Monte Carlo Pricing of Temperature Weather Derivatives.

By Jorge C Gibert

Submitted as Partial Fulfillment of the Graduate Certification in

Quantitative Environmental Finance

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Florida International University, Spring 2024

1. INTRODUCTION

A weather derivative is a financial instrument designed to hedge or speculate on the risks associated with adverse weather conditions. Unlike traditional financial assets such as stocks or bonds, the value of weather derivatives is linked to atmospheric variables like temperature, precipitation, wind speed, or other meteorological factors (Brewer, 2000). Industries that are vulnerable to weather variability use weather derivatives to hedge against weather-related risks. These industries include agriculture, energy, tourism, and insurance.

Weather derivative contracts typically involve two parties: a contract buyer and a contract seller. The buyer gets protection against weather-related risks by securing a prearranged payout based on specific weather conditions. The seller assumes the associated risk in exchange for a premium from the buyer (Hartmann & Geyer, 2005). Usually, weather derivatives exist, each tied to specific weather parameters like Temperature, Precipitation, Wind, etc.

Temperature Derivatives: Temperature derivatives rely on temperature indexes such as Heating Degree Days (HDD) or Cooling Degree Days (CDD) to measure deviations from predetermined temperature thresholds. For example, during the winter season, the buyer of an HDD contract might be entitled to a payout if the average temperature falls below a certain level during the winter months, being compensated for the loss associated with reduced heating demand.

Precipitation Derivatives: These derivatives are linked to measures of rainfall or snowfall in specific regions. They could be used by agricultural producers to hedge against losses resulting from drought or excessive precipitation.

Wind Derivatives: Wind derivatives are associated with wind speed or wind energy production and are frequently used by wind farm operators to manage revenue volatility stemming from fluctuations in wind conditions.

By allowing market participants to transfer and manage these risks, weather derivatives contribute to overall market efficiency and stability (Weng & Zeng, 2017). The purpose of this paper is to develop a method, to price Temperature Weather derivatives using Montecarlo Modeling.

Brief History of Temperature Weather Derivatives

The history of temperature weather derivatives dates back to the last decade of the 20th century when financial markets began to recognize the economic impact of weather fluctuations on various industries.

The inception of weather derivatives began in July 1996 with the first over-the-counter (OTC) trade written by Aquila Energy, which developed a dual-commodity hedge for Consolidated Edison Co. Since then, OTC trading of weather derivatives has persisted, gaining momentum from 1997 onward. As market demand expanded, the Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME) played a pivotal role by introducing exchange-traded weather futures and options, including contracts based on temperature indexes on September 22, 1999 (Brewer, 2000). These contracts provided market participants with a standardized mechanism for managing temperature-related risks. After its introduction, Temperature weather derivatives gained traction among corporations seeking to mitigate the financial impact of weather fluctuations. These derivatives became increasingly popular in industries sensitive to temperature variations, such as energy utilities, agricultural producers, and retail businesses. The early 2000s witnessed further innovation and expansion in the temperature derivatives market, with the development of sophisticated pricing models and risk management strategies.

It is estimated that about 30% of the U.S. economy is directly affected by the weather. CME Group offers Weather futures and options which are index-based products geared to average seasonal and monthly weather in 18 cities around the world (CME Group Inc., 2021)



Percent of Total Volume

Fig. 1.1. Weather derivative percent of Total value by market. Source: CME Group Inc, 2021

Academic research contributed to the advancement of mathematical models for pricing temperature derivatives, enhancing the understanding of temperature dynamics and their impact on derivative values (Hartmann & Geyer, 2005) (Considine, 2000). As the temperature derivatives market matured, it diversified to include a range of contract types and underlying indexes. Heating Degree Days (HDD) and Cooling Degree Days (CDD) emerged as the predominant indexes used in temperature derivatives, reflecting the demand for heating and cooling services based on temperature thresholds.

