



# Identification of Risk Extreme Values in a Time Series and Analysis with an Autoregressive Method

## Application for Climate Risk Events

Gianluca Rosso

(GradStat, RSS the Royal Statistical Society, London – Corresponding Scholar, SIS Società Italiana di Statistica, Roma)

Correspondence to: [gianluca.rosso@sis-statistica.org](mailto:gianluca.rosso@sis-statistica.org)

**ABSTRACT.** *In this article there is no intention to repeat basic concepts about risk management, but we will try to define why often is usefull the time series analysis during the assessment of risks, and how is possible to compute a significative analysis using regression and autoregression. After some basic concepts about trend analysis, will be introduced some methods to identify peaks. This is often usefull when there is no need to use the full time series, because sometimes is more practical to focus only on the extremes. With a correct time series without “not-anomalous” data, the extremes time series are treated with a simply autoregression model. This drives to know if the time series has a correlation between periods, and how many periods could be considered lagged among them. We think that climate events frequently are lagged because the climate show a clear increasing tendency, and that climate risks are potentially increasing during the time. There will be no specific conclusion related with risk management, because the proposed solution with autoregression can be adapted to any time series analysis.*

**KEYWORDS.** *Time series analysis, trend analysis, peaks identification, outliers, peak over threshold POT, linear regression, autoregression, OLS methods, Excel, risk management, operational risk, risk assessment, extreme events, extreme values, climate events, psychology of loss, loss aversion, future discounting, Giddens’s paradox.*

### 1. INTRODUCTION.

In this article there is no intention to repeat basic concepts about risk management, but few words about the principles of ORM will be usefull to introduce the question: why we need to use (or if you prefer: is better to use) time series analysis? And why this is usefull for the most of operational risk, but particulary for risks related with climate events?

Risk assessment is substantially a quantitative analysis, that needs both mathematical and statistical approaches. Are used the scrupulousness of math, but also the probabilistic concept of stat. So there is a balance between what “is” and what “could be”. Another direction from this

balance is a psychology approach, well known as “psychology of loss”. The mile stone of this approach is the loss aversion.

Loss aversion is a human characteristic that describes how people are intrinsically afraid of losses. Loss aversion unavoidably leads to risk aversion and a number of predictable behaviours in certain situations. Loss aversion and risk are intrinsically linked. Research into the psychological value drives to the weight that people give to probabilities. And here is again the statistical element described more over. Where the odds of an event are very small, people become almost completely indifferent to variations in levels of risk. In particular people are more heavily influenced (in terms of weighting of probabilities) if an event is described by using frequencies than by using standard indicators of probability of risk. Loss aversion and related biases are an important drivers of human decision making in many situations. On the one hand it can encourage extreme risk averse behaviour, and yet in a different situation it can lead to excessive risk taking.

These are heavy evaluation elements in order to assess extreme events, as in climate.

Traditionally time series are the basis of any climate analysis. There is only mathematical and statistical reasons? Yes, if you refers to letterature. But probably is possible to add an element in order to make stronger this approch. The element is the loss aversion and the tendency of people to have a bias in favour of the “status quo” because they are more concerned about losses than about future gains. A tendency that is related to “future discounting”, a basic concept related with the “Giddens’s paradox”.

It states that in the course of day-to-day life a great number of risks, and climate risk are in that order, many will sit on their hands and do nothing of a concrete nature about them. Yet waiting until they become visible and acute before being stirred to serious action will, by definition, be too late.

The key of this situation is that if people have troubles to see forward, researchers must operate in order to let the people see backward. And from the backward analysis, the time series analysis, we can see then forward. This because analysis of time series can drives automatically to the analysis of trend. This is a natural approach to the study, and there is no other way forward.

When we look to natural extreme events we approach to an argument drammatically important for humanity. Social, economic and moral implications are so big that its study will be one of the most important challenge for the next decades.

For example, global annual temperatures in last ten years seems to be in average quite stable. But if we wide our view and we take a look to the last 30 years, we could have a point of view very different. Because we can see clearly the tendance: temperature is growing up. It’s true that we can observe at least two periods in which temperature are stable, but data mustn’t be treated as isolated elements. They must be analized as a time series.

It’s the natural variability that could show every single period as a record, in positive or in negative. Every portion of our time series could be anomalous, and therefore could contain an extraordinary event.

As wrote in many papers, as said in many news, the problem is not only the amount of the event but also the frequency of occurrence.

There are many ways to analyze these data; in this article we propose a path to have a solution.

After some basic concepts about trend analysis, will be introduced some methods to identify peaks. This is often usefull when there is no need to use the full time series, because sometimes is more practical to focus only on the extremes. With a correct time series without “not-anomalous” data, the extremes time series are treated with a simply autoregression model. This brings to know if the time series has a correletion between periods, and how many periods could be considered lagged. We think that single climate events are lagged because the climate show a clear tendency and that climate risks are potentially increasing during the time.




Fig. 1.1

## 2. TREND ANALYSIS.

At the basis of any analysis of extreme indicators lies the estimation of trends.

There are two definitions for “trend”. In much of the statistical literature a trend is conceived of as that part of a series which changes relatively slowly (smoothly) over time. Viewed in terms of *prediction*, a trend is that part of the series which, when extrapolated, gives the clearest indication of the future long-term movements in the series.

In many situations these definitions will overlap. But not in all situations. In case of data following a *random walk*, the latter trend definition does not lead to a smooth curve. Typical examples of the first definition are splines, LOWESS smoothers and Binomial filters. Typical example of the second definition is the IRWtrend model in combination with the Kalman filter.

If we scan the climate literature on trend methods, an enormous amount of models arises. We found the following trend models or groups of models (without being complete): low pass filters (various binomial weights; with or without end point estimates), ARIMA models and variations (SARIMA, GARMA, ARFIMA), linear trend with OLS (ordinary least square), kernel smoothers, splines, the resistant (RES) method, Restricted Maximum Likelihood AR, based linear trends, trends in rare events by logistic regression, Bayesian trend models, simple Moving Averages, neural networks, Structural Time-series Models (STMs), smooth transition models, Multiple Regression models with higher order polynomials, exponential smoothing, Mann-Kendall tests for monotonic trends (with or without correction for serial correlations), trend tests against long-memory time series, robust regression trend lines (MM or LTS regression), Seidel-Lanzante trends incorporating abrupt changes, wavelets, Singular Spectrum Analysis (SSA), LOESS and LOWESS smoothing, Shiyatov corridor methods, Holmes double-detrending methods, piecewise linear fitting, Students t-test on sub-periods in time, extreme value theory with a time-varying location parameter and, last not but least, some form of expert judgment (drawing a trend “by hand”). However, the number of trend models applied to extreme indicators, appears to be much more limited.

The trend model almost exclusively applied, is the OLS straight line. This model has the advantage of being simple and generating uncertainty information for any trend difference [ $\mu_t - \mu_s$ ] (indices “t” and “s” are arbitrary time points within the sample period).

The OLS regression model reads as

$$y_t = \mu_t + \epsilon_t = a + b \cdot t + \epsilon_t \quad (2.1)$$

with “a” the intercept, “b” the slope of the regression line and “t” a noise process.

