A.L.
CAPITAL ADVISORY

# Portfolio Construction Under Parameter Uncertainty: A Bayesian Framework for Strategic Asset Allocation

Anton Ladnyi
CFA Level III Candidate · Ex-Goldman Sachs · Ex-J.P. Morgan

February 2026

## DISCLAIMER AND DISTRIBUTION NOTICE

## ABSTRACT

Parameter uncertainty in portfolio construction is a well-documented and structurally significant challenge. The classical mean–variance optimization framework of Markowitz (1952) is theoretically grounded but operationally fragile: estimation errors in expected returns, variances, and covariances are amplified by the optimizer rather than attenuated, producing portfolios that are unstable, concentrated, and poor predictors of their own out-of-sample performance — a phenomenon Michaud (1989) characterized as error maximization.

This paper develops a governance-oriented quantitative framework for strategic asset allocation addressing estimation error through three methodologically coherent mechanisms. First, covariance estimation is regularized via the Ledoit–Wolf (2004) analytical shrinkage estimator, which minimizes expected mean-squared loss by contracting the sample covariance matrix toward a structured target. Second, expected return estimation proceeds through the Black–Litterman (1990, 1992) linear-Gaussian Bayesian model, which combines market-equilibrium implied returns with investor views expressed through a pick matrix, yielding a posterior distribution over expected returns with formally quantified uncertainty. Third, risk is characterized beyond variance through parametric Expected Shortfall, maximum drawdown, and target-wealth probability distributions obtained via path-dependent simulation.

The paper further introduces a four-layer model governance hierarchy covering the statistical model, parameter estimation, constraint architecture, and judgment integration layers, and addresses the sensitivity of outputs to parameter choices, alternative constructions of the view-uncertainty matrix Ω, the relative-entropy interpretation of Black–Litterman updating, and the Bayesian interpretation of ridge regularization. Throughout, the emphasis is on structural logic, estimation risk, and the conditions under which each methodological choice is theoretically defensible.



## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Anton Ladnyi is an investment professional with experience in institutional equity research at Goldman Sachs (2017–2020) and private wealth management at J.P. Morgan (2021–2025), where he applied quantitative portfolio construction frameworks — including mean–variance optimisation, Monte Carlo simulation, and scenario analysis — to multi-asset client mandates. He holds an MSc in International Business Management and has passed the CFA Level I and Level II examinations (CFA Institute verified); he is currently a CFA Level III Candidate. His research focuses on Bayesian methods in portfolio construction, shrinkage covariance estimation, and model governance frameworks.


This working paper represents an independent research contribution and does not reflect the views of any past or present employer.


| | |
|---|---|
| Keywords: | Black–Litterman · Ledoit–Wolf shrinkage · Mean-variance optimisation · Bayesian asset allocation · CVaR · Monte Carlo simulation · Model governance |
| JEL Codes: | G11 · G12 · C11 · C58 |
| Classification: | Working Paper · For Professional Distribution · February 2026 |

NOTATION AND CONVENTIONS

The following conventions are maintained throughout. Vectors and matrices appear in bold; scalars are unformatted. Stochastic variables are distinguished from realizations by context. All return moments are expressed on an annualized basis unless stated otherwise.

## Return Definitions

| | |
|---|---|
| $r_t$ □ □$^N$ | Vector of excess log-returns at time t for the N-asset universe. r_{i,t} = ln(P_{i,t}/P_{i,t−1}) − r_{f,t} |
| $R_t$ □ □$^N$ | Vector of simple excess returns. R_{i,t} = (P_{i,t}/P_{i,t−1}) − 1 − r_{f,t} |
| $r_f$ | Risk-free rate, treated as deterministic over the relevant horizon |

## Covariance Estimation

| | |
|---|---|
| S | Sample covariance matrix: (1/(T−1)) Σ_{t=1}^T (r_t − μ̂)(r_t − μ̂)' |
| Σ̂ (or Σ_LW) | Ledoit–Wolf shrinkage estimator of the population covariance matrix |
| α* | Optimal shrinkage intensity (analytical solution, Ledoit–Wolf 2004) |
| F | Shrinkage target matrix (scaled identity: (tr(S)/N)·I) |

## Black–Litterman

| | |
|---|---|
| Π | Equilibrium implied return vector: Π = δ Σ w_mkt |
| δ | Market risk aversion coefficient: δ̂ = (μ̂_mkt − r_f) / σ̂²_mkt |
| τ | Prior uncertainty scalar governing confidence in Π relative to views |
| P, Q, Ω | View pick matrix, view vector, and view-uncertainty diagonal matrix |
| μ_BL | Black–Litterman posterior mean: [(τΣ)$^{1}$ + P'Ω$^{1}$P]$^{1}$ [(τΣ)$^{1}$Π + P'Ω$^{1}$Q] |
| M_BL | Posterior covariance of μ: [(τΣ)$^{1}$ + P'Ω$^{1}$P]$^{1}$ |
| M_posterior | Predictive covariance: Σ + M_BL (correct MVO input) |

## Risk Analytics

| | |
|---|---|
| VaR_α | Value at Risk at level α: negative α-quantile of return distribution |
| ES_α (CVaR) | Expected Shortfall at α: E[−r_p \| r_p ≤ −VaR_α] |
| MDD | Maximum drawdown: largest peak-to-trough decline over a specified horizon |
| RC_i | Risk contribution of asset i: w_i · (∂σ_p/∂w_i) |