In recent years, temperature weather derivatives have become an integral component of risk management strategies for businesses exposed to temperature-related risks. The market continues to evolve with the introduction of new products and innovations aimed at addressing the diverse needs of market participants



CME Weather Futures & Options Volumes

Figure 1.2. CME Option and Future Traded Values 2019-2020. Source CME Group Inc., 2021

Features of Temperature Weather Derivatives Contracts

Temperature derivatives are characterized by several features:

- 1. **Settlement Mechanism:** Settlement of temperature derivatives can occur in cash or physical delivery. Cash settlement involves a payment based on the difference between the actual and reference temperature multiplied by a predetermined contract value.
- 2. **Underlying Index:** The most common indexes used in temperature derivatives are Heating Degree Days (HDD) and Cooling Degree Days (CDD). HDD measures deviations below a reference

temperature, indicating heating demand, while CDD measures deviations above a reference temperature, indicating cooling demand. For a given day $\in N$

$$CDD_n = (T_n - 65)^+$$
 1.1
 $HDD_n = (65 - T_n)^+$ 1.2

Where T_n is the average of the maximum daily temperature (T_{max}) and the minimum daily temperature. In this paper, T_n was calculated as

$$T_n = \frac{T_{max} - T_{min}}{2}.$$
 1.3

3. **Contract Specifications:** Temperature derivatives specify the reference temperature, contract period, and payout structure. For example, a contract may pay out if the cumulative HDD during winter months exceeds a certain threshold (usually 65 degrees Fahrenheit in the US). The buyer of the option will receive a payout that is a function of the cumulative index over a period with a number of days *N*, i.e.

$$\xi = f(DD) \qquad 1.4$$

So DD for Heating (H_n , usually May 15 to October 15 for OTC) and Cooling season (C_n , usually November 15 to March 15 for OTC)

$$DD = H_n = HDD^N = \sum_{n=1}^{N} (T_n - 65)^+$$

$$DD = C_n = CDD^N = \sum_{n=1}^{N} (T_n - 65)^+$$
1.5

Two popular payoff functions are call options with caps and put options with floors. In the case of a call option with a cap, the payoff function is

$$\xi = \min\{\alpha(DD - K)^+, C\}$$
 1.7

Where α is the payout rate (Typically 2,500 or 5000 USD), and the cap *C*, 500,000 or 1000,000 USD, and *K*_c is the strike. See Figure 1.2 (*see Appendix 1 for Python code*)



Figure 1.2. Call option with K = \$750 and C = \$500,000

The payoff function for a put option with a payoff function



is shown in Figure 1.3.

Figure 1.3. Put option with Strike $K_P = 550 and Floor F = \$1000,000

2. MEAN-REVERSION AND THE ORNSTEIN-UHLENBECK PROCESS

2.1 Mean Reversion: Asset prices will eventually return to their long-term mean or average. This concept is grounded in the belief that asset prices and historical returns will gravitate toward a long-term average over time.

How It's Used:

Statistical Analysis: Investors use statistical tools like Z-scores to measure how far an asset price has deviated from its mean.

Volatility: Some traders and investors use mean reversion in the context of volatility, buying options when volatility is high with the expectation that it will revert to the mean.

Risk Management: Stop-loss orders and take-profit points can be typically set around the mean to manage potential losses and secure gains.

Algorithmic Trading: Quantitative analysts use mean reversion in algorithmic trading strategies, often using complex mathematical models to predict price movements.

Limitations of Mean-eversion

- Market Conditions: Mean reversion is less effective in strongly trending markets, where prices may not revert to the mean for extended periods.
- Transaction Costs: The strategy often involves frequent trading, which has a propensity for higher transaction costs.
- False Signals: Shorter time frames in particular are susceptible to market noise, which can generate false mean-reverting signals.
- Economic Events: Economic shocks or sudden news can disrupt mean-reverting patterns, leading to potential losses.
- Lack of Direction: Unlike trend-following strategies, mean reversion is non-directional, which may not suit all trading styles.

2.2 Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Process (U-O)

The Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process is a stationary Gauss–Markov process, which means that it is a Gaussian process, a Markov similar to a discrete-time AR(1) process (Doob, 1942).

The Black-Scholes equation (Øksendal, 1998), commonly used to price financial options, assumes that the underlying asset's price follows a geometric Brownian motion. This means that the price of the underlying moves in a continuous and normally distributed fashion over time. However, weather derivatives are based on underlying assets like temperature, rainfall, or wind speed, which do not exhibit the same characteristics as financial assets.

Weather variables often have non-normal distributions and exhibit patterns like seasonality and autocorrelation, which makes them more complex than financial assets (Wigley, 2006). Additionally, weather data can have jumps or discontinuities, such as sudden temperature changes due to weather events like storms, which are not captured by the continuous and smooth movements assumed in the Black-Scholes model.

Therefore, applying the Black-Scholes equation directly to weather derivatives would not accurately reflect the unique characteristics of weather-related data, leading to inaccurate pricing and risk assessment. Instead, models specifically designed for weather derivatives take into account the statistical properties and dynamics of weather variables to provide more accurate pricing and risk management.