Other examples of OLS linear trend fits can be found in linear trend estimation in combination with ARIMA models for the residuals. In the field of *disaster studies* OLS trends are the dominant method, albeit that the original data are log-transformed in most cases. Hu et al. (2012) apply Mann-Kendall tests with correction for serial correlation (no actual trend estimated in this approach).

Finally, some authors acknowledge that the use of a specific trend model, along with uncertainty analysis, may lead to deviating inferences on (significant) trend changes. Therefore, they chose to evaluate trends using *more than one trend model*. For example, Moberg and Jones apply two different trend models to the same data: the OLS trend model and the resistant (RES) model. Subsequently, they evaluate all their results with respect to these two trend models. Even more methods are evaluated by Young et al. (2011). They estimate five different trend models to 23-yr wind speed and wave height data and evaluate uncertainty information for each model (their supporting material).

We note that the application of more than one trend model to the same data has been published more often (not specifically for the evaluation of extremes).

### 3. IDENTIFYING PEAKS.

There are two methods in identifying movements of the extreme value are taking the maximum value in a given period (called Block Maxima method) and retrieve the values that pass through a given threshold (called Peaks Over Threshold method).

A dataset of events is given, and it is possible to draw it with a scatterplot (Fig. 3.1).




Fig. 3.1. Source: E. Masiello, Univ. Lyon 1

Generalized Extreme Value (GEV) distribution is a family of continuous distribution is built into the EVT to combine the Gumbel, Frechet, and Weibull distribution, known as the extreme value distribution of type I, II, and III. On the GEV distribution,  $X$  is the random variable which has Probability Density Function (PDF) is as follows

$$f(x, \mu, \sigma, \xi) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma} \left\{ 1 + \xi \left( \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \right) \right\}^{\frac{1}{\xi} - 1} \exp \left\{ - \left( 1 + \xi \left( \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{\xi}} \right\}, & \xi \neq 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sigma} \exp \left\{ - \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \right\} \exp \left\{ - \exp \left( - \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \right) \right\}, & \xi = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where:

$\mu$  is a parameter of location;

$\sigma$  is a parameter of scale;

$\xi$  is a parameter of shape.

Shape parameter  $\xi$  determines the behavior of the tail distribution. Distribution type defined with  $\xi = 0$ ,  $\xi > 0$ , and  $\xi < 0$  and can be likened to the Gumbel, Frechet, and Weibull distribution.

One of the methods in identifying movements of the extreme value is Block Maxima, which identifies the extreme value based on the value of maximum observation data are grouped according to certain periods. In this method, observation data is divided into blocks in a certain period, example monthly, quarterly, semester, or year. Then for each block is determined the magnitude of observation data and the value is the maximum value of the extremes for each block and were used as the sample (Fig. 3.2).

The POT (Peak Over Threshold) method involves choosing some threshold value, collecting the extreme values above that threshold into a sample, and then drawing conclusions based on that sample. The extreme values are taken as the peak values between two distinct upcrossings. To account for variation in the particular time series chosen, it is beneficial to generate or record multiple data for the same length of time and then form the extreme value sample from the peaks over threshold of all the time series (fig. 3.3).

In our example is shown in Fig. 3.4.




Fig. 3.2. Source: E. Masiello, Univ. Lyon 1




Fig. 3.3. Example of time series with the upcrossings (green) and extreme values (red) marked for a threshold value.  
Source: J. Rinker, Peak-over-Threshold Method for Extreme Values.




Fig. 3.4. Source: E. Masiello, Univ. Lyon 1

Let introduce an important relation between this method of analysis and the regression. This relation will be important for later consideration.

In the scatterplot above we have a distribution of items that has no particular tendencies. Is a partial indefinite cloud of dots. But if we have a more definite trend of data, we should consider two approach.

With a constant threshold the graph is not much different from the other above (Fig. 3.5), but in a quantile regression the aspect of our analysis assume a different perspective (Fig. 3.6).




Fig. 3.5.




Fig. 3.6.

About the exceeding of the value over a threshold, is possible to calculate the probability of the loss during the time. We refer to a Keith Porter work<sup>1</sup>. This function is called risk curve.

<sup>1</sup> K. Porter, A Beginner's Guide to Fragility, Vulnerability, and Risk, University of Colorado, Denver CO USA.

$$R(\chi) = \int_{s=0}^{\infty} -(1 - P[X \leq \chi | S = s]) \frac{dG(s)}{ds} ds \quad (3.2)$$

where

- $X$  = uncertain degree of loss to an asset, such as the uncertain damage factor
- $x$  = a particular value of  $X$
- $s$  = a particular value of the environmental excitation
- $R(x)$  = annual frequency with which loss of degree  $x$  is exceeded
- $G(s)$  = the mean annual frequency of excitation exceeding intensity  $s$
- $P[X \leq x | S = s]$  = cumulative distribution function of  $X$  evaluated at  $x$ , given  $s$ . If  $X$  is lognormally distributed at  $S = s$

then

$$P[X \leq x | S = s] = \Phi \left( \frac{\ln(\frac{x}{\theta(s)})}{\beta(s)} \right) \quad (3.3)$$

where

- $\theta(s)$  = median vulnerability function, i.e., the value of the damage factor with 50% exceedance probability when the asset is exposed to excitation  $s$
- $v(s)$  = coefficient of variation of vulnerability, i.e., the coefficient of variation of the damage factor of the asset exposed to excitation  $s$
- $\beta(s)$  = logarithmic standard deviation of the vulnerability function, i.e., the standard deviation of the natural logarithm of the damage factor when the asset is exposed to excitation  $s$ .

About the environmental excitation, a correct definition we can give is that it is usually the force, deformation, or other degree of loading to which the asset is subjected. In climate events, every measurable force is potentially an environmental excitation. About floods, flood depth or momentum flux or a vector combination of the two at the perimeter of an asset such as a building qualify as excitation by the environment on the asset. The US Army Corps of Engineers uses these measures as inputs to their flood vulnerability functions. If one has the mean vulnerability function  $y(s)$  and coefficient of variation of loss as a function of excitation  $v(s)$ , to evaluate  $\theta(s)$  and  $\beta(s)$  using the following most general formulas

$$\beta = \sqrt{\ln(1 + v^2)} \quad (3.4)$$

$$\theta = \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{1 + v^2}} \quad (3.5)$$

Equation (3.2) can be numerically integrated by

$$R(x) = \left( p_{i-1}(x) G_{i-1} \left( 1 - \exp(m_i \Delta s_i) \right) - \frac{\Delta p_i(x)}{\Delta s_i} G_{i-1} \left( \exp(m_i \Delta s_i) \left( \Delta s_i - \frac{1}{m_i} \right) + \frac{1}{m_i} \right) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n (p_{i-1}(x) \cdot a_i - \Delta p_i(x) \cdot b_i) \quad (3.6)$$



from the (3.3)

$$p_i(x) = P[X \leq x | S = s_i] = \Phi\left(\frac{\ln(\frac{x}{\theta(s_i)})}{\beta(s_i)}\right) \quad (3.7)$$

then

$$\Delta p_i(x) = p_i(x) - p_{i-1}(x) \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\Delta s_i = s_i - s_{i-1} \quad (3.9)$$

$$m_i = \ln\left(\frac{G_i}{G_{i-1}}\right) / \Delta s_i \quad (3.10)$$

for  $i=1, 2, \dots, n$

#### 4. REGRESSION.

Just a few words about regression, to introduce the autoregression model.