SECTION A

# Portfolio Construction Under Parameter Uncertainty

## A.1 The Utility Maximization Framework

The canonical foundation of the portfolio selection problem is the expected utility hypothesis. Under the assumptions that either asset returns are multivariate elliptically distributed or that the investor's utility function is quadratic in wealth, the expected utility maximization problem reduces to:

$$\max_{w} U(w) = w'\mu - (1/2) \cdot A \cdot w'\Sigma w \text{ subject to } 1^{N}{}'w = 1 \quad (A.1)$$

The scalar $A > 0$ is the investor's Arrow–Pratt coefficient of absolute risk aversion, parameterizing the marginal rate of substitution between expected return and variance. The mean–variance objective is exact when returns are elliptically distributed (variance is a sufficient statistic) or under quadratic utility. In practice, it is most defensibly interpreted as a second-order Taylor expansion of a general expected utility problem.

## A.2 The Efficient Frontier

For fixed A, (A.1) selects a unique portfolio on the mean–variance efficient frontier — the set of portfolios achieving minimum variance for every level of expected return. As A varies over $(0, \infty)$, the solution traces the entire upper locus from the global minimum-variance portfolio ($A \to \infty$) to the maximum expected return portfolio ($A \to 0$ ). This parameterization provides the theoretical link between investor risk preferences and portfolio composition.

## A.3 Policy Constraints

In institutional and advisory contexts, (A.1) is supplemented by mandate constraints. The most commonly imposed are long-only constraints ($w_i \geq 0$), individual upper bounds ($w_i \leq u_i$), sector limits ($\Sigma_{i \; S_k} w_i \leq c_k$), turnover bounds ($\Sigma_i |w_i - w_i \;| \leq \kappa$), and tracking-error constraints ($(w - w_b)'\Sigma(w - w_b) \leq \varepsilon^2$). Each constraint restricts the feasible set and, in the presence of estimation error, often improves out-of-sample portfolio stability by limiting the optimizer's ability to exploit noise.

## A.4 Decision-Making Under Parameter Uncertainty

The central difficulty in applying (A.1) is that neither $\mu$ nor $\Sigma$ is observed. Plug-in estimation — substituting sample estimates ($\hat{\mu}$, S) directly — ignores estimation error entirely. Jorion (1985) demonstrated that a Bayesian investor who accounts for parameter uncertainty holds a portfolio substantially more diversified than the plug-in MVO solution, with the degree of diversification increasing monotonically in N/T. This observation motivates the estimators developed in Sections C through E.

SECTION B

# Mean–Variance Optimization: Properties and Pathologies

## B.1 The Unconstrained Solution

In the absence of inequality constraints, (A.1) subject to $1'w = 1$ has the closed-form Lagrangian solution. The first-order conditions yield:

$$w^* = (1/A)\ \Sigma^{-1}\mu + \gamma\ \Sigma^{-1}1 \quad (B.2)$$

where $\gamma$ is determined by the budget constraint. The solution (B.2) expresses the Tobin (1958) two-fund separation theorem: every efficient portfolio is a linear combination of the global minimum-variance portfolio (proportional to $\Sigma^{-1}1$) and the tangency direction (proportional to $\Sigma^{-1}\mu$), independent of A.

## B.2 Convexity Properties

For any positive definite $\Sigma$ and $A > 0$, the mean–variance objective is strictly concave in w: the variance term $w'\Sigma w$ is a positive definite quadratic form (strictly convex), and the expected return term $w'\mu$ is affine. The problem is therefore a strictly convex program, guaranteeing a unique global maximum.

## B.3 Input Sensitivity: The Michaud Critique

The theoretical coherence of the mean–variance framework is substantially qualified in practice by its sensitivity to the accuracy of inputs. The mechanism is transparent from (B.2): optimal weights depend on $\Sigma^{-1}\mu$, so estimation error in either $\Sigma$ or $\mu$ is multiplied through the precision matrix. Michaud (1989) characterized MVO as an error maximizer: the optimizer treats estimation noise as signal and concentrates weight on assets with the most extreme (and likely most error-prone) estimated return.

> Practical implication: With $T = 60$ monthly observations and $N = 10$ assets, the standard deviation of the estimation error for any individual asset's expected return is $\sigma_i/\sqrt{T} \approx 0.20/\sqrt{60} \approx 2.6\%$ annually — comparable to the true risk premium itself. This renders the sample mean $\hat{\mu}$ an unreliable direct input to the optimizer.

## B.4 The Expected Return Estimation Problem

From T i.i.d. observations of returns with true mean $\mu$ and covariance $\Sigma$, the sample mean $\hat{\mu}$ is unbiased with covariance $\mathrm{Cov}(\hat{\mu}) = (1/T)\Sigma$. Merton (1980) established that, unlike variances, expected returns cannot be estimated with increasing precision by increasing observation frequency — only calendar span matters. The required horizon for a statistically significant individual expected return estimate at the 95% confidence level is approximately:

$$T^* \approx 4 / SR_i^2 \quad (D.1)$$

where $SR_i = \mu_i/\sigma_i$ is the asset's annualized Sharpe ratio. For moderate Sharpe ratios (0.3–0.5), T* exceeds 16–44 years — far beyond any plausible stationary estimation window. This motivates the use of model-based estimators in Sections D and E.