The cyclical nature of the temperature time series justifies the use of a mean-reverting process in modeling its dynamics which can be done as an Ito process with a mean reverting O-U process.

$$dT_t = \kappa (\overline{T}_t - T_t) dt + \sigma_t dW_t t \qquad 2.1$$

Dornier and Queruel (Dornier and Queruel, 2000). Benth and Šaltytė-Benth (Benth, et. al., 2008), Benth and Benth (Benth and Saltyte-Benth, 2005)], Alaton et al. (Alaton, et. al., 2002) observed that in general the speed of mean reversion should be a function of time. However, the authors provided no evidence as no studies had been undertaken to compute the daily mean reversion as the process is very complex.

To capture fully the mean-reverting dynamics of the temperature, it is important to have the Expectation of the temperature T_t to approximate the long-term reverting average temperature \overline{T}_t . i.e.

$$Exp[T_t] \approx T_t$$
 2.2

Ito-Doeblin Formula

$$df(t,x) = f_t(t,x)dt + f_x(t,x)dx + \frac{1}{2}f_{xx}(t,x)dxdx \qquad 2.3$$

The function to be used is similar to the one used for the Cox-Ingersoll_Ross (CIR) (Bensoussan and Brouste, 2016) interest rate model, i.e.:

$$f(t,x) = e^{\kappa t}x, \qquad f_t(t,x) = \kappa e^{\kappa t}, f_x(t,x) = e^{\kappa t}, \qquad f_{xx}(t,x) = 0$$

$$d(e^{\kappa t}T_t) = df_t(t,T_t) + f_t(t,T_t)dt + f_x(t,T_t)dT_t + \frac{1}{2}f_{xx}(t,x)dT_t dT_t \qquad 2.4$$

$$d(e^{\kappa t}T_t) = \kappa e^{\kappa t}T_t dt + e^{\kappa t}dT_t + \frac{1}{2}(0)dT_t dT_t$$

$$d(e^{\kappa t}T_t) = \kappa e^{\kappa t}T_t dt + e^{\kappa t}\kappa(\overline{T}_t - T_t)dt + e^{\kappa t}\sigma_t dW_t$$

$$d(e^{\kappa t}T_t) = e^{\kappa t}\kappa(\overline{T}_t)dt + e^{\kappa t}\sigma_t dW_t \qquad 2.5$$

Integrating over $u \in t > s$

$$\int_{s}^{t} d(e^{\kappa t}T_{t}) = e^{\kappa t}T_{t} - e^{\kappa s}T_{s} = \int_{s}^{t} \kappa e^{\kappa u}\overline{T}_{u}du + \int_{s}^{t} e^{\kappa u}\sigma_{t}dW_{u} \qquad 2.6$$

$$e^{\kappa t}T_t = e^{\kappa s}T_s + \int_s^t \kappa e^{\kappa u}\overline{T}_u du + \int_s^t e^{\kappa u}\sigma_t dW_u$$
 2.7

Changing the base on the integral to $d\overline{T}_t$ and dividing by $e^{\kappa t}$

$$T_t = e^{-\kappa(t-s)}T_s + \int_s^t \kappa e^{-\kappa(t-u)} d\overline{T}_u + \int_s^t e^{-\kappa(t-u)} \sigma_t dW_u$$
 2.8

Integrating the second term on the right,

$$T_t = T_s e^{-\kappa(t-s)} + T_t e^{-\kappa(t-t)} - T_s e^{-\kappa(t-s)} + \int_s^t e^{-\kappa(t-u)} \sigma_t dW_u$$
 2.9

Grouping similar terms,

$$T_t = \overline{T}_t + (T_t - \overline{T}_s)e^{-\kappa(t-s)} + \int_s^t e^{-\kappa(t-u)}\sigma_t dW_u$$
 2.10

Since

$$Exp\left[\int_{s}^{t} e^{-\kappa(t-u)}\sigma_{t}dW_{u}\right] = 0$$
$$Exp[T_{t}] = \overline{T}_{t} + (T_{t} - \overline{T}_{s})e^{-\kappa(t-s)} \neq \overline{T}_{t}$$
2.11

This issue arises from the fact that κ is not constant but it changes over time.

This issue was corrected by adding a term $\frac{d\bar{T}_t}{dt}$ so the O-U model was modified to be written as

$$dT_t = \left[\frac{d\overline{T}_t}{dt} + \kappa(\overline{T}_t - T_t)\right]dt + \sigma_t dW_t \qquad 2.10$$

The solution used to mitigate this issue was initially proposed by Dornier and Querel (Dornier and Queruel, 2000) and further developed by Dzupire, Ngare, and Odongo (Dzupire, Ngare and Odongo, 2019) who used a Lévy process-driven Ornstein-Uhlenbeck daily temperature model that took into account a time-dependent speed of mean reversion, κ . The long average temperature \overline{T}_t was modeled as the sum of a seasonal term (sinusoidal) and a term that incorporates a small trend in the temperature data which can be due to global warming and urban heating effects (linear).