Linear regression represents an expected value estimation method, conditioned by a dependent variable  $Y$ , given values of others independent variables

$$X_1, \dots, X_k: \mathbb{E}[Y | X_1, \dots, X_k] \quad (4.1)$$

These values are defined as regressors.

The linear regression model is

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + u_i \quad (4.2)$$

where:

- $i$  change between observations,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ;
- $Y_i$  is the dependent variable;
- $X_i$  is the independent variable or regressor;
- $\beta_0 + \beta_1 X$  is the regression line or population regression function;
- $\beta_0$  is the intercept value of the regression line;
- $\beta_1$  is the slope of the regression line;
- $u_i$  is the random error.

Estimated regression model is

$$\hat{Y}_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 X_i \quad (4.3)$$

With

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \quad (4.4)$$

$$\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x} \quad (4.5)$$

In some cases the regression can be considered already sufficient enough to determine the trend. But sometimes the Mann-Kendall<sup>2</sup> test must be properly executed after the regression, that is the basis for the analysis. Shortly, we could say that linear regression is useful to estimate tendency of the parameters, and Mann-Kendall test to estimate significance of the tendency. The choice about only regression or regression plus Mann-Kendall test depends mainly on the modeling of the investigation to be carried out, and then some conditions such as the availability of data, timing, costs.

<sup>2</sup> The Mann-Kendall (M-K) Test is a simple test for trend. Mann-Kendall is a non-parametric test and as such, it is not dependent upon: The magnitude of data, Assumptions of distribution (does not have to have a normal / bell shape distribution), Missing data or Irregularly spaced monitoring periods. Mann-Kendall assesses whether a time-ordered data set exhibits an increasing or decreasing trend, within a predetermined level of significance. Using one of the test, or using a combination of both, five types of trend tests are possible (as presented in the following table)

	Not Adjusted for X	Adjusted for X
Nonparametric	Mann-Kendall trend test on Y	Mann-Kendall trend test on residuals R from LOWESS of Y on X
Mixed	---	Mann-Kendall trend test on residuals R from regression of Y on X
Parametric	Regression of Y on T	Regression of Y on X and T

The table uses the following notation:

- Y = the random response variable of interest in the trend test,
- X = an exogenous variable expected to affect the value of Y,
- R = the residuals from a regression or LOWESS of Y versus X, and
- T = time (often expressed in years).

Mann-Kendall is frequently used for analysis on climate time series, which is the argument of this article. So if we refer to trends in flood flows: Y would be streamflow, X would be the precipitation amount, and R would be called the precipitation-adjusted flow (the duration of precipitation used must be appropriate to the flow variable under consideration. For example, if Y is the annual flood peak from a 25 km<sup>2</sup> basin then X might be the 1-hour maximum rainfall, whereas if Y is the annual flood peak for a 25000 km<sup>2</sup> basin then X might be the 24-hour maximum rainfall).

Mann-Kendall test is related with a statistical hypothesis testing. The null hypothesis H<sub>0</sub> is that there is no trend in the time series. The three alternative hypotheses are that there is a negative trend, a non-null trend, or a positive trend.

Decision	True Situation	
	No trend. H <sub>0</sub> true.	Trend exists. H <sub>0</sub> false.
Fail to reject H <sub>0</sub> . "No trend"	Probability = 1-α	(Type II error) β
Reject H <sub>0</sub> . "Trend"	(Type I error) significance level α	(Power) 1-β

Probabilities associated with possible outcomes of a trend test.  
 $\alpha$  = Prob (reject H<sub>0</sub> | H<sub>0</sub> true) and  $1 - \beta$  = Prob (reject H<sub>0</sub> | H<sub>0</sub> false)

The hypothesis testing is performed according to a predetermined level of significance, in a manner that the test assumes meaning or not. A p-value less than the predetermined significance indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected, i.e. that there is a trend in our time series.

## 5. AUTOREGRESSION.

### 5.1 BASIS.

We state that data at particular point of time are (probably highly) correlated with the value that precede and/or succeed.

The creation of an autoregressive model generates a new predictor variable by using the Y variable lagged one or more periods.

$$y_t = f(y_{t-1}, y_{t-2}, \dots, y_{t-p}, \varepsilon_t) \quad (5.1)$$

Dependent variable is a function of itself at the previous moment of period or time.

The most often seen form of the equation is a linear form:

$$y_t = b_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p b_i y_{t-i} + e_t \quad (5.2)$$

where:

$y_t$  the dependent variable values at the moment  $t$ ,

$y_{t-i}$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ ) the dependent variable values at the moment  $t-i$ ,

$b_0, b_i$  ( $i=1, \dots, p$ ) regression coefficient,

$p$  autoregression rank,

$e_t$  disturbance term.

$$b = \begin{bmatrix} b_0 \\ b_1 \\ \vdots \\ b_p \end{bmatrix} \quad y = \begin{bmatrix} y_{p+1} \\ y_{p+2} \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{bmatrix} \quad X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & y_p & y_{p-1} & \dots & y_1 \\ 1 & y_{p+1} & y_p & & y_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 1 & y_{n-1} & y_{n-2} & & y_{n-p} \end{bmatrix} \quad (5.3)$$

A first-order autoregressive model is concerned with only the correlation between consecutive values in a series.

$$y_t = b_0 + b_1 y_{t-1} + e_t \quad (5.4)$$

A second-order autoregressive model considers the effect of relationship between consecutive values in a series as well as the correlation between values two periods apart.

$$y_t = b_0 + b_1 y_{t-1} + b_2 y_{t-2} + e_t \quad (5.5)$$

The selection of an appropriate autoregressive model is not an easy task.

Once a model is selected and OLS method is used to obtain estimates of the parameters, the next step would be to eliminate those parameters which do not contribute significantly.

$$H_0; \beta_p = 0 \quad (5.6)$$

(The highest-order parameter does not contribute to the prediction of  $Y_t$ )

$$H_1; \beta_p \neq 0 \quad (5.7)$$

(The highest-order parameter is significantly meaningful)

$$Z = \frac{b_p}{S(b_p)} \quad (5.8)$$

using an alpha level of significance, the decision rule is to reject  $H_0$  if

$$Z > Z_\alpha \quad (5.9)$$

or if

$$-Z < -Z_\alpha \quad (5.10)$$

and not to reject  $H_0$  if

$$-Z_\alpha \leq Z \leq Z_\alpha \quad (5.11)$$

Here a short table with values of  $Z_\alpha$

$Z_{0,1} = 1,645$
$Z_{0,05} = 1,960$
$Z_{0,02} = 2,236$
$Z_{0,01} = 2,576$
$Z_{0,001} = 3,291$

If the null hypothesis is NOT rejected we may conclude that the selected model contains too many estimated parameters. The highest-order term then be deleted and a new autoregressive model would be obtained through least-squares regression. A test of the hypothesis that the “new” highest-order term is 0 would then be repeated.

This testing and modeling procedure continues until we reject  $H_0$ . When this occurs, we know that our highest-order parameter is significant and we are ready to use this model.

## 5.2 CASE STUDY.

### 5.2.1 THE MODEL.

Referring to the paper wrote about extreme events in Italy (Climate events and insurance demand - the effect of potentially catastrophic events on insurance demand in Italy, G. Rosso, A. Chieppa, A. Ricca, with C. D. Pronzato and I. Pecetto, 2014).

