

# BUSS386 Problem Set 12 — Solutions

## Volatility

Prof. Ji-Woong Chung

### Problem 1 — Historical, EWMA, GARCH

Prices: 360.0, 363.6, 360.0, 367.2, 363.5, 369.8.

(a) Log returns  $R_t = \ln(S_t/S_{t-1})$ :

$t$	1	2	3	4	5
$R_t$	0.00995	-0.00995	0.01980	-0.01012	0.01718
$R_t^2$	0.0000990	0.0000990	0.000392	0.000102	0.000295

$$\sum R_t^2 = 0.000988.$$

(b)  $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{daily}}^2 = 0.000988/5 = \boxed{0.0001976}$ .

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\text{daily}} = 0.01406 \Rightarrow \hat{\sigma}_{\text{annual}} = 0.01406\sqrt{252} = \boxed{22.3\%}.$$

(c) EWMA with  $w = 0.94$ . Reorder from most recent ( $k=0=R_5$ ) to oldest:

$k$	0	1	2	3	4
$R^2$	0.000295	0.000102	0.000392	0.0000990	0.0000990
$w^k$	1.0000	0.9400	0.8836	0.8306	0.7807

$$\sum w^k R^2 = 0.000898, \sum w^k = 4.4349.$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\text{daily}}^2 = 0.000898/4.4349 = 0.0002024, \hat{\sigma}_{\text{annual}} = \sqrt{0.0002024 \times 252} = \boxed{22.6\%}.$$

(d) GARCH:  $\sigma_\infty^2 = 0.0001976$ ,  $\omega = (1 - 0.99)(0.0001976) = 1.976 \times 10^{-6}$ . Start  $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_\infty^2$ .  
 $\epsilon_1 = R_1 = 0.00995$ ,  $\epsilon_1^2 = 9.9 \times 10^{-5}$ :

$$\sigma_2^2 = 1.976 \times 10^{-6} + 0.05(9.9 \times 10^{-5}) + 0.94(0.0001976) = \boxed{0.0001927}, \sigma_2 = \boxed{1.39\%/day}.$$

$$\epsilon_2 = R_2 = -0.00995, \epsilon_2^2 = 9.9 \times 10^{-5}:$$

$$\sigma_3^2 = 1.976 \times 10^{-6} + 0.05(9.9 \times 10^{-5}) + 0.94(0.0001927) = \boxed{0.0001881}, \sigma_3 = \boxed{1.37\%/day}.$$

### Problem 2 — Implied volatility inversion

$S_0 = K = 100$ ,  $T = 0.25$ ,  $r = 0.04$ ,  $c_{\text{mkt}} = 5.00$ .

(a)  $\sigma = 0.20$ :  $\sigma\sqrt{T} = 0.10$ ,  $d_1 = (0 + 0.06 \cdot 0.25)/0.10 = 0.15$ ,  $d_2 = 0.05$ .  
 $N(0.15) = 0.5596$ ,  $N(0.05) = 0.5199$ .  
 $c = 100(0.5596) - 100e^{-0.01}(0.5199) = 55.96 - 51.48 = \boxed{\$4.48}$ .  
Market  $\$5.00 > \$4.48 \Rightarrow$  IV is *above* 20%.

(b)  $\sigma = 0.25$ :  $\sigma\sqrt{T} = 0.125$ ,  $d_1 = (0 + 0.07125 \cdot 0.25)/0.125 = 0.1425$ ,  $d_2 = 0.0175$ .  
 $N(0.1425) = 0.5567$ ,  $N(0.0175) = 0.5070$ .  
 $c = 100(0.5567) - 100e^{-0.01}(0.5070) = 55.67 - 50.19 = \boxed{\$5.48}$ .  
Market  $\$5.00$  is *between*  $\$4.48$  (at 20%) and  $\$5.48$  (at 25%)  $\Rightarrow$  IV is in (20%, 25%).

(c) Linear interpolation:

$$\sigma_{\text{imp}} \approx 0.20 + \frac{5.00 - 4.48}{5.48 - 4.48}(0.25 - 0.20) = 0.20 + \frac{0.52}{1.00}(0.05) = 0.20 + 0.026 = \boxed{22.5\%}$$

A few Newton iterations would refine this slightly but 22.5% is within the bid-ask of typical quotes.

### Problem 3 — Vol risk premium and gamma scalping

(a)  $\sigma_{\text{real}}^2 - \sigma_{\text{imp}}^2 = 0.15^2 - 0.19^2 = 0.0225 - 0.0361 = -0.0136 < 0$ .

A long-gamma scalper has negative expected P&L — on average, realized vol does not cover the implied vol you paid.

(b) Short vol = collect the premium that long-vol pays. The volatility risk premium of  $\sim 4$  pp is structural: investors pay to hedge tail risk. JEPI / covered-call ETFs / Korean ELS issuers all sell this insurance.