The SDE is solved by multiplying the equation by the factor $e^{\int_0^t \kappa du}$ so we have

$$e^{\int_{0}^{t} \kappa du} d\overline{T}_{u} - e^{\int_{0}^{t} \kappa du} \kappa (\overline{T}_{u} - T_{u}) du + e^{\int_{0}^{t} \kappa du} dT_{u} = e^{\int_{0}^{t} \kappa du} \sigma_{t} dW_{u}$$

$$d[e^{\int_{0}^{t} \kappa du} \kappa (\overline{T}_{u} - T_{u})] du = e^{\int_{0}^{t} \kappa du} \sigma_{t} dW_{u}$$
2.11

Let $Z_t = e^{\int_0^t \kappa du} (\overline{T}_u - T_u)$, then $dZ_t = d \left[e^{\int_0^t \kappa du} (\overline{T}_u - T_u) \right] = e^{\int_0^t \kappa du} \sigma_t dW_u$ with $Z_t = Z_o - \int_0^t e^{\int_0^t \kappa du} \sigma_t dW_u$ 2.13

Substituting $Z_t = e^{\int_0^t \kappa du} (\overline{T}_u - T_u)$ with $\overline{T}_0 - T_0$ into 2.11

 $e^{\int_0^t \kappa du} \kappa(\overline{T}_t - T_t) = e^{\int_0^t \kappa du} \kappa(\overline{T}_o - T_o) - \int_0^t e^{\int_0^t \kappa du} \sigma_t dW_u$ rearranging terms

$$T_{t} = \overline{T}_{t} + e^{-\int_{0}^{t} \kappa du} \int_{0}^{t} e^{\int_{0}^{t} \kappa du} \sigma_{t} dW_{u}$$
 2.12
So $E[T_{t}] = \overline{T}_{t}$ 2.13

Temperature Model for Trend and Seasonality.

$$T_{trend} = a + bt$$

$$T_{season} = \alpha sin(\omega t + \phi)$$

$$\overline{T}_{t} = a + bt + \alpha sin(\omega t + \phi) \quad \text{with } \omega = \frac{2\pi}{365}$$

3. MODIFIED ORNSTEIN-UHLENBECK PROCESS WITH MONTE CARLO SIMULATION FOR WEATHER DERIVATIVE PRICING.

Weather derivatives, financial instruments whose values are derived from weather variables such as temperature, precipitation, or wind speed, have gained significant traction in recent years as tools for managing weather-related risks. These derivatives allow businesses to hedge against adverse weather conditions that might impact their operations, such as farmers protecting against crop damage due to droughts or energy companies hedging against revenue losses from mild winters affecting energy demand.

One of the commonly used models for pricing weather derivatives is the modified Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, a stochastic model that describes the mean-reverting behavior of a variable over time. This model, coupled with Monte Carlo simulation techniques, offers a robust framework for pricing weather derivatives accurately (Stein, Lopes, and Medino, 2021).

Understanding the Modified Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Process

The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process is a stochastic process that models the evolution of a variable over time. It is characterized by two parameters: the long-term mean to which the variable reverts and a parameter controlling the speed of reversion. The modified Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process introduces additional parameters to account for seasonality and trends in the data, making it particularly suitable for modeling weather variables that exhibit such characteristics.

In the context of weather derivatives, the modified Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process can be used to model various weather variables such as temperature or precipitation. By calibrating the model to historical weather data, analysts can estimate the parameters governing the mean-reverting behavior of the variable, allowing them to simulate future scenarios.

4. MONTE CARLO SIMULATION FOR WEATHER DERIVATIVE PRICING

Monte Carlo simulation is a computational technique used to estimate the probability distribution of outcomes by repeatedly sampling from a probability distribution of input variables (Oetomo and Stevenson, 2005). In the context of weather derivative pricing, Monte Carlo simulation is employed to generate a large number of possible future paths for the weather variable of interest based on the modified Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process.

To price a weather derivative using Monte Carlo simulation and the modified Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, the following steps are typically followed:

1. Calibration: Estimate the parameters of the modified Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process using historical weather data. This involves fitting the model to observed weather patterns to determine the long-term mean, speed of reversion, seasonality, and trend parameters.