We used a complete database with daily climate observations. The database was processed and modified in order to have: first, a smaller monthly database, second, a set with the only extreme events.

This database is shown in tab. 5.2.1.1. It represent extrem precipitation events in last eleven years in Italy. The first event assume the “month” number 1, so that di other events have a month numbered with a properly “jump”, usefull to draw correctly in a chart, and to calculate a frequency and the “distance” between each single event.

The tab. 5.2.1.1 show also the amount of precipitation in millimeters. You can note that there are no events with precipitations less than 100 mm. This was the threshold assumed in the past research. Substantially, in that research the threshold was linear, as shown in fig. 3.4. Because the study of the regression, seems to be incompatible with charts like 3.5 or 3.6.

This is the minimum dataset required for an autoregression analysis.

month	precip mm	month	precip mm
1	200	94	800
8	396	95	517
9	280	99	363
24	517	102	195,2
40	150	106	542
43	203	107	927
45	154	119	899
58	200	128	405
65	312	130	601
70	372	131	400
79	195,2	133	570
82	225	137	130
84	381	139	300
86	355	140	520
93	230	141	500
>>>>>		142	1355

Tab. 5.2.1.1

As said, you can note that the column “month” jumps. In Our case this is not a problem because the autoregression model correltes the observations among them, properly shiftet for the number of periods we want to analize. But there could be cases in which also the “empty” observation plays an important role. This could be for reinsurance, where the threshold represent the excess amount and the zero items could have significance if the Company payed nothing). We could explain this approach with a very simple example.

Let the series  $x(t)$  be observed, with  $t = (1, \dots, 12)$

1	200
2	30
3	40
4	120
5	80
6	110
7	180
8	55
9	190
10	110
11	20
12	110

Tab. 5.2.1.2

Using the POT peaks over threshold method on order to save the only observations exceeding 100 of value, the result is shown in the following Tab. 5.2.1.3.

1	200
2	–
3	–
4	120
5	–
6	110
7	180
8	–
9	190
10	110
11	–
12	110

Tab. 5.2.1.3

As said, this dataset can be considered in two different ways:

<b>tab A</b>	1	200	<b>tab B</b>	1	200
	4	120		2	0
	6	110		3	0
	7	180		4	120
	9	190		5	0
	10	110		6	110
	12	110		7	180
				8	0
				9	190
				10	110
				11	0
				12	110

Tab. 5.2.1.4 – 5.2.1.4.bis

These concepts are well described by Stuart Coles, from Bristol University.  
Fig. 5.2.1.1. shows an example of chart that represent precipitations.




Fig. 5.2.1.1 Source: S. Coles, Bristol University

Events under the threshold are dropped in Fig. 5.2.1.2.




Fig. 5.2.1.2: S. Coles, Bristol University

What we need is to consider these events consequential among them.

The Tab A is good for our scopes, and easy treatable with the Autoregression method. With this dataset we can draw a scatterplot and we can conduct a prior analysis in order to evidence if a trend is present in our time series.

The scatterplot of data shows an increasing trend (Fig. 5.2.1.3).

The regression was calculated as said in par. 4, and the equation of the regression line is

$$y = 14,78x + 189,14 \quad (5.2.1.1)$$


One of the condition in order to make a good autoregression analysis is that we need to detrend our series; one of the reason is to be able to obtain meaningful sample statistics such as means, variances, and correlations with other variables. Such statistics are useful as descriptors of future behavior only if the series is stationary. For example, if the series is consistently increasing over time, the sample mean and variance will grow with the size of the sample, and they will always

underestimate the mean and variance in future periods. And if the mean and variance of a series are not well-defined, then neither are its correlations with other variables. For this reason you should be cautious about trying to extrapolate regression models fitted to nonstationary data. But many analysis uses the original time series not detrended. The reason could be found in the values contained in the database, which propriety and behaviour drives to prefer this kind of analysis. We will use the autocorrelation for both, trended and detrended time series; and we will compare the results.

Many alternative methods are available for detrending. Simple linear trend in mean can be removed by subtracting the least-squares-fit straight line calculated with regression.

Therefore the equation (5.2.1.1) is useful to do detrending procedure. Many statistical software do this operation automatically, but even in Excel a simply formula can resolve this problem. For time series trends, Excel treats the equation as a function of observation number, so that the first observation is 1, the second is 2; and so on. It is necessary to add a column with these observation numbers to support the trend calculations.

Figure 5.2.1.3 shows the method of calculation, with the formula used for detrending. It's easy to recognize into the formula the parameters of the regression line. The new detrended series is then shifted for three periods. These data will be used in autoregression analysis.



	A	B	C	D
	month	precip mm	obs number	detrend
1				
2	1	200	1	-1,92232
3	6	996	2	81,07
4	9	260	3	19,9246
5	24	517	4	108,249
6	40	150	5	-42,9745
7	43	203	6	-26,9311
8	45	154	7	-47,3684
9	58	200	8	-34,924
10	65	312	9	-3,15371
11	70	372	10	10,6054
12	79	195,2	11	-44,5013
13	82	225	12	-38,6085
14	88	984	13	-1,07988

Fig. 5.2.1.3




Fig. 5.2.1.4






Fig. 5.2.1.5

The scatterplot of the detrended series is pictured in figure 5.2.1.5.

The first step to use the autoregression model is to replicate all the independent variables, one for each period you think useful for the analysis. The key is to copy data near the original data, but one-period shifted. As said, this operation can be replicated even if you have di amount of shifted periods you want to analyze.

In Fig. 5.2.1.6 you can see the result: the Tab 5.2.1.1 integrated with the series detrended from the Fig. 5.2.1.5, plus the shifting action to generate a numbers of other variables useful to perform an adequate autoregressive analysis. The data at the bottom of the table will be never used. The data at the top will be used in correlation to the period of the autoregression you need to perform.

In this model are used detrended data calculated (Fig. 5.2.1.4), but the procedure is the same even with original data not detrended.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	month	precip mm	#	detr	X1	X2	X3
2	1	200	1	-1,922			
3	8	396	2	81,07	-1,922		
4	9	280	3	19,925	81,07	-1,922	
5	24	517	4	108,25	19,925	81,07	-1,922
6	40	150	5	-42,97	108,25	19,925	81,07
7	43	203	6	-26,93	-42,97	108,25	19,925
8	45	154	7	-47,37	-26,93	-42,97	108,25
9	58	200	8	-34,93	-47,37	-26,93	-42,97
10	65	312	9	-3,154	-34,93	-47,37	-26,93
11	70	372	10	10,405	-3,154	-34,93	-47,37
12	79	195,2	11	-44,5	10,405	-3,154	-34,93
13	82	225	12	-38,61	-44,5	10,405	-3,154
14	84	381	13	-0,073	-38,61	-44,5	10,405
15	86	355	14	-10,37	-0,073	-38,61	-44,5
16	93	230	15	-44,02	-10,37	-0,073	-38,61
17	94	800	16	87,961	-44,02	-10,37	-0,073
18	95	517	17	17,393	87,961	-44,02	-10,37
19	99	363	18	-20,25	17,393	87,961	-44,02
20	102	195,2	19	-58,46	-20,25	17,393	87,961
21	106	542	20	11,813	-58,46	-20,25	17,393
22	107	927	21	85,578	11,813	-58,46	-20,25
23	119	899	22	74,801	85,578	11,813	-58,46
24	128	405	23	-23,45	74,801	85,578	11,813
25	130	601	24	10,506	-23,45	74,801	85,578
26	131	400	25	-28,4	10,506	-23,45	74,801
27	133	570	26	-0,596	-28,4	10,506	-23,45
28	137	130	27	-77,9	-0,596	-28,4	10,506
29	139	300	28	-50,25	-77,9	-0,596	-28,4
30	140	520	29	-15,82	-50,25	-77,9	-0,596
31	141	500	30	-20,95	-15,82	-50,25	-77,9
32	142	1355	31	109,32	-20,95	-15,82	-50,25
33					109,32	-20,95	-15,82
34						109,32	-20,95
35							109,32

Fig. 5.2.1.6

Analysis for one period with the variable “detr” as dependent and X1 as independent.