## B.5 The Risk Aversion Parameter

The parameter A governs the investor's location on the efficient frontier. It is not statistically estimated from historical returns but elicited from investor preferences, revealed-preference analysis of existing allocations, or direct calibration to stated loss tolerance. The sensitivity of the optimal portfolio to A varies along the frontier: near the minimum-variance portfolio (high A), the frontier is flat in the return direction and the portfolio is stable under perturbations in A; near the maximum return portfolio (low A), the frontier is steep and small changes in A produce large weight shifts. This non-linearity reinforces the governance requirement for precise and periodically reviewed risk tolerance specifications.

SECTION C

# Covariance Estimation and Shrinkage

## C.1 Pathologies of the Sample Covariance Matrix

The sample covariance matrix $S = (1/(T-1)) \Sigma_{t=1}^{T} (r_t - \hat{\mu})(r_t - \hat{\mu})'$ is the maximum likelihood estimator of $\Sigma$ under the multivariate normal model. For $T > N$ it is positive definite almost surely and unbiased. However, unbiasedness does not imply statistical accuracy; $S$ exhibits three pathologies with direct portfolio construction consequences.

### C.1.1 Eigenvalue Dispersion and Ill-Conditioning

As the ratio $\gamma = N/T$ increases toward unity, the condition number $\kappa(S)$ — the ratio of the largest to the smallest sample eigenvalue — grows without bound. The Marchenko–Pastur (1967) law characterizes the limiting empirical spectral distribution: sample eigenvalues systematically spread relative to true eigenvalues, with small eigenvalues underestimated and large eigenvalues overestimated. This dispersion is not a finite-sample artifact but a structural property of high-dimensional estimation that persists even at very large $T$. The large condition number directly amplifies estimation error in the inversion $S^{-1}$ required by (B.2).

### C.1.2 Pairwise Correlation Noise

$S$ contains $N(N-1)/2$ distinct pairwise covariances. As $N$ grows, the parameter count grows quadratically while the observation count grows only linearly, so the effective degrees of freedom per parameter diminish. Sample correlations consequently exhibit significant estimation noise and a systematic bias toward zero in large universes, causing $S$ to overstate the diversification benefits available in the portfolio.

### C.1.3 Non-Stationarity

$S$ is a backward-looking unconditional estimator calibrated to a fixed historical window. Return covariances are not stationary: they vary systematically across volatility regimes, business cycles, and structural breaks. Portfolios optimized on $S$ calibrated to a low-volatility period will systematically underestimate forward-looking tail correlations, with governance consequences for risk budget compliance.

## C.2 The Shrinkage Framework

Ledoit and Wolf (2004) address the pathologies of $S$ by forming a convex combination with a structured target matrix $T$:

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{LW} = (1 - \alpha)\, S + \alpha\, T \quad (C.1)$$

The target $T$ has low variance but positive bias relative to $\Sigma$; the sample matrix $S$ has zero bias but high variance. The optimal shrinkage intensity $\alpha^*$ is the value minimizing the expected squared Frobenius norm loss $E[\|\hat{\Sigma}_{LW} - \Sigma\|^2_F]$. Ledoit and Wolf show that $\alpha^*$ admits a closed-form analytical estimator requiring no cross-validation and no subjective calibration:

$$\alpha^* = \min(1, \max(0, \beta^2 / \delta^2)) \quad (C.2)$$

where $\beta^2 = E[\|S - T\|^2_F]$ measures the variance of S around T, and $\delta^2 = \|T - \Sigma\|^2_F$ measures the squared bias of T. Critically, $\alpha^*$ increases with N/T: the framework automatically prescribes stronger regularization when the estimation problem is more severely underdetermined.

## C.3 Choice of Shrinkage Target

The target matrix T encodes the structural assumption the practitioner is willing to impose on Σ. Four targets are standard in the literature:

| Target | Structure | Applicability |
|---|---|---|
| Scaled identity | $\hat{\alpha} \cdot S_{avg} \cdot I$ | Maximum regularization; all correlations shrunk to zero. Appropriate when N/T is large and individual correlations are uninformative. |
| Constant correlation | $\bar{\rho}\sqrt{S_{ii} S_{jj}}$ for $i \neq j$ | Preserves individual variances; shrinks all pairwise correlations toward their cross-sectional mean $\bar{\rho}$. Parsimonious for homogeneous asset universes. |
| Single-factor | Factor-model $\Sigma_f + D$ | Decomposes covariance into systematic and idiosyncratic components. Appropriate when a factor structure is well-identified. |
| Diagonal (variance-only) | diag(S) | Discards all correlation information. Useful as a lower bound in sensitivity analysis. |

For equity universes with broadly similar cross-sectional correlation levels, the constant-correlation target provides the best balance of parsimony and empirical fidelity: individual volatility estimates are preserved from the data while the correlation structure is stabilized. The shrinkage estimator consistently improves out-of-sample portfolio Sharpe ratios relative to portfolios constructed using S, as documented in Ledoit and Wolf (2004, 2012).

## C.4 Effect on Optimizer Stability

Blending S with a well-conditioned target T lifts the smallest sample eigenvalues, reducing the condition number $\kappa(\hat{\Sigma}_{LW})$ relative to $\kappa(S)$. This directly reduces the amplification factor in (B.3), producing optimal weight vectors that are more stable across rebalancing periods and less sensitive to small perturbations in return inputs. The improvement in conditioning is the primary mechanism through which shrinkage reduces portfolio turnover and improves the reproducibility of optimization outputs.