- 2. Simulation: Generate a large number of simulated paths for the weather variable using the calibrated modified Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. Each path represents a possible evolution of the weather variable over time.
- 3. Derivative Valuation: For each simulated path, calculate the payoff of the weather derivative based on its contract specifications. This could involve comparing the simulated weather variable against a predetermined strike level or using more complex payoff structures.

Monte Carlo Integration: Aggregate the payoffs from all simulated paths and calculate the average payoff. This average represents the expected value of the weather derivative under the modified Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process.

The entire programming process of fitting the Temperature Data and Volatility, applying the model, and simulating predicting the option price by Monte Carlo simulation are shown in the Python code below. The coding process consisted of two parts. An initial code was developed to create a time series based on historical temperature data to obtain fitting parameters. These parameters were used in the second code to estimate the price function of the temperature weather derivative using a Monte Carlo simulation. The results from the Monte Carlo simulation using the O-U model were graphed in conjunction with the results from the Black-Scholes model. In this paper, the comparison was presented for visual inspection only. No deep analysis was carried out.

5. MONTE CARLO SIMULATION FOR PRICING WEATHER DERIVATIVE OPTION WITH PYTHON.

5.1. Code 1. Data retrieval, cleaning, organization, and fitting. Code Title (WDDtata Processing.ipynb)

5.1.1 Python's library import, Data Frame uploading, and cleaning. Creation of Temperature time series with calculated Daily Time Average (DTA)

<pre>#Import Libraries and Load Raw Data import numpy as np import datetime as dt import datetime as dt import matplotlib.pyplot as plt import matplotlib.pyplot as plt import interpolate import interpolate import interpolate import matplotlib.pyplot as plt warnings.filterwarnings('ignore') max_temp = pd.read_csv('inskum_temperature.csv')</pre>									
mid.X	Product code	station number	r Ven	r Month	Dav	Maximum temperature (Degree E)	Days of accumulation of maximum temperature	Quality	
0	IDCJAC0010	6606	2 185	9 1	1	76	NaN	Quanty	
1	IDCJAC0010	6606	2 185	9 1	2	76	1.0	Y	
2	IDCJAC0010	6606	2 185	9 1	3	76	1.0	Y	
3	IDCJAC0010	6606	2 185	9 1	4	76	1.0	Y	
4	IDCJAC0010	6606	2 185	9 1	5	76	1.0	Y	
<pre>min_temp.head()</pre>									
_	Product code	station numbe	r Yea	r Month	Day	Minimum temperature (Degree F)	Days of accumulation of minimum temperature	Quality	
0	IDCIAC0011	6606	2 185	9 1 5 4	1	58	NaN	Y	
2	IDCIAC0011	6606	2 103	9 1 D 1	2	60	10	v	
3	IDCIAC0011	6606	2 185	9 1	4	63	1.0	Y	
4	IDCJAC0011	6606	2 185	9 1	5	62	1.0	Y	
<pre>count = 0 for ms, ms in zip(np.where(max_temp.isnull())[0], np.where(min_temp.isnull())[0]): if mx != mn: count += 1 print('Number of Null Values: ', count) #From row Data, Extracts Date (Y-M-D) Maximum and Minimum Temperatures (Tmax, and Tmin) and calculate the Daily Averane (T=(Tmax=Tmin)/2)</pre>									
<pre>#From row Data, Extracts Date (Y-H-D) Maximum and Minimum Temperatures (Tmax, and Tmin) and calculate the Daily Average (T=(Tmax+Tmin)/2) def deteite(row): return dt.dateime(row:/wear,row.Month,row.Day) max.temp(Tet'] = min.temp.appl(dateime,axis-1) min.temp(Tet'] = min.temp.appl(dateime,axis-1) max.temp(Tet'] = min.temp.appl(dateime,axis-1) max.temp.etma(tot') = min.temp.appl(dateime,axis-1) max.temp.forgoroulum with useless data, remanes the columns Left, and merges the data frames drop_cols = (0;1,2,3,4,6,7) max.temp.forgor(max.temp.colums[drop_cols],axis-1,inplace-True) min.temp.orenae(columus:('Waxis-1,inplace-True) max.temp.etmp.colums[drop_cols],axis-1,inplace-True) max.temp.etmp.colums[drop_cols],axis-1,inplace-True) max.temp.etmp.colums[drop_cols],axis-1,inplace-True) max.temp.forgor(max.temp.setge(min_temp.colums[drop_cols],risht=), inplace-True) max.temp.etmp.colums(Cols), datis-1, inplace-True) max.temp.forgor(max.temp.forgor(tot)) #Calculates Datis Automace(Datis T(Maximus temperature (Degree F)':Tima'), inplace-True) temps = max_temp.setge(min_temp.colums[drop_cols],axis-1,inplace-True) temps = max_temp.setge(min_temp.colums[drop_cols],axis-1,inplace-True) temps = max_temp.setge(min_temp.tutu) #Calculates Datis Automace(Datis T(Maximus temperature) temps = temps.setge(row): return (row.Tmax+row.Tmin)/2 temps(Ti) = temps.setge(row): return (row.Tmax+row.Tmin)/2 temps(Ti) = temps.setge(row): forgor(max.temp.setge(row): forgor</pre>									
	Tma	ux Tmin T							
	Date								
185	9-01-01 7	76 58 67.0							
185	9-01-02 7	76 60 68.0							
185	9-01-03 7	76 60 68.0							
185	9-01-04 7	76 63 69.5							
185	9-01-05 7	76 62 69.0							
185	9-01-05 7 	76 62 69.0 							
185 202 202	9-01-05 7 2-06-29 6 2-06-30 6	76 62 69.0 54 46 55.0 52 50 56.0							
185 202 202 202	9-01-05 7 2-06-29 6 2-06-30 6 2-07-01 5	76 62 69.0 54 46 55.0 52 50 56.0 54 51 52.5							
185 202 202 202 202	 2-06-29 6 2-06-30 6 2-07-01 5 2-07-02 6	76 62 69.0 54 46 55.0 52 50 56.0 54 51 52.5 50 51 55.5							
185 202 202 202 202 202	9-01-05 7 2-06-29 6 2-06-30 6 2-07-01 5 2-07-02 6 2-07-02 6	76 62 69.0 54 .46 55.0 52 50 56.0 54 .51 52.5 50 .51 .55.5 52 .53 .57.5							

