA can be described, in general, with a two-dimensional discrete Fourier transform (2D-DFT) summarized as follows:

- Estimating variance-covariance matrixes (VCMs) and autocovariance matrixes



(ACMs) of observed vector (i.e. multiple) time-series  $y_t$ ,  $C_{j,k} =$

$$Cov(y_{t-j}, y_{t-k}) = E(y_{t-j} y_{t-k}^T), j, k = 0, 1, \dots, p, \text{ assuming } E(y_t) = 0.$$

- Combining VCMs and ACMs,  $C_{j,k}$ , by applying a two-dimensional discrete Fourier transform (2D-DFT) on VCMs and ACMs.
- Referring resulted transform (by 2D-DFT) as spectral density matrixes (SDMs):  

$$\{\Omega_{q,r}\} = DFT_{2D}(\{C_{j,k}\}).$$
- Applying principal components analysis (PCA) on each of the SDMs,  $\Omega_{q,r}$ ,  
 $q, r = 0, 1, \dots, p.$
- Estimating principal components (PCs) of original VCMs and ACMs by applying inverse 2D-DFT on PCs of SDMs.
- This way, PCs of each of original VCMs and ACMs contain dynamic information from all of VCMs and ACMs.
- If observed vector time-series can be reasonably assumed as locally stationary, the 2D-DFT becomes simplified as weighted (1-D) DFT, with exactly the same “weights of the Bartlett window” shown by Doz and Fuleky (2020).

The LMDFM estimates two different simplest forms of DFM. DFM of Form I estimates:

$$y_t = \mu_t + X_{t,0} f_t + X_{t,1} f_{t-1} + \dots + X_{t,p} f_{t-p} + u_t,$$

$$f_t = g(e_t),$$

where  $e_t$  is a vector of white noises of unit variance,  $g(\cdot)$  is a linear transformation, and elements of vector  $f_t$  are independent of each other and over time. Other application facts about Form I include:

- classic form of DFM for classic dynamic analysis,
- suitable for simple Monte Carlo simulation,

- estimating a whole set of matrixes of factor loadings  $X_{t,k}$ ,
- not applicable to “big data set” due to large number of elements of loadings,
- question on time-series forecast: sizable impact by assuming unknown factor scores  $f_{t+s} = 0$  ?
- for variance-covariance forecast: assuming stable variance of  $f_t$ .

LMDFM’s DFM of Form II estimates Eqs. (2.1) and (2.2) as:

$$y_t = \mu_t + X_{t,0} f_t + u_t,$$

$$f_t = A_{t,1} f_{t-1} + A_{t,2} f_{t-2} + \cdots + A_{t,p} f_{t-p} + v_t,$$

where the only loadings matrix  $X_{t,0}$  in Form II is NOT the same as that in Form I (just share the same symbol). Other application facts about Form II include:

- only one matrix of factor loadings,  $X_{t,0}$ ,
- estimating a whole set of VAR matrixes,  $A_{t,k}$ , of common factors,
- non-zero vector autocovariance of comm factors,  $Cov(f_{t-j}, f_{t-j-k}) \neq 0$ ,  
therefore, not for simple Monte Carlo simulation,
- applicable to “big data set” due to limited number of elements of VAR matrixes,
- question on time-series forecast: smaller impact by assuming unknown errors  $v_{t+s} = 0$  ?
- for variance-covariance forecast: assuming stable variance of errors  $v_t$ .

DFM of Form II, i.e. Eqs. (2.1) and (2.2), is utilized to estimate common components, including

$X_{t,0}$ ,  $f_t$ ,  $A_{t,j}$ ,  $R_t^{(v)}$ ,  $V_{(t-j),0}$ ,  $V_{(t-j),k}$  and  $u_t$ , shown in Section “2. Model Estimation”.

## **Appendix B. YWpcAR Algorithm**

Yule-Walker-PCA autoregression model (YWpcAR,

[https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-prndys7tr7go6?sr=0-](https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-prndys7tr7go6?sr=0-4&ref_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa)

[4&ref\\_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa](https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/pp/prodview-prndys7tr7go6?sr=0-4&ref_=beagle&applicationId=AWSMPContessa)) is estimated by an implementation of principal components analysis (PCA) on Yule-Walker (YW) equation summarized as follows:

- Applying principal components analysis (PCA) on sample variance-autocovariance matrix (VACM) in Yule-Walker (YW) equation.
- Replacing elements of sample VACM by PCA-based common components.
- Constructing PCA-based YW equation with replacing elements of matrix and vector in YW equation by correspondent PCA-based common components of VACM.
- Estimating AR model coefficients by PCA-based YW equation.
- Combining individual principal component score time-series into an unobserved dynamic component (UDC) time-series.
- Forecasting expected value and variance of observed time-series with UDC time-series of YW-PCA AR model.

The YWpcAR can be utilized to estimate idiosyncratic components, including  $g_t$ ,  $D_{t,k}$ ,  $R_t^{(e)}$ ,  $W_{(t-j),0}$ ,  $W_{(t-j),k}$  and  $R_t^{(r)}$ , shown in Section “2. Model Estimation”.

## **References**

L. Alessi, M. Barigozzi and M. Capasso (2007). “Dynamic factor GARCH: Multivariate volatility forecast for a large number of series”. LEM Working Paper Series, No. 2006/25, Laboratory of Economics and Management (LEM), Pisa.

C. Doz and P. Fuleky (2020). “Chapter 2, Dynamic Factor Models” In *Macroeconomic Forecasting in the Era of Big Data: Theory and Practice*, Ed. P. Fuleky,

Advanced Studies in Theoretical and Applied Econometrics, Volume 52. Springer.

J. Fan, A. Furger and D. Xiu (2015). “Incorporating Global Industrial Classification Standard into Portfolio Allocation: A Simple Factor-Based Large Covariance Matrix Estimator with High Frequency Data”. Working Paper, No. 15-01, University of Chicago Booth School of Business, 2015.

R. Litterman and K. Winkelmann (1998). “Estimating covariance matrices”. Risk Management Series, Goldman Sachs Group, Inc., 1998.

J. Menchero, A. Morozov and A. Pasqua (2013). “Predicting risk at short horizons: a case study for the USE4D model”. MSCI Model Insight, MSCI, 2013.

A.J. Patton (2011). “Volatility forecast comparison using imperfect volatility proxies”. Journal of Econometrics, 2011, 160 (1), 246–256.

**[ EOF ]**