SECTION D

# Expected Return Estimation and Reverse Optimization

## D.1 Limitations of Historical Mean Estimation

Merton (1980) demonstrated that expected returns cannot be estimated with increasing precision by increasing sampling frequency at fixed calendar span: $\mathrm{Cov}(\hat{\mu}) = (1/T)\Sigma$ is invariant to the observation interval $\Delta t$, and only the total span $T \cdot \Delta t$ matters. For practical estimation windows ($T = 60$–$120$ months), the standard error of individual asset expected returns is of the same order as the true risk premium, rendering direct historical estimation unreliable.

## D.2 Reverse Optimization and Equilibrium Implied Returns

The reverse optimization approach of Sharpe (1974) and Black and Litterman (1990) avoids direct historical estimation by deriving the expected return vector that would make observed market-capitalization weights mean–variance optimal. Under CAPM, the implied returns $\Pi$ are defined as:

$$\Pi = \delta \, \Sigma \, w_{mkt} \quad (D.2)$$

where the market risk aversion $\delta$ is estimated as:

$$\hat{\delta} = (\hat{\mu}_{mkt} - r_f) / \hat{\sigma}^2_{mkt} \quad (D.3)$$

The implied returns $\Pi$ are intrinsically consistent with the covariance structure $\Sigma$, carry less sampling variance than individual asset means (aggregating information from all market participants), and produce the market portfolio as the MVO solution when $A = \delta$. The key limitation is that $\Pi$ is conditional on market efficiency — if the market portfolio is not mean–variance efficient, $\Pi$ may be a biased measure of true expected returns.

SECTION E

# Black–Litterman as Bayesian Posterior Updating

## E.1 The Bayesian Structure

The Black–Litterman model (Black and Litterman, 1990, 1992) is a linear-Gaussian hierarchical Bayesian model. A prior distribution over the expected return vector $\mu$ is updated by a likelihood derived from investor views, yielding a posterior distribution from which the posterior mean and covariance are derived analytically by conjugacy.

### E.1.1 Prior Distribution

The prior encodes the belief that the true expected return vector $\mu$ is distributed around the equilibrium implied returns $\Pi$:

$$\mu \sim N(\Pi, \tau\Sigma) \quad (E.1)$$

The scalar $\tau > 0$ governs prior uncertainty: $\tau \to 0$ corresponds to complete confidence in equilibrium (the prior collapses to a point mass at $\Pi$), while large $\tau$ reflects diffuse prior beliefs.

### E.1.2 View Likelihood

Investor views are expressed as K linear combinations of asset returns, observed with noise:

$$Q = P\mu + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \sim N(0, \Omega) \quad (E.2)$$

$P$ $^{K\times N}$ is the pick matrix (rows sum to 0 for relative views, to 1 for absolute views), $Q$ $^{K}$ is the view vector, and $\Omega$ is a diagonal matrix of view uncertainty variances.

## E.2 Posterior Distribution by Conjugacy

Since both the prior (E.1) and the likelihood (E.2) are Gaussian, the posterior distribution $p(\mu \mid Q)$ is Gaussian by conjugacy. The posterior mean and covariance are:

$$\mu_{BL} = [(\tau\Sigma)^{-1} + P'\Omega^{-1}P]^{-1} [(\tau\Sigma)^{-1}\Pi + P'\Omega^{-1}Q] \quad (E.4)$$

$$M_{BL} = [(\tau\Sigma)^{-1} + P'\Omega^{-1}P]^{-1} \quad (E.5)$$

The posterior mean $\mu_{BL}$ can be interpreted as a precision-weighted average of the prior mean $\Pi$ and the view-implied returns: views with lower uncertainty (smaller $\Omega_{kk}$) receive higher precision weight and pull the posterior further from the prior.

## E.3 The Predictive Distribution

The predictive distribution $r_{t+1} \mid Q$ is obtained by marginalizing over the posterior of $\mu$:

$$r_{t+1} \mid Q \sim N(\mu_{BL}, \Sigma + M_{BL}) \equiv N(\mu_{BL}, M_{posterior}) \quad (E.7)$$

The predictive covariance $M_{posterior} = \Sigma + M_{BL}$ is the sum of the irreducible return variance $\Sigma$ and the parameter uncertainty $M_{BL}$. Using the Woodbury identity:

$$M_{posterior} = \Sigma + \tau\Sigma - (\tau\Sigma)P'[P(\tau\Sigma)P' + \Omega]^{-1}P(\tau\Sigma) \quad (E.8)$$

This matrix is symmetric by construction; numerical implementations should enforce symmetry explicitly after the inversion step to guard against floating-point asymmetry. It is $M_{posterior}$, not $M_{BL}$ alone, that is the theoretically correct covariance input to the mean–variance optimizer.

## E.4 The Uncertainty Scalar τ

The scalar $\tau$ is the most interpretively contested element of the Black–Litterman parameterization. Several interpretations appear in the literature:

| Interpretation | Mechanism |
|---|---|
| Estimation horizon (Black & Litterman) | $\tau = 1/T$, where T is the effective number of independent observations used to estimate $\Pi$. Treats the prior uncertainty as the sampling variance of the equilibrium mean estimator. |
| He–Litterman convention (1999) | $\Omega = \mathrm{diag}[P(\tau\Sigma)P']$. Under this construction, $\tau$ governs the overall prior/view confidence ratio; the ratio $\tau/\omega_k^2$ determines the weight placed on view k relative to the prior. $\tau$ can be absorbed into $\Omega$ without loss of generality. |
| Satchell–Scowcroft reparameterization | $\tau\Sigma$ is treated as a single object (the prior covariance of $\mu$) and calibrated to produce a prior predictive distribution with a target variance. |
| Idzorek confidence approach (2005) | $\omega_k^2$ is calibrated iteratively so that the weight deviation induced by view k matches a specified analyst confidence level, expressed as a percentage. $\tau$ then scales the overall prior–view confidence ratio. |

Remark E.1 — Parameterization Invariance: The posterior mean (E.5) depends on $\tau$ and $\Omega$ only through their relative magnitudes. Scaling both $\tau$ and all diagonal entries of $\Omega$ by the same positive constant leaves $\mu_{BL}$ unchanged. This means $\tau$ and $\Omega$ are not separately identified without an additional identification condition. Practitioners must document their parameterization convention as part of the model governance record.