(c) The catch: short-vol strategies lose catastrophically when realized vol *exceeds* implied — exactly when you can least afford it (1987, 2008, 2018 XIV, 2020 COVID, 2024 Aug 5 KOSPI 200). The carry is real; so is the crash.

### Problem 4 — Smile-adjusted equity put

$S_0 = 360$ ,  $K = 342$ ,  $T = 0.5$ ,  $r = 0.03$ ,  $q = 0.015$ .  
 $\ln(S_0/K) = \ln(360/342) = 0.05129$ .  $(r - q)T = 0.0075$ .

(a)  $\sigma = 0.18$ :  $\sigma\sqrt{T} = 0.1273$ .  
 $d_1 = (0.05129 + (0.0075 + 0.0162)(0.5))/0.1273 = (0.05129 + 0.01185)/0.1273$   
wait:  $(r - q + \sigma^2/2)T = (0.0075 + 0.5 \cdot 0.0324) \cdot 0.5 = (0.0075 + 0.0162) \cdot 0.5 = 0.01185$   
 $d_1 = (0.05129 + 0.01185)/0.1273 = 0.06314/0.1273 = 0.4960$ .  
 $d_2 = 0.4960 - 0.1273 = 0.3687$ .  
 $N(-0.4960) = 0.3099$ ,  $N(-0.3687) = 0.3562$ .  
 $p = Ke^{-rT}N(-d_2) - S_0e^{-qT}N(-d_1) = 342(0.9851)(0.3562) - 360(0.9925)(0.3099)$   
 $= 119.99 - 110.71 = \boxed{9.28}$  pts.

(b)  $\sigma = 0.21$ :  $\sigma\sqrt{T} = 0.1485$ .  
 $(r - q + \sigma^2/2)T = (0.0075 + 0.5 \cdot 0.0441)(0.5) = (0.0075 + 0.02205)(0.5) = 0.01478$   
 $d_1 = (0.05129 + 0.01478)/0.1485 = 0.06607/0.1485 = 0.4449$ .  
 $d_2 = 0.4449 - 0.1485 = 0.2964$ .

$$N(-0.4449) = 0.3282, N(-0.2964) = 0.3834.$$

$$p = 342(0.9851)(0.3834) - 360(0.9925)(0.3282) = 129.16 - 117.28 = \boxed{11.88} \text{ pts.}$$

- (c) Smile premium =  $11.88 - 9.28 = \boxed{2.60}$  pts. Per contract:  $2.60 \times \text{€} 250,000 = \boxed{\text{€} 650,000}$  extra cost.

## Problem 5 — Surface interpolation

- (a) Read directly:  $\sigma(K/S_0 = 1.05, T = 6\text{mo}) = \boxed{16.0\%}$ .

- (b) At  $K/S_0 = 1.05, T = 6\text{mo} \rightarrow 16.0\%, T = 12\text{mo} \rightarrow 16.5\%$ . Linear at  $T = 9$  months:

$$\sigma = 16.0\% + \frac{9-6}{12-6}(16.5\% - 16.0\%) = 16.0\% + 0.25\% = \boxed{16.25\%}$$

- (c) At  $T = 6\text{mo}, K/S_0 = 1.00 \rightarrow 17.5\%, K/S_0 = 1.05 \rightarrow 16.0\%$ . Linear at  $K/S_0 = 1.03$ :

$$\sigma = 17.5\% + \frac{0.03}{0.05}(16.0\% - 17.5\%) = 17.5\% - 0.9\% = \boxed{16.6\%}$$

(Pure linear in  $K$  here because the target  $T = 6\text{mo}$  is on the grid; bilinear in general.)

- (d) At  $T = 3\text{mo}$ : skew from 21% (0.95) down to 15% (1.10), a drop of 6 pp. At  $T = 12\text{mo}$ : 19% to 16.5%, a drop of only 2.5 pp. So skew is steeper at  $T = 3$  months.

Typical because short-dated options price imminent event risk (the next earnings / FOMC / Korean MPC); long-dated options price the long-run RN distribution where event risk averages out.

## Problem 6 — Variance swap

$$K_{\text{var}} = 0.0324, \text{Notional} = \text{€} 1\text{B.}$$

- (a) Realized variance = 0.0400:

$$\text{Payoff} = 1\text{B} \times (0.0400 - 0.0324) = 1\text{B} \times 0.0076 = \boxed{+\text{€} 7.6\text{M}} \text{ (gain for the buyer).}$$

- (b) Realized variance = 0.0225:

$$\text{Payoff} = 1\text{B} \times (0.0225 - 0.0324) = -1\text{B} \times 0.0099 = \boxed{-\text{€} 9.9\text{M}} \text{ (loss for the buyer).}$$

- (c) Variance swaps are exactly replicable by a  $1/K^2$ -weighted strip of OTM options (Carr-Madan); volatility swaps involve  $\sqrt{\text{Var}}$  which is concave and not perfectly replicable, so variance is the cleaner product for dealers to make markets in.