5.1.2. The Data Frame was divided into winter and summer seasons and a histogram was plotted.



Date





5.1.3. Visualization of Trend and Seasonability.





5.1.4. Seasonal decomposition and visualization of trend, seasonality, and residuals.



5.1.5. Fitting models to daily average temperature time series were applied, and model parameters were obtained and compared.



5.1.6. Fitting Parameters were calculated and applied to fitted data.



5.1.7. Autocorrelation was applied and residuals were analyzed.



2016 Date

2022

2010

Residuals after de-trending and removing seasonality from the DAT



5.1.8. Probability distribution was calculated and plotted.



5.1.9. Visualization of Fitted Data.





<pre>precises an Autoprepression of the Residuals and print parameters residuals = temp:[rest] residuals.index = pd.obtetimeIndex(residual.index).to_period("0") model = Autordep(residuals, lgtsl, ol_names.True,trend="n") model = dift = model.fit() cof= model.fit().topens cof= model.fit().topens res.index = res.index.to_tleattap() print(model.fit().tomesy())</pre>									
AutoReg Model Results									
Dep. Variable	e:	res	No. Ob	servations:		59718			
Model:		AutoReg(1)	Log Li	kelihood.		166627.381			
Method:	Co	nditional MLE	S.D. c	of innovatio	ns	3.941			
Date:	Tue	, 30 Apr 2024	AIC			333258.762			
Time:		10:33:44	BIC			333276.757			
Sample:		01-02-1859 - 07-03-2022	HQIC			333264.353			
	coef	std err	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]			
res.Ll	0.4880	0.004 13 Ro	86.609 oots	0.000	0.481	0.495			
	Real	Imagir	nary	Modul	us	Frequency			
AR.1	2.0494	+0.00	900j	2.04	94	8.0000			