## E.5 Alternative View-Uncertainty Matrix Specifications

| Ω Construction | Mechanism and Properties |
|---|---|
| Proportional (He–Litterman) | $\Omega = \mathrm{diag}[P(\tau\Sigma)P']$. View uncertainty scales with the variance of the underlying assets. Internally consistent; requires no additional inputs beyond $\tau$. |
| Confidence-implied (Idzorek, 2005) | $\Omega_{kk}$ set so that the portfolio deviation from $w_{mkt}$ matches a prespecified confidence percentage. Iterative; provides an intuitive investor-facing calibration. |
| Tracking-error calibrated | Magnitude of $\Omega$ chosen so that total tracking error of the posterior portfolio versus $w_{mkt}$ equals a target level, providing a risk-budget interpretation. |
| Entropy-minimizing (Meucci, 2010) | $\Omega$ chosen to minimize the Kullback–Leibler divergence from the prior, subject to the view constraints holding in expectation. See Section E.6. |

## E.6 Relative-Entropy Interpretation

The Black–Litterman update admits an alternative, non-parametric characterization as a minimum relative-entropy problem. As established by Meucci (2010), the Black–Litterman posterior distribution $p^*(\mu)$ can be recovered as the solution to:

$$p^*(\mu) = \arg\min_q KL(q \,\|\, p_0) \text{ subject to } E_q[P\mu] = Q \quad (E.9)$$

where $KL(q \,\|\, p_0) = \int q(\mu) \ln[q(\mu)/p_0(\mu)]\, d\mu$ is the Kullback–Leibler divergence from the prior $p_0(\mu) = N(\Pi, \tau\Sigma)$, and the constraint requires that the posterior expected return vector satisfies the investor's view projections in expectation. Under the Gaussian specification, the minimum relative-entropy solution coincides with the Bayesian posterior (E.3), but the entropy formulation is more general: it extends naturally to non-Gaussian prior and scenario-based view structures where conjugacy is unavailable, and underpins the broader Fully Flexible Views framework of Meucci (2010). The relative-entropy framing makes transparent that the Black–Litterman update is the minimum-information perturbation of the equilibrium prior consistent with satisfying the investor's views — a property that provides a principled rationale for using the equilibrium as the default.

SECTION F

# Constrained Optimization Using Posterior Inputs

## F.1 Integration of Posterior Parameters

The Black–Litterman posterior parameters ($\mu_{BL}$, $M_{posterior}$) replace ($\mu$, $\Sigma$) in the mean–variance objective. The resulting constrained program is:

$$w^* = \arg\max_{w \in \Omega} w'\mu_{BL} - (A/2)\, w' M_{posterior}\, w \quad (F.1)$$

Since $M_{posterior}$ is positive definite whenever $\Sigma$ is positive definite and $\Omega$ is positive semi-definite, the objective is strictly concave and the solution is unique. The use of $\mu_{BL}$ provides two structural advantages over the plug-in estimator: the posterior mean is anchored to the equilibrium prior and therefore more stable across rebalancing periods, and it incorporates investor views through a formally specified likelihood rather than ad hoc overrides of sample estimates.

## F.2 Weight Bounds and Concentration Control

Long-only constraints ($w_i \geq 0$) and upper bounds ($w_i \leq u_i$) are the most frequently imposed inequality constraints in institutional mandates. In the Black–Litterman context, the equilibrium prior $\Pi = \delta\Sigma w_{mkt}$ assigns positive implied returns to all assets with positive market weights, which naturally reduces the frequency of binding lower bounds at zero relative to the plug-in MVO solution. Upper bound constraints are motivated by concentration risk, liquidity limits, and regulatory position limits. The shadow price on a binding upper bound has the interpretation of the marginal utility cost of the limit and may be reported as a governance metric to flag constraints with material welfare consequences.

## F.3 Turnover Constraints

Under transaction costs, the static one-period problem (F.1) is suboptimal. A tractable approximation imposes a linear turnover constraint:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} |w_i - w_i^0| \leq \kappa \quad (F.2)$$

where $w^0$ is the current portfolio and $\kappa$ is the maximum admissible turnover. The absolute value terms are linearized via auxiliary variables $v_i \geq |w_i - w_i^0|$, converting (F.1)–(F.2) into a standard convex quadratic program. The governance framework should specify rebalancing frequency, the definition of $\kappa$ relative to total portfolio cost, and the trigger conditions for off-cycle rebalancing.

## F.4 Ridge Regularization and Its Bayesian Interpretation

An alternative to explicit weight bounds is to add a quadratic regularization term to the objective:

$$\max_{w} w'\mu_{BL} - (A/2)\, w' M_{posterior}\, w - (\gamma/2)\|w\|^2 \quad (F.3)$$

The ridge penalty $(\gamma/2)\|w\|^2$ shrinks portfolio weights toward zero, reducing concentration and improving out-of-sample stability. The first-order condition of (F.3) yields:

$$w^* = (A\ M_{posterior} + \gamma\ I)^{-1}\ \mu_{BL} \quad (F.4)$$

which is identical to the unconstrained MVO solution under the inflated covariance $(A\ M_{posterior} + \gamma\ I)/A$.