Note that because the shifting, the first value of “detr” is not considered.

The regression output is typical. All outputs are showed as attachments, both detrended and trended series.

The way to add and examine more periods is easy and is showed in Fig. 5.2.1.8.

At the top of the Excel sheet are data that will be used only if needed in relationship with the regressors at the right of the original data. Every single period  $i$  of the autoregressive method  $AR(i)$  it's none other than a single multiregression, with the exception on the first one that is a single regression with a dependent and an independent variable.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	month	precip mm	#	detr	X1	X2	X3
2	1	200	1	-1,922			
3	8	396	2	81,07	-1,922		
4	9	280	3	19,925	81,07	-1,922	
5	24	517	4	108,25	19,925	81,07	-1,922
6	40	150	5	-42,97	108,25	19,925	81,07
7	43	203	6	-26,93	-42,97	108,25	19,925
8	45	154	7	-47,37	-26,93	-42,97	108,25
9	58	200	8	-34,93	-47,37	-26,93	-42,97
10	65	312	9	-3,154	-34,93	-47,37	-26,93
11	70	372	10	10,405	-3,154	-34,93	-47,37
12	79	195,2	11	-44,5	10,405	-3,154	-34,93
13	82	225	12	-38,61	-44,5	10,405	-3,154
14	84	381	13	-0,073	-38,61	-44,5	10,405
15	86	355	14	-10,37	-0,073	-38,61	-44,5
16	93	230	15	-44,02	-10,37	-0,073	-38,61
17	94	800	16	87,961	-44,02	-10,37	-0,073
18	95	517	17	17,393	87,961	-44,02	-10,37
19	99	363	18	-20,25	17,393	87,961	-44,02
20	102	195,2	19	-58,46	-20,25	17,393	87,961
21	106	542	20	11,813	-58,46	-20,25	17,393
22	107	927	21	85,578	11,813	-58,46	-20,25
23	119	899	22	74,801	85,578	11,813	-58,46
24	128	405	23	-23,45	74,801	85,578	11,813
25	130	601	24	10,506	-23,45	74,801	85,578
26	131	400	25	-28,4	10,506	-23,45	74,801
27	133	570	26	-0,596	-28,4	10,506	-23,45
28	137	130	27	-77,9	-0,596	-28,4	10,506
29	139	300	28	-50,25	-77,9	-0,596	-28,4
30	140	520	29	-15,82	-50,25	-77,9	-0,596
31	141	500	30	-20,95	-15,82	-50,25	-77,9
32	142	1355	31	109,32	-20,95	-15,82	-50,25
33					109,32	-20,95	-15,82
34			NEVER USED --->			109,32	-20,95
35							109,32

Fig. 5.2.1.7

	A	B	C	F	G	H	I
1	month	precip mm	#	detr	X1	X2	X3
2	1	200	1	-1,922			
3	8	396	2	81,07	-1,922		
4	9	280	3	19,925	81,07	-1,922	
5	24	517	4	108,25	19,925	81,07	-1,922
6	40	150	5	-42,97	108,25	19,925	81,07
7	43	203	6	-26,93	-42,97	108,25	19,925
8	45	154	7	-47,37	-26,93	-42,97	108,25
9	58	200	8	-34,93	-47,37	-26,93	-42,97
10	65	312	9	-3,154	-34,93	-47,37	-26,93
11	70	372	10	10,405	-3,154	-34,93	-47,37
12	79	195,2	11	-44,5	10,405	-3,154	-34,93
13	82	225	12	-38,61	-44,5	10,405	-3,154
14	84	381	13	-0,073	-38,61	-44,5	10,405
15	86	355	14	-10,37	-0,073	-38,61	-44,5
16	93	230	15	-44,02	-10,37	-0,073	-38,61
17	94	800	16	87,961	-44,02	-10,37	-0,073
18	95	517	17	17,393	87,961	-44,02	-10,37
19	99	363	18	-20,25	17,393	87,961	-44,02
20	102	195,2	19	-58,46	-20,25	17,393	87,961
21	106	542	20	11,813	-58,46	-20,25	17,393
22	107	927	21	85,578	11,813	-58,46	-20,25
23	119	899	22	74,801	85,578	11,813	-58,46
24	128	405	23	-23,45	74,801	85,578	11,813
25	130	601	24	10,506	-23,45	74,801	85,578
26	131	400	25	-28,4	10,506	-23,45	74,801
27	133	570	26	-0,596	-28,4	10,506	-23,45
28	137	130	27	-77,9	-0,596	-28,4	10,506
29	139	300	28	-50,25	-77,9	-0,596	-28,4
30	140	520	29	-15,82	-50,25	-77,9	-0,596
31	141	500	30	-20,95	-15,82	-50,25	-77,9
32	142	1355	31	109,32	-20,95	-15,82	-50,25
33					109,32	-20,95	-15,82
34			NEVER USED --->			109,32	-20,95
35							109,32

Fig. 5.2.1.8

About the method to read regression output, here are few indications.

$R^2$  is between 0 and 1 and indicates the amount of variation of  $y_i$  around  $y_{\text{bar}}$  (its mean) that is explained by the regressors.

The ANOVA (analysis of variance) table splits the sum of squares into its components:

$$\text{Total sums of squares} = \text{Residual (or error) sum of squares} + \text{Regression (or explained) sum of squares.}$$

Thus

$$\sum_i (y_i - y_{\text{bar}})^2 = \sum_i (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2 + \sum_i (\hat{y}_i - y_{\text{bar}})^2 \quad (5.2.1.2)$$

where  $\hat{y}_i$  is the value of  $y_i$  predicted from the regression line and  $\bar{y}$  is the sample mean of  $y$ .

$$R^2 = 1 - \text{Residual SS} / \text{Total SS} \quad (\text{general formula for } R^2) \quad (5.2.1.3)$$

F gives the overall F-test of  $H_0: \beta_j = 0$  versus  $H_a$ : at least one of  $\beta_j$  does not equal zero. Excel computes F this as

$$F = [\text{Regression SS}/(k-1)] / [\text{Residual SS}/(n-k)] \quad (5.2.1.4)$$

Significance F has the associated P-value. If value  $> 0.05$ , we do not reject  $H_0$  at significance level 0.05. Significance F in general has a related Excel formula that is  $\text{FINV}(F, k-1, n-k)$  where  $k$  is the number of regressors including the intercept.

