Stress Testing 2.0
Moving beyond Traditional Scenarios

How AI and Machine Learning technologies are transforming the design, execution, and governance of financial stress testing.

AUTHOR
Ankur Rambhia

PUBLISHED BY
Levrara Consulting Group

Index Summary

01

Synopsis

This white paper explores how emerging AI and Machine Learning technologies are transforming the design, execution, and governance of financial stress testing. Traditional stress-testing frameworks rely heavily on linear models, expert judgment, and a limited set of predefined scenarios—approaches that often fall short in capturing today's fast-evolving, interconnected risks.

> ***The paper introduces Stress Testing 2.0, a next-generation framework that leverages AI/ML to build richer, dynamic, and forward-looking scenarios.***

It explains how advanced modelling techniques can uncover hidden correlations, simulate non-linear market behaviour, and generate thousands of plausible stress pathways that go far beyond conventional handcrafted scenarios.

02

Executive Summary

Financial institutions operate in an environment marked by growing macroeconomic uncertainty, rapid market shifts, and complex connections across portfolios, geographies, and counterparties. Traditional stress-testing frameworks—largely linear, expert-driven, and backward-looking—struggle to capture these emerging risks with the speed and precision regulators and risk committees now expect. Stress Testing 2.0, powered by Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML), offers a transformative opportunity to close this gap.

The paper concludes that Stress Testing 2.0 enables institutions to shift from periodic compliance exercises to strategic, intelligence-driven risk management, strengthening resilience and improving decision-making in an increasingly uncertain financial environment.

It addresses the limitations of conventional stress-testing frameworks and redefines scenario generation through AI and machine learning.

Overall, Stress Testing 2.0 enables institutions to shift from periodic, compliance-driven exercises to strategic, intelligence-driven risk management, strengthening resilience and improving decision-making in an increasingly uncertain financial environment.

03

Introduction

The global financial crisis of 2008, market dislocations in 2020, and more recent liquidity and counterparty shocks have underscored how real-world stress events unfold through complex, path-dependent interactions rather than through isolated, one-off shocks. Traditional frameworks that impose fixed shocks fail to account for how economic variables, balance sheets, and risk behaviours evolve over time and how stress in one area can propagate through interconnected systems.

Against this backdrop, Stress Testing 2.0 emerges as a next-generation framework designed to overcome these limitations. By integrating forward-looking scenario generation, dynamic balance-sheet modelling, and advanced analytics (including AI and machine learning), Stress Testing 2.0 enables organisations to simulate a rich set of plausible future stress paths, capture second-order effects, and enhance early warning capabilities. Rather than applying pre-defined shocks at a single point in time, this approach models how risks materialise and interact across multiple periods and under varying macroeconomic and market conditions.

In the sections that follow, we explore the limitations of traditional stress testing, the core principles of Stress Testing 2.0, practical applications, and how forward stress testing is reshaping risk management in leading global institutions.

04

Limitations of Traditional Stress Testing

Traditional stress-testing frameworks have played a central role in risk management for over a decade, but their effectiveness is increasingly challenged by today's volatile and interconnected financial environment. Several structural limitations reduce their ability to capture emerging risks and support timely decision-making.

Traditional stress testing is limited by:

- Static and Linear Scenario Design
- Historical bias
- Manual processes
- Narrow scenario coverage
- Weak forward-looking capabilities
- Inability to capture complexity
- Heavy Dependence on Expert Judgment

> **These limitations set the stage for Stress Testing 2.0, where AI/ML bring dynamic, scalable, forward-looking, intelligence-driven risk assessments.**

05

Stress Testing 2.0: A Next-Generation Framework

Stress Testing 2.0 represents a fundamental evolution in the way financial institutions assess resilience under uncertainty. Unlike traditional stress testing frameworks rely on static, predefined shocks, Stress Testing 2.0 adopts a forward-looking, dynamic, and integrated approach to scenario analysis. Its objective is not only to measure losses under adverse conditions, but to understand how stress develops, propagates, and amplifies over time across the institution.

At the core of Stress Testing 2.0 is the recognition that modern financial risks are non-linear, interconnected, and behavioural in nature. Credit deterioration, market volatility, liquidity stress, and operational disruptions rarely occur in isolation. Instead, they evolve jointly, driven by macroeconomic shifts, market sentiment, policy responses, and behavioural reactions from customers, counterparties, and management. Stress Testing 2.0 is designed to capture these interactions through multi-period simulations and path-dependent scenario modelling.