5.1.11. The monthly volatility of the DAT was estimated and plotted.



5.1.12. The daily volatility of the DAT was estimated and plotted.



5.1.13. A 5-knot (optimal) B-splined was applied to the daily volatility.





5.1.14. Volatility function was obtained from the quadratic variation of the Temperature process.



5.1.15. The volatility (κ) of the volatility process was estimated using the quadratic variation of σ .

	<pre># Estimate volatility of the volatility process by using the quadratic variation of print("damm si: ", readv[01]:set(),1b] model & Aurolog(vol["stat"], lags:1, old_names=True,trends'n') model.fit = nodel.fit() coef = nodel.fit(:netai print("late of mean reversion of volatility process is : ', coef[0]) print(model.fit.summary()) Gamm is: 0.975</pre>										
	Rate of mean reversion of volatility process is : 0.9885299831341818 AutoReg Model Results										
	Dep. Variable:		5	td	No. Ob	servations:		366			
	Model:		AutoReg(1)	Log Li	kelihood		-378.671			
	Method:	Co	onditional M	1LE	S.D. 0	f innovation	15	0.683			
	Date:	Sur	n, 28 Apr 20	12.4	AIC			761.343			
	Time:		22:28:	52	BIC			769.143			
	Sample:			1	HQIC			764.443			
				66							
		coef	std err		z	P> Z	[0.025	0.975]			
	std.L1	0.9885	0,008	126	5.244	0,000	0.973	1.084			
				Roo	ots						
		Real	Inz	gina	iry	Modulı	15	Frequency			
	AR.1	1.0116	+6	.000	90j	1.01	.6	0.0000			

5.1.15. The data frame was approximated by applying an Euler-Maruyama scheme. O-U Parameters were obtained by using a Monte Carlo approximation.





no_siss = 10000 trading_data_winter = pd_data_pange(start='2021-07-01', end='2021-07-01', freq='0') ex_temps_winter, ex_siss_winter = monte_carlo_temp(trading_data_winter, Tbar_parama, volatility, first_ord, no_siss) trading_data_winner = pd_data_pange(start='2021-01-01', end='2021-01-01', freq='0') ex_temps_winner, ex_siss_winner = monte_carlo_temp(trading_data_winner, thar_parama, volatility, first_ord, no_siss) pit.figure(figure(12,0)) Tbar_winner = ex_temps_winner.tbdc[-1.0][Tbar'] Tbar_winner = ex_temp_winner.jbdc[-1.000], linewidth&_ibbdl='Summer', colors'tabiorange') pit.figure(figure(12,000), provide = figure(10,000), linewidth&_ibbdl='Summer', colors'tabiorange') pit.pit(Tbar_winner, vblinter'mergersture % Siss') pit.figure(figure(12,000), linewidth&_ibbdl='Tbar_winner', colors'tabiorange') pit.fill(Tbar_winner, vblinter'mergersture % Siss') pit.fill(Tbar_winner, vblinter'mergersture % Siss'), dbals'Summer', colors'tabiorange') pit.fill(Tbar_winner),[0,1000], linewidth&_ibbdl='Tbar_winner', colors'tabible') pit.tabe((Tbar_winner,Tbar_winner),[0,1000], linewidth&_ibbdl='Tbar_winner', colors'tabible') pit.tabe((Tbar_winner,Tbar_winner),[0,1000], linewidth&_ibbdl='Tbar_winner', colors'tabible') pit.tabe((Tbar_winner,Tbar_winner),[0,1000], linewidth&_ibbdl='Tbar_winner', colors'tabible') pit.tabe()



5.2. The code shown below, uses the results obtained in part 5 to price the winter temperature option with the Monte Carlo simulation and the O-U model and compares it to the results obtained with the Black-Scholes Model. Code name: WDPricing

5.2.1. Data Processing.





5.2.1. Trading range was defined and models were applied.







6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, it was demonstrated a comprehensive approach to analyzing temperature data and estimating the price of temperature weather options. Python programs were developed to process temperature data and fit the average temperature along with its volatility using B-splines. This methodology enabled us to capture the intricate patterns and fluctuations in temperature and volatility time series.

Subsequently, a Monte Carlo simulation was implemented, employing the modified Ornstein-Uhlenbeck method to estimate the price of temperature weather options. By simulating multiple paths of the temperature time series, we obtained reliable estimates of option prices, accounting for the stochastic nature of temperature dynamics.

Finally, we compared the obtained prices of temperature weather options with those derived from the Black-Scholes model for call and put options. This comparative analysis provided valuable insights into the effectiveness of our approach and highlighted the importance of incorporating temperature dynamics in pricing weather derivatives.

Overall, our findings suggest that incorporating temperature data and utilizing advanced simulation techniques can significantly enhance the accuracy of pricing temperature weather options, thereby enabling better risk management strategies for stakeholders in weather-sensitive industries.

Refinement of Simulation Models: Further research could focus on refining the simulation models used for estimating temperature dynamics. Exploring alternative stochastic processes or incorporating additional factors could potentially improve the accuracy of option price estimates.

Incorporation of Additional Data Sources: Integrating other relevant data sources such as humidity, wind speed, or precipitation could enrich the analysis and provide a more comprehensive understanding of weather-related risk factors.

Extension to Other Weather Derivatives: While our study primarily focused on temperature weather options, future research could extend the analysis to other types of weather derivatives such as rainfall or snowfall options. This expansion would broaden the applicability of the developed methodology.