### F.4.1 Bayesian Interpretation of Ridge Regularization

The ridge penalty has a precise Bayesian interpretation: it corresponds to placing a Gaussian prior on the portfolio weight vector centered at the origin:

$$w \sim N(0,\ (1/\gamma)\ I) \quad (F.5)$$

The maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate under this prior, combined with the Gaussian likelihood induced by (F.1), reproduces the ridge solution (F.4) exactly. This connects structurally to the Black–Litterman framework: just as BL imposes a Gaussian prior $N(\Pi, \tau\Sigma)$ on $\mu$ to regularize return estimation, ridge regularization imposes a Gaussian prior $N(0, (1/\gamma)I)$ on $w$ to regularize the allocation. Both are MAP estimators under Gaussian priors. The parameter $\gamma$ plays the role of prior precision — large $\gamma$ implies strong shrinkage toward the equal-zero allocation, while $\gamma \to 0$ recovers unconstrained MVO.

## F.5 Robust Optimization and Constraint Stability

The Goldfarb–Iyengar (2003) robust approach solves the worst-case problem over an ellipsoidal uncertainty set:

$$w^* = \arg\max_{w} \min_{(\mu,\Sigma) \in U} w'\mu - (A/2)\ w'\Sigma w \quad (F.6)$$

The size of the uncertainty set $U$ is a governance parameter that governs the robustness–efficiency tradeoff: a larger set produces portfolios insensitive to a wider range of estimation errors but sacrifices expected utility. Shadow prices on binding constraints and gradient norms with respect to inputs ($\mu_{BL}$, $M_{posterior}$, $A$) constitute a minimum sensitivity reporting standard and should be documented at each rebalancing cycle.

SECTION G

# Risk Measurement Beyond Variance

## G.1 Limitations of Variance as a Risk Measure

Portfolio variance $w'\Sigma w$ is a sufficient risk statistic only under elliptically distributed returns or quadratic utility. Empirical return distributions exhibit negative skewness, excess kurtosis, tail dependence that intensifies in adverse market states, and time-varying volatility. Variance-optimal portfolios therefore may carry tail risk substantially exceeding what a Gaussian model predicts.

## G.2 Value at Risk

Value at Risk at confidence level $\alpha$ (0, 1) is the negative $\alpha$-quantile of the portfolio return distribution. Under normality:

$$\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha = -(\mu_p + z_{1-\alpha} \sigma_p) \quad (G.2)$$

where $\mu_p = w'\mu_{BL}$ and $\sigma_p = \sqrt{w' M_{posterior} w}$. Despite its regulatory prevalence (Basel II–IV), VaR is not a coherent risk measure: it violates sub-additivity (Artzner et al., 1999), meaning VaR(A + B) may exceed VaR(A) + VaR(B).

## G.3 Expected Shortfall (CVaR)

Expected Shortfall at level $\alpha$ is the expected loss conditional on the loss exceeding $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha$:

$$\mathrm{ES}_\alpha = E[-r_p \mid r_p \leq -\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha] = \mu_p + \sigma_p \cdot \varphi(z_{1-\alpha}) / (1-\alpha) \quad (G.3)$$

where $\varphi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal PDF. $\mathrm{ES}_\alpha$ is coherent (satisfies sub-additivity), convex in portfolio weights, and amenable to convex optimization. The implementation in this framework uses the full Monte Carlo distribution rather than the parametric approximation, consistent with Basel III.

## G.4 Euler Risk Decomposition

The Euler decomposition partitions portfolio risk across constituent assets such that contributions sum identically to total risk. For the marginal contribution to total risk:

$$RC_i = w_i \cdot (\partial\sigma_p / \partial w_i) = w_i \cdot (\Sigma w)_i / \sigma_p \quad (G.5)$$

Assets with $RC_i > w_i$ carry disproportionate risk relative to their capital allocation and constitute the primary targets for concentration management under a risk-budget governance framework.

SECTION H

# Scenario Analysis and the Simulation Framework

## H.1 Distributional and Calibration Assumptions

Required Disclosure — Baseline Simulation Assumptions:

Distribution: Return innovations are assumed i.i.d. multivariate Gaussian. Empirical return distributions exhibit negative skewness, excess kurtosis, and tail dependence that intensifies in adverse regimes. The Gaussian assumption systematically underestimates the frequency and magnitude of extreme drawdowns. Extensions to multivariate t-distributed or regime-switching innovations address this bias at the cost of additional parameter estimation uncertainty.

Parameter conditioning: The simulation is calibrated to the point estimates ($\mu_{BL}$, $M_{posterior}$). It does not integrate over the posterior uncertainty in ($\mu$, $\Sigma$); the simulated wealth distribution therefore conditions on the parameters being known exactly, understating total uncertainty. A predictive simulation integrating over the full posterior would produce wider distributional outcomes.

Stationarity: The model assumes ($\mu_{BL}$, $M_{posterior}$) are constant over the simulation horizon. Covariance structures and risk premia are empirically time-varying; the unconditional model omits regime-transition dynamics.

Rebalancing and contribution mechanics: The rebalancing policy and cash-flow schedule assumed in the simulation are stylized. Deviation from the simulated policy — due to market closures, liquidity constraints, or behavioral factors — introduces tracking differences between simulated and realized wealth paths.