- Column "Coefficient" gives the least squares estimates of  $\beta_j$ .
- Column "Standard error" gives the standard errors (i.e. the estimated standard deviation) of the least squares estimates  $b_j$  of  $\beta_j$ .
- Column "t Stat" gives the computed t-statistic for  $H_0: \beta_j = 0$  against  $H_a: \beta_j \neq 0$ .
- This is the coefficient divided by the standard error. It is compared to a t with  $(n-k)$  degrees of freedom.  $N$  is the number of observations and  $k$  the number of regressors.
- Column "P-value" gives the p-value for test of  $H_0: \beta_j = 0$  against  $H_a: \beta_j \neq 0$ .
- This equals the  $\Pr\{|t| > t\text{-Stat}\}$  where  $t$  is a t-distributed random variable with  $n-k$  degrees of freedom and  $t\text{-Stat}$  is the computed value of the t-statistic given in the previous column. Note that this p-value is for a two-sided test. For a one-sided test divide this p-value by 2 (also checking the sign of the t-Stat).
- Columns "Lower 95%" and "Upper 95%" values define a 95% confidence interval for  $\beta_j$ .

We used Excel to perform the analysis, because Excel has a very large diffusion, a lot of tools designed for it are available, frequently for free, and costs for the program are very light if reported with others statistical programs, especially for students. But excel own particularity specs that is important to know:

- Excel restricts the number of regressors (only up to 16 regressors);
- Excel requires that all the regressor variables be in adjoining columns. You may need to move columns to ensure this;
- Excel standard errors and t-statistics and p-values are based on the assumption that the error is independent with constant variance (homoskedastic);
- Excel does not provide alternatives, such as heteroskedastic-robust or autocorrelation-robust standard errors and t-statistics and p-values;
- more specialized software are STATA, EVIEWS, SAS, LIMDEP, PC-TSP, and many others.

Now, let's see the output of detrended AR(1).

OUTPUT RIEPILOGO

Statistica della regressione	
R multiplo	0,148665849
R al quadrato	0,022101535
R al quadrato corretto	-0,012823411
Errore standard	52,17970381
Osservazioni	30

ANALISI VARIANZA

	gdl	SQ	MQ	F	Significatività F
Regressione	1	1723,018403	1723,018403	0,632829472	0,433012
Residuo	28	76236,2017	2722,721489		
Totale	29	77959,22011			

	Coefficienti	Errore standard	Stat t	Valore di significatività	Inferiore 95%	Superiore 95%	Inferiore 95,0%	Superiore 95,0%
Intercepta	1,382648743	9,543368813	0,144880573	0,885843027	-18,1661	20,931354	-18,16606	20,931354
Variabile X 1	0,161812235	0,203407989	0,795505797	0,433011776	-0,25485	0,5784746	-0,25485	0,5784746

Fig. 5.2.1.9

Standard deviation of data is 50,9 (form Descriptive Statistics). The standard error of the autoregression (52,17) and the t Stat (0,79) seems to tell us that the data are not so lagged as we expected. Also autoregressions with more periods drives to the same conclusions.

OUTPUT RIEPILOGO

Statistica della regressione	
R multiplo	0,15496
R al quadrato	0,024012602
R al quadrato corretto	-0,051063352
Errore standard	51,74028171
Osservazioni	29

ANALISI VARIANZA

	gdl	SQ	MQ	F	Significatività F
Regressione	2	1712,481664	856,2408322	0,319844109	0,729079
Residuo	26	69603,47554	2677,056752		
Totale	28	71315,95721			

	Coefficienti	Errore standard	Stat t	Valore di significatività	Inferiore 95%	Superiore 95%	Inferiore 95,0%	Superiore 95,0%
Intercepta	-1,401310389	9,630257288	-0,14551121	0,885429498	-21,1966	18,393967	-21,19659	18,393967
Variabile X 1	0,163426393	0,205573011	0,794979805	0,433822783	-0,25913	0,5859878	-0,259135	0,5859878
Variabile X 2	-0,013931734	0,206107918	-0,067594365	0,946625678	-0,43759	0,4097292	-0,437593	0,4097292

Fig. 5.2.1.10

OUTPUT RIEPILOGO

Statistica della regressione	
R multiplo	0,327250905
R al quadrato	0,107093155
R al quadrato corretto	-0,004520201
Errore standard	51,3325957
Osservazioni	28

ANALISI VARIANZA

	<i>gdl</i>	<i>SQ</i>	<i>MQ</i>	<i>F</i>	Significatività <i>F</i>
Regressione	3	7584,959273	2528,319758	0,959501256	0,427849
Residuo	24	63240,84915	2635,035381		
Totale	27	70825,80842			

	Coefficienti	Errore standard	Stat <i>t</i>	Valore di significatività	Inferiore 95%	Superiore 95%	Inferiore 95,0%	Superiore 95,0%
Intercetta	-2,141059352	9,783612282	-0,218841394	0,828623951	-22,3334	18,051324	-22,33344	18,051324
Variabile X 1	0,152825569	0,216790797	0,704944908	0,487630083	-0,29461	0,6002598	-0,294609	0,6002598
Variabile X 2	0,048112684	0,208573612	0,230674838	0,81952248	-0,38236	0,4785875	-0,382362	0,4785875
Variabile X 3	-0,316125243	0,20466228	-1,544618984	0,135523417	-0,73853	0,1062769	-0,738527	0,1062769

Fig. 5.2.1.11

The assumption was that climate extreme events can have a relationship, a lagged effect, because there is an element, or more than one, that influence results, so that the result of one time period tends to spill over into the next period or periods. We know that probably exogenous effects are influencing frequency and intensity of events, and that seems to be real an accumulation situation. But the analysis with a detrended series is so borderline, even with a conclusion to a negative direction, that probably the “noise” that define the trend has characteristics so particular that a detrending action is no needed.

In effect the autoregression analysis performed with the original data give other results.

Standard deviation of the descriptive statistics (271,6) is greater than standard error we get with autoregression with one period. So the original data seems to be lagged.

OUTPUT RIEPILOGO

Statistica della regressione	
R multiplo	0,32803921
R al quadrato	0,10760973
R al quadrato corretto	0,07573865
Errore standard	262,491897
Osservazioni	30

ANALISI VARIANZA

	<i>gdl</i>	<i>SQ</i>	<i>MQ</i>	<i>F</i>	Significatività <i>F</i>
Regressione	1	232641,1	232641,148	3,376406518	0,07677
Residuo	28	1929256	68901,9959		
Totale	29	2161897			

	Coefficienti	Errore standard	Stat <i>t</i>	Valore di significatività	Inferiore 95%	Superiore 95%	Inferiore 95,0%	Superiore 95,0%
Intercetta	267,592408	102,0505	2,62215706	0,013972464	58,55146	476,63336	58,551459	476,63336
Variabile X 1	0,41949996	0,228299	1,83750007	0,0767705	-0,04815	0,8871498	-0,04815	0,8871498

Fig. 5.2. 1.12

We should have a proof with the correlation analysis.

detrended			trended		
	<i>data</i>	<i>X1</i>		<i>data</i>	<i>X1</i>
data		1	data		1
X1	0,148665849	1	X1	0,32803921	1

Fig. 5.2.1.13

In both the correlation is positive, as expected. As in the detrended data value is less than 0.3, the correlation is weak. But in the correlation calculated with original data the correlation is just a little bit better, a moderate correlation that follow the results of autoregression. With two and three periods, also the autoregression with original data tell us that the relationship between the events seems to be non existent.