Validation and Sensitivity Analysis: Conducting extensive validation studies and sensitivity analyses can enhance the robustness of the proposed approach. Investigating the impact of varying model parameters and assumptions on option prices would provide valuable insights into the reliability of the results.

Integration with Risk Management Frameworks: Exploring ways to integrate the pricing of temperature weather options into broader risk management frameworks within industries sensitive to weather fluctuations could facilitate more informed decision-making processes.

By addressing these avenues for future work, researchers can further advance the understanding and application of quantitative methods in weather derivative pricing, ultimately contributing to improved risk management practices in weather-sensitive industries

References

Alaton, P., Djehiche, B., & Stillberger, D. (2002). On modeling and pricing weather derivatives. Applied mathematical finance, 9(1), 1-20.

Bensoussan, A., & Brouste, A. (2016). Cox–Ingersoll–Ross model for wind speed modeling and forecasting. Wind Energy, 19(7), 1355-1365.

Benth, F. E., & Saltyte-Benth, J. (2012). Modeling and pricing in financial markets for weather derivatives (Vol. 17). World Scientific.

Benth, F. E., Benth, J. S., & Koekebakker, S. (2008). Stochastic modeling of electricity and related markets (Vol. 11). World Scientific.

Black, F., and Scholes, M. (1973), "The Pricing of Options and Corporate Liabilities," Journal of Political Economy, 81, 637–654.

Bloomfield, P. (1992), "Trends in Global Temperature," Climate Change, 21,1–16.

Bollerslev, T. (1986), "Generalized ARCH," Journal of Econometrics, 31,307–327.

Bollerslev, T., and Wooldridge, J. M. (1992), "Quasi-Maximum Likelihood Estimation and Inference in Dynamic Models With Time-Varying Covariances," Econometric Reviews, 11, 143–172

Brewer, M. (2000). Weather Derivatives: Risk Management Tools for Weather-Sensitive Markets. *The Journal of Futures Markets*, 20(3), 219-244.

CME Group Inc., (2021). Weather Futures and Options, Retrieved From *https://www.cmegroup.com/trading/weather/files/weather-fact-card.pdf*

Doob, J.L. (April 1942). "The Brownian Movement and Stochastic Equations". Annals of Mathematics. 43 (2): 351–369

Dornier, F., & Queruel, M. (2000). Caution to the wind. Energy & power risk management, 13(8), 30-32.

Dzupire, N. C., Ngare, P., & Odongo, L. (2019). Pricing basket weather derivatives on rainfall and temperature processes. International Journal of Financial Studies, 7(3), 35.

G. Considine (2000). Introduction to weather derivatives. Aquila Energy, http://www.

Golden, L. L., M. Wang and C. C. Yang "Handling Weather Related Risks Through the Financial Markets: Considerations of Credit Risk, Basis Risk, and Hedging." Journal of Risk & Insurance, Vol. 74, No. 2, pp. 319–346, June 2007.

Hartmann, J., & Geyer, R. (2005). Weather derivatives as part of integrated risk management concepts. *Weather*, *60*(11), 320-324.

Jewson, S., A. Brix and C. Ziehmann (2005). "Weather Derivatives Valuation: The Meteorological, Statistical, Financial, and Mathematical Foundations". Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Mathews, J. S. (2009) "Dog Days and Degree Days", CME Group

Myers, R. 2008 "What Every CFO Needs to Know About Weather Risk Management", Storm Exchange, Inc. & CME Group

Oetomo, T., & Stevenson, M. (2005). Hot or cold? A comparison of different approaches to the pricing of weather derivatives. Journal of Emerging Market Finance, 4(2), 101-133.

Øksendal, Bernt (1998). "Option Pricing". Stochastic Differential Equations: An Introduction with Applications (5th ed.). Berlin: Springer. pp. 266–283

Stein, J., Lopes, S. R. C., & Medino, A. V. (2021). A Generalization of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Process: Theoretical Results, Simulations and Parameter Estimation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.06374.

Tang, K., Ed. (2010). "Weather Risk Management: A Guide for Corporations, Hedge Funds and Investors" Archived 2010-01-22 at the Wayback Machine, Risk Books.

Weng, Y., & Zeng, H. (2017). Modeling and Pricing of Weather Derivatives. In *Quantitative Financial Risk Management* (pp. 351-379). Springer, Cham.

Wigley, Tom M. L. (2006). "Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere – Understanding and Reconciling Differences (Executive Summary)" (PDF). The US Climate Change Science Program. NOAA