## H.2 Cholesky Decomposition and Correlated Innovations

Return innovations with the correct covariance structure are generated via the Cholesky decomposition of the daily covariance matrix $\Sigma_d = M_{posterior} / D$, where D is the number of trading days per year. Let $L = \mathrm{chol}(\Sigma_d)$ be the lower triangular Cholesky factor. Daily correlated returns are generated as:

$$r_t = \mu_d + L z_t, \quad z_t \sim N(0, I_N) \quad (H.1)$$

where $\mu_d = \mu_{BL} / D$. The Cholesky decomposition is unique when $\Sigma_d$ is positive definite, which is guaranteed by the Ledoit–Wolf shrinkage procedure. Across D·H simulation steps, L is computed once and applied at every time step, making the procedure computationally efficient.

## H.3 Path-Dependent Wealth Dynamics

Portfolio wealth evolves according to the discrete recursion:

$$W_t = W_{t-1} (1 + w' r_t) + c_t \quad (H.2)$$

where $c_t$ is the net cash contribution at time t. Under periodic rebalancing, the weight vector w is reset to $w^*$ at each rebalancing date; between dates, weights drift with realized asset returns. The collection of S wealth paths $\{W_t^{(s)}\}_{t=0}^{DH}$ constitutes the full distributional output. Terminal wealth percentiles $W_{DH}^{(s)}$ provide non-parametric estimates of the outcome distribution without any additional distributional assumption beyond those stated in Section H.1.

### H.4 Maximum Drawdown and Recovery Duration

The maximum drawdown for simulation path s is:

$$MDD^{(s)} = \min_{t \in [0,DH]} \left[ W_t^{(s)} / \max_{u \leq t} W_u^{(s)} - 1 \right] \quad \text{(H.3)}$$

$MDD^{(s)} \leq 0$ by definition. The recovery duration $T_{rec}^{(s)}$ is the elapsed time from the pre-trough peak to the first date on which $W_t$ recovers to the peak level; paths that never recover are censored at the horizon. The median MDD and median recovery duration across all S paths are the primary governance reference statistics for drawdown risk communication.

### H.5 Target Wealth Probability

The probability that terminal wealth exceeds a specified target $W^*$ is:

$$P^* = P(W_{DH} \geq W^*) \approx (1/S) \sum_{s=1}^{S} 1[W_{DH}^{(s)} \geq W^*] \quad \text{(H.4)}$$

The Monte Carlo estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal with standard error $\sqrt{P^*(1-P^*)/S}$. The required number of paths S to achieve a target standard error of $\varepsilon$ is $S \approx P^*(1-P^*)/\varepsilon^2$, which governs the precision–computation tradeoff in simulation design. This precision estimate should be reported alongside $P^*$ to provide the reader with a measure of simulation-induced uncertainty.

SECTION I

# Model Governance Framework

## I.1 A Four-Layer Governance Hierarchy

A quantitative portfolio construction framework is not self-governing. Every methodological element embeds assumptions that introduce model risk. The history of quantitative finance contains numerous cases in which technically sophisticated models were applied without adequate governance in regimes where their assumptions were violated, with materially adverse consequences.

The framework described in this paper is organized into four governance layers:

| Governance Layer | Scope of Assumptions | Validation Procedures | Review Cadence |
|---|---|---|---|
| Statistical Model | Distributional assumptions governing the return-generating process (multivariate Gaussian i.i.d.) | Distributional diagnostics (skewness, kurtosis, tail dependence tests). Sensitivity under alternative distributions. | Reviewed annually or on event-driven schedule |
| Parameter Estimation | Estimation of Σ (shrinkage target, α*), market risk aversion δ, equilibrium prior Π, and BL posterior (μ_BL, M_posterior) | Monitoring of α*, condition number of M_posterior, and stability of δ. Out-of-sample covariance forecast evaluation. | Recalibrated at each rebalancing cycle; major structural changes trigger full re-estimation |
| Constraint Architecture | Investment policy constraints: long-only bounds, concentration limits u_i, turnover κ, sector caps c_k | Shadow price reporting on all active constraints. Goldfarb–Iyengar robustness testing. | Reviewed against IPS at each rebalancing; updated when mandate constraints change |
| Judgment Integration | View specification (P, Q, Ω) and prior uncertainty scalar τ. Interface between qualitative judgment and quantitative outputs. | View attribution: decomposition into per-view contributions. Realized view accuracy monitoring over rolling windows. | Views documented with rationale and confidence specification; attribution reviewed post-rebalancing |

## I.2 Parameter Sensitivity and Model Validation

At each rebalancing cycle, a minimum validation protocol should be executed and documented:

| Validation Procedure | Objective and Output |
|---|---|
| Input sensitivity | Gradient of w* with respect to μ_BL, M_posterior, and A. Flag assets with weight sensitivity exceeding a defined threshold. |
| Out-of-sample backtesting | Compare realized portfolio statistics (return, volatility, drawdown) against model in-sample predictions. Persistent discrepancies indicate specification error. |
| Eigenvalue monitoring | Track the time series of the eigenvalue distribution of M_posterior and the shrinkage intensity α*. Structural changes may warrant re-specification of the shrinkage target. |
| Scenario stress testing | Evaluate portfolio outcomes under manually specified adverse scenarios: correlation spike, large adverse return realization, simultaneous factor drawdown. Report stress loss against risk budget limits. |
| View attribution | Decompose the BL portfolio deviation from w_mkt into per-view contributions. Report the marginal utility impact of each view. |

Each application of this framework should produce a documented model record containing at minimum: the estimation window; the shrinkage target selection and resulting $\alpha^*$; the source of market-capitalization weights; the method and realized estimate of $\delta$; the identity, rationale, and confidence specification of all views in P and Q; the $\Omega$ construction method and the value of $\tau$; the investor risk aversion A and its calibration basis; all policy constraints; the rebalancing policy; and key simulation parameters. This record enables full reproducibility and constitutes an auditable trail consistent with the stated assumptions.