#### OUTPUT RIEPILOGO

Statistica della regressione	
R multiplo	0,33304455
R al quadrato	0,11091867
R al quadrato corretto	0,0425278
Errore standard	271,805443
Osservazioni	29

#### ANALISI VARIANZA

	<i>gdl</i>	<i>SQ</i>	<i>MQ</i>	<i>F</i>	Significatività F
Regressione	2	239636,4	119818,205	1,621834416	0,21689
Residuo	26	1920833	73878,1987		
Totale	28	2160470			

	<i>Coefficienti</i>	<i>Errore standard</i>	<i>Stat t</i>	<i>Valore di significatività</i>	<i>Inferiore 95%</i>	<i>Superiore 95%</i>	<i>Inferiore 95,0%</i>	<i>Superiore 95,0%</i>
Intercetta	244,810699	125,7253	1,94718708	0,062389478	-13,6214	503,24278	-13,62138	503,24278
Variabile X 1	0,40025971	0,256212	1,5622227	0,130326579	-0,12639	0,9269104	-0,126391	0,9269104
Variabile X 2	0,07408742	0,253488	0,29227157	0,772398608	-0,44697	0,59514	-0,446965	0,59514

Fig. 5.2.1.14

#### OUTPUT RIEPILOGO

Statistica della regressione	
R multiplo	0,3494325
R al quadrato	0,12210307
R al quadrato corretto	0,01236595
Errore standard	279,507447
Osservazioni	28

#### ANALISI VARIANZA

	<i>gdl</i>	<i>SQ</i>	<i>MQ</i>	<i>F</i>	Significatività F
Regressione	3	260784,1	86928,0242	1,112687067	0,363433
Residuo	24	1874986	78124,4132		
Totale	27	2135770			

	<i>Coefficienti</i>	<i>Errore standard</i>	<i>Stat t</i>	<i>Valore di significatività</i>	<i>Inferiore 95%</i>	<i>Superiore 95%</i>	<i>Inferiore 95,0%</i>	<i>Superiore 95,0%</i>
Intercetta	293,363292	146,471	2,00287647	0,056609992	-8,93797	595,66455	-8,937966	595,66455
Variabile X 1	0,40810533	0,263935	1,54623378	0,135133901	-0,13663	0,9528405	-0,13663	0,9528405
Variabile X 2	0,10155194	0,280089	0,36257076	0,720098983	-0,47652	0,6796264	-0,476523	0,6796264
Variabile X 3	-0,1493143	0,261725	-0,5705011	0,573640953	-0,68949	0,3908592	-0,689488	0,3908592

Fig. 5.2.1.15

### 5.2.2 TESTING THE MODEL.

We have demonstrated that a the original dataset has a lightly autocorrelation with one period. Nothing concern other periods and the detrended series.

The model building need another important step: the validation.

Model validation is a very important step in the model building sequence. Often the validation of a model seems to consist of nothing more than quoting the  $R^2$  statistic from the fit. But we have seen that in our specific case  $R^2$  is particularly low. This is not necessarily bad because  $R^2$  value does not guarantee that the model fits the data well. So, at this point we need to do a graphical residual analysis.

The difference between the observed value of the dependent variable ( $y$ ) and the predicted value ( $\hat{y}$ ) is called the residual ( $e$ ). Each data point has one residual.

Residual = Observed value - Predicted value

$$e = y - \hat{y} \quad (5.2.2.1)$$

The residual plot shows the residuals on the vertical axis and the independent variable on the horizontal axis. If the points in a residual plot are randomly dispersed around the horizontal axis, a linear regression model is appropriate for the data; otherwise, a non-linear model is more appropriate.

The residual plot of our model is shown in the figure below (Fig. 5.2.2.1).




Fig. 5.2.2.1

The residual plot shows a fairly random. This random pattern indicates that a linear model provides a decent fit to the data. The residuals should not be either systematically high or low. So, the residuals should be centered on zero throughout the range of fitted values. In other words, the model is correct on average for all fitted values.

Nonetheless we have a situation particularly good, and the residual plot seems to confirm that the model describe fairly well our time series, the plot show in the middle of X axis a point particularly high, that seems to be over the average and is distinctly over the other values.

Displaying the data related to this point we could see that the value is 500 and the difference (residual) is 877.65 (Fig. 5.2.2.2 and Fig. 5.2.2.3).




Fig. 5.2.2.3

Osservazione	Y prevista	Residui	Residui standard	Percentile	Y
1	351,4924	44,50760128	0,17255926	1,666666667	130
2	433,71439	-153,7143899	-0,595962053	5	150
3	385,0524	131,9476049	0,511570618	8,333333333	154
4	484,47388	-334,4738845	-1,296779976	11,66666667	195,2
5	330,5174	-127,517401	-0,49439439	15	195,2
6	352,7509	-198,7508986	-0,770571927	18,33333333	200
7	332,1954	-132,1954008	-0,512531341	21,66666667	203
8	351,4924	-39,49239872	-0,153114949	25	225
9	398,47639	-26,4763937	-0,102650936	28,33333333	230
10	423,64639	-228,446391	-0,885703546	31,66666667	280
11	349,4788	-124,4787989	-0,482613506	35	300
12	361,9799	19,0201024	0,073742343	38,33333333	312
13	427,42189	-72,42189061	-0,280785024	41,66666667	355
14	416,51489	-186,5148918	-0,723132024	45	363
15	364,0774	435,9226026	1,690104156	48,33333333	372
16	603,19237	-86,19237184	-0,334174197	51,66666667	381
17	484,47388	-121,4738845	-0,47096323	55	396
18	419,87089	-224,6708914	-0,871065655	58,33333333	400
19	349,4788	192,5212011	0,746418929	61,66666667	405
20	494,96138	432,0386166	1,675045655	65	500
21	656,46887	242,5311339	0,940311135	68,33333333	517
22	644,72287	-239,7228674	-0,929423279	71,66666667	517
23	437,48989	163,5101105	0,633940786	75	520
24	519,71188	-119,7118808	-0,464131811	78,33333333	542
25	435,39239	134,6076102	0,521883656	81,66666667	570
26	506,70738	-376,7073821	-1,460522369	85	601
27	322,1274	-22,12740186	-0,085789573	88,33333333	800
28	393,44239	126,5576058	0,490673193	91,66666667	899
29	485,73238	14,26761562	0,0553166	95	927
30	477,34239	877,6576147	3,402743454	98,33333333	1355

Fig. 5.2.2.2



This point is referred to the last observation with 1355 in the 142nd month. After the procedure of identification of peaks, the residual plot help us to find outliers. This event is clearly an outliers. As wrote in a previous paper (G. Rosso, Outliers emphasis on cluster analysis - the use of squared Euclidean distance and fuzzy clustering to detect outliers in a dataset, 2014) outliers can became a precious source of information. In our case we can note that the anomalous event is the last of our time series, and this bring us to the need to persist in carefully observation of events because probably in a close future we could have other anomalous events.

## 6 CONCLUSIONS.

Autocorrelation, trend, autoregression. These items are strictly lagged among them. When we try to understand events, frequently time series that describe them have characteristics of autocorrelation. This means that every single events could be influenced by the previous event, and often not with the only one previous, but with many.

As a natural continuation of the research “Climate events and insurance demand - The effect of potentially catastrophic events on insurance demand in Italy” we tried to answer to these questions: these kind of time series have characteristic of autocorrelation? How can we manage this events? There is the opportunity to assess them correctly and to do predictions?

The answer to the first question is: yes, frequently risk time series, and climate risk time series in particular, have events correlated among them.

The answer to the second question was explained in this article. We suggested to manage first the amount of the events, because probably not the entire time series could be useful for analysis. So if only events exceeding a threshold are useful for the analysis, there are methods dedicated to this work of selection. After that, we suggest to consider that events could be correlated, and that a kind of “noise” can influence the trend of the time series. We can image this “noise” as a persistence of any kind.

What supposed often is difficult to demonstrate. The time series object of study must be treated carefully and every result must be interpreted. In our example, autoregression was calculated with the data of the cited research. The scatterplot shows evident fluctuations especially in the last period, however the trend is clear. We know that climate time series are affected by a persistence noise. The world climate is changing, and related risks too. The change seems to be very fast, progressive and exponential increasing. The effect of our anthropogenic activities are subjected to accumulation. This is the “noise” we are speaking. And the increasing trend seems to be in that direction. But if we see the results of the autoregression calculated with our climate data, this assumption is not evident. The time series was detrended before the autoregression calculus, but results tell us that the original time series behave than the detrended series, and only for one period. Results of the autoregression calculated (both on the detrended time series and the original one) seem to suggest that the only effect that evoke the presence of this noise is really the trend. Besides the strong fluctuation of the data values produces outputs with feeble significance of the R squared. But stronger evidence are in the residual analysis. This kind of analysis help to verify the goodness of the model, but also help to identify outliers present in time series.

Definitively we can assert that in a climate time series is present a noise that drive to a correlation between periods. The process proposed help to define if the series must be detrended, how many periods are lagged, if model is good enough, if there are outliers in the series and what is their magnitude. The process is long, but supply a lot of informations useful to provide directions about the analysis.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

*Matteo Barigozzi*, LSE London School of Economics and Political Science;

*Esterina Masiello*, UCBL Claude Bernard University Lyon 1 - ISFA Institut de science financière et d'assurances;

*Keith Porter*, University of Colorado Boulder and SPA Risk LLC, Denver CO USA.

## REFERENCES.

- IPCC, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - Climate Change 2013, WG1 Working Group I, 5th Assessment Report;
- IPCC, Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation, 2012;
- C. Cacciamani, Eventi estremi, entità e ricorrenza, *Ecoscienza*, n. 5 - 2013;
- Ministero dell'Ambiente Italiano, Classificazione dei Comuni Italiani in base al Livello di attenzione per il Rischio Idrogeologico, Servizio per la difesa del territorio, 2000;
- R. Manzato, Lo stato dell'arte sull'assicurazione dei rischi catastrofali, ANIA, 2014;
- OECD Governments, OECD Recommendation on good practices for enhanced risk awareness and education on insurance issues, 2008;
- Courbage, W. R. Stahel, The Geneva Reports Risk and Insurance Research, Extreme events and insurance: 2011 annus horribilis, n. 5 - 2012;
- Rosenzweig, A. Iglesias, X. B. Yang, P. R. Epstein, E. Chivian, Climate change and extreme weather events - Implications for food production, plant diseases, and pests, University of Nebraska – Lincoln, NASA Publications - National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 2001;
- S. Hallegatte, Accounting for Extreme Events in the Economic Assessment of Climate Change, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, 2005;
- G. Moles, J. R. Banga, K. Keller, A. S. Lieber, Global optimization of climate control problems using evolutionary and stochastic algorithms, 2003;
- P. J. Crutzen, Benvenuti nell'Antropocene. L'uomo ha cambiato il clima, la Terra entra in una nuova era, Mondadori, 2005;
- P. R. Kleindorfer, Interdependency of Science and Risk Finance in Catastrophe Insurance and Climate Change, INSEAD, 2010;
- D.R. Helsel, R.M. Hirsch, Statistical Methods in Water Resources, U.S. Geological Survey, Techniques of Water-Resources Investigations Book 4, Chapter A3, 2010;
- R. M. Wood, M. Drayton, A. Berger, P. Burgess, T. Wright, Catastrophe loss modelling of storm-surge flood risk in eastern England, The Royal Society, 2005;
- Diers, Stochastic modelling of catastrophe risks in DFA models;
- J. Gallergher, Learning about an infrequent event: evidence from flood insurance take-up in the US, Dpt. Of Economics University of California at Berkeley, 2010;
- E. Masiello, Climate Change and Risk Management, Université Lyon 1;
- H. Apel, A. H. Thielen, B. Merz, G. Blöschl, A probabilistic modelling system for assessing flood risks, Springer, 2003;
- Rahayu, Identification of Climate Change with Generalized Extreme Value (GEV) Distribution Approach, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 423 (2013) 012026, 2013;

- J. Rinker, Peak-over-Threshold Method for Extreme Values, Duke University, 2013;
- J. Kyselýa, J. Picekb, R. Beranováa, Estimating extremes in climate change simulations using the peaks-over-threshold method with a non-stationary threshold, *Global and Planetary Change*, Volume 72, Issues 1–2, May 2010, Pages 55–68;
- S. Das, S. P. Simonovic, Assessment of Uncertainty in Flood Flows under Climate Change Impacts in the Upper Thames River Basin, Canada, *British Journal of Environment & Climate Change*, 2(4): 318-338, 2012;
- P. Northrop, Marginal modelling of spatially-dependent non-stationary extremes using threshold modelling, University College London, Environmental Extremes, Royal Statistical Society, 2010;
- A. Giddens, The Politics of Climate Change, Polity Press Cambridge, 2009;
- E. Bee Dagum, Analisi delle Serie Storiche, Modellistica, previsione e scomposizione, Springer, 2002;
- A. Smolka, Natural disasters and the challenge of extreme events: risk management from an insurance perspective, The Royal Society, 2006;
- A. Smolka, Natural catastrophes: causes, trends and risk management. The challenge of submarine mass movements an insurance perspective, *Norwegian Journal of Geology*;
- S. Coles, L. Pericchi, Anticipating Catastrophes through Extreme Value Modeling;
- S. Coles, A. Davison, Statistical Modelling of Extreme Values, 2008, based on ‘An Introduction to Statistical Modeling of Extreme Values’ (by Stuart Coles, Springer, 2001);
- A. Chieppa, A. Ricca, G. Rosso, Climate events and insurance demand - The effect of potentially catastrophic events on insurance demand in Italy, with C. D. Pronzato, I. Pecetto, University of Turin, Department of Economics and Statistics «Cognetti de Martiis», 2014;
- G. Rosso, Outliers emphasis on cluster analysis - the use of squared euclidean distance and fuzzy clustering to detect outliers in a dataset, 2014;
- K. Porter, A Beginner’s Guide to Fragility, Vulnerability, and Risk, University of Colorado Boulder and SPA Risk LLC, Denver CO USA, 2015.