### I.4 Judgment as a Structured Input

Quantitative models encode explicit, verifiable assumptions about market structure. They cannot, however, encode all relevant information: qualitative assessment of geopolitical risk, regulatory change, or structural shifts in competitive dynamics may be material to expected returns but does not follow from historical data alone. The Black–Litterman framework provides a principled mechanism for incorporating such assessment through the view matrix P and view vector Q. The precision with which each belief is held — encoded in $\Omega_{kk}$ — should reflect the analyst's honest assessment of their informational advantage relative to the market consensus. The governance value of this structure is that it forces every judgment to be explicit, quantified, and attributable, enabling post-hoc evaluation of view quality and continuous improvement.

CONCLUSION

## Synthesis and Implications

This paper has developed a unified quantitative framework for portfolio construction under parameter uncertainty, integrating four methodologically coherent components: Ledoit–Wolf shrinkage estimation of the covariance matrix, reverse optimization of market-implied returns, Black–Litterman Bayesian updating of expected returns with an explicit derivation of the posterior predictive distribution, and multi-horizon simulation-based risk analytics with fully disclosed distributional assumptions.

The unifying theme is the explicit recognition and systematic management of estimation risk. The sample covariance matrix is regularized toward a structured target to reduce eigenvalue dispersion and improve optimizer conditioning. Historical return means are replaced by posterior estimates that blend market-equilibrium information with investor views in proportion to their respective precisions. The posterior predictive covariance M_posterior is shown to be the theoretically correct optimizer input. Risk analytics extend beyond single-period Gaussian variance to encompass tail risk, drawdown dynamics, and goal-attainment probability.

The four-layer governance hierarchy provides a structured basis for model risk management. A framework that is well-specified, transparently parameterized, regularly validated, and documented in a reproducible model record constitutes a sound basis for disciplined investment decision-making under irreducible uncertainty.

## REFERENCES


Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Eber, J.-M., and Heath, D. (1999). Coherent Measures of Risk. Mathematical Finance, 9(3), 203–228.

Black, F. and Litterman, R. (1990). Asset Allocation: Combining Investor Views with Market Equilibrium. Goldman Sachs Fixed Income Research.

Black, F. and Litterman, R. (1992). Global Portfolio Optimization. Financial Analysts Journal, 48(5), 28–43.

Goldfarb, D. and Iyengar, G. (2003). Robust Portfolio Selection Problems. Mathematics of Operations Research, 28(1), 1–38.

He, G. and Litterman, R. (1999). The Intuition Behind Black-Litterman Model Portfolios. Goldman Sachs Investment Management Division Working Paper.

Idzorek, T. (2005). A Step-By-Step Guide to the Black-Litterman Model: Incorporating User-Specified Confidence Levels. Zephyr Associates Working Paper.

Jorion, P. (1985). International Portfolio Diversification with Estimation Risk. Journal of Business, 58(3), 259–278.

Kahneman, D. and Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Under Risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263–291.

Ledoit, O. and Wolf, M. (2004). Honey, I Shrunk the Sample Covariance Matrix. Journal of Portfolio Management, 30(4), 110–119.

Ledoit, O. and Wolf, M. (2012). Nonlinear Shrinkage Estimation of Large-Dimensional Covariance Matrices. Annals of Statistics, 40(2), 1024–1060.

Marchenko, V.A. and Pastur, L.A. (1967). Distribution of Eigenvalues for Some Sets of Random Matrices. Mathematics of the USSR — Sbornik, 1(4), 457–483.

Markowitz, H. (1952). Portfolio Selection. Journal of Finance, 7(1), 77–91.

Merton, R. (1980). On Estimating the Expected Return on the Market: An Exploratory Investigation. Journal of Financial Economics, 8(4), 323–361.

Meucci, A. (2010). The Black-Litterman Approach: Original Model and Extensions. Symmys Working Paper.

Michaud, R.O. (1989). The Markowitz Optimization Enigma: Is Optimized Optimal? Financial Analysts Journal, 45(1), 31–42.

Rockafellar, R.T. and Uryasev, S. (2000). Optimization of Conditional Value-at-Risk. Journal of Risk, 2(3), 21–41.

Rockafellar, R.T. and Uryasev, S. (2002). Conditional Value-at-Risk for General Loss Distributions. Journal of Banking and Finance, 26(7), 1443–1471.

Sharpe, W.F. (1974). Imputing Expected Security Returns from Portfolio Composition. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, 9(3), 463–472.

Stein, C. (1956). Inadmissibility of the Usual Estimator for the Mean of a Multivariate Normal Distribution. Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Vol. 1, 197–206.

Tobin, J. (1958). Liquidity Preference as Behavior Toward Risk. Review of Economic Studies, 25(2), 65–86.


A.L. Capital Advisory
Warsaw, Poland

alcapitaladvisory.com
@AntonLadnyi


Working Paper · February 2026