Strategic Value of Stress Testing 2.0

By shifting from static shock analysis to continuous, forward-looking resilience assessment, Stress Testing 2.0 enables institutions to:

- Anticipate risks earlier and more accurately
- Strengthen capital and liquidity planning
- Improve crisis preparedness and response
- Align risk insights with strategic decision-making
- Meet evolving regulatory and supervisory expectations

What is Forward Stress Testing / Stress Testing 2.0

Forward stress testing is an enhanced, forward-looking approach to stress testing that shifts the focus from historical or predefined scenarios to dynamic, predictive, and path-dependent scenarios.

It answers the question: "What adverse conditions could realistically emerge next, given today's risk environment?"

Forward stress testing is a methodology that uses forward-looking indicators, such as market trends, macroeconomic forecasts, risk-factor dynamics, and early-warning signals, to create scenarios that evolve over time, rather than point-in-time shocks.

Where traditional stress tests rely on static shocks (e.g., interest rates rise by 200 bps), forward stress testing instead focuses on evolving trajectories (e.g., rates gradually tighten, liquidity deteriorates, credit spreads widen, and volatility increases over a quarter due to tightening policy and risk aversion).

Why Forward Stress Testing is Required

Financial institutions operate in an environment marked by growing macroeconomic uncertainty, rapid market shifts, and complex interconnections across portfolios, geographies, and counterparties. Traditional stress-testing frameworks—largely linear, expert-driven, and backward-looking—struggle to capture these emerging risks with the speed and precision regulators and risk committees now expect. Stress Testing 2.0, powered by Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML), offers a transformative opportunity to close this gap.

Forward stress testing enables banks, insurers, and asset managers to:

- **Identify emerging risks earlier** (e.g., signs of a liquidity crunch 2–3 months ahead)
- **Prepare for nonlinear shocks** (volatility spikes, contagion, regime shifts)
- **Improve capital planning** with future-facing insights
- **Move beyond regulatory compliance** to strategic risk management

How it is Different from Traditional Stress Testing: Sample Example

TRADITIONAL STRESS TEST	FORWARD STRESS TEST
"Assume NIFTY drops 25% tomorrow."	"Given rising inflation, widening credit spreads, and weakening corporate earnings, simulate a scenario where equities break down to 10–15%, liquidity thins, two default events occur, and volatility rises by 40%. "

Comparison Table: Traditional vs. Stress Testing 2.0

DIMENSION	TRADITIONAL STRESS TESTING	STRESS TESTING 2.0 (AI/ML-DRIVEN)
Scenario Design	Manual, expert-driven; limited to a few predefined shocks	Automated, data-driven; thousands of dynamic and plausible scenarios
Model Behaviour	Linear assumptions; fixed correlations	Non-linear modelling; evolving, regime-sensitive correlations
Forward-Looking Capability	Primarily backward-looking, based on past crises	Strong forward-looking insights using early-warning indicators and predictive analytics
Scenario Evolution	Point-in-time shocks; static frameworks	Path-dependent, time-evolving scenarios with complex interactions
Risk Interdependencies	Weak capture of contagion and second-order effects	Models contagion, feedback loops, cross-asset and counterparty spillovers
Data Usage	Relies on structured, historical datasets	Integrates structured + unstructured data (news, sentiment, macro signals)
Operational Efficiency	Slow, manual, resource-intensive: cycle takes weeks or months	Automated pipelines; real-time or near-real-time stress-testing capability
Scenario Breadth	3–10 scenarios per cycle	Hundreds to thousands of scenarios generated and tested
Adaptability	Slow to update; limited responsiveness to new risks	Rapid scenario refresh based on new signals or market events
Model Governance	Traditional validation, limited explainability	XAI frameworks, bias detection, traceability, and robust governance
Use Case Orientation	Primarily regulatory and compliance-driven	Strategic, continuous risk management and capital decision support
Technology Stack	Legacy systems; siloed architecture	Integrated platforms with AI/ML engines, scalable computation, and cloud-native pipelines

Case Studies: Failures in Traditional Stress Testing and How AI and ML Could Have Helped and prevented the failures address Failures.

CASE STUDY 01 Global Financial Crisis (2007–2008)

• CONTEXT

Leading global banks relied heavily on stress tests calibrated to historical housing data and benign macroeconomic assumptions.

• OUTCOME

The collapse of Lehman Brothers and near-failure of multiple global banks resulted in unprecedented government bailouts and regulatory reform.

• STRESS TESTING GAPS

- Assumed continued growth in housing prices
- Underestimated correlation of mortgage defaults
- Failed to model system-wide liquidity freezes and contagion

• KEY LESSON

Stress testing based solely on historical data fails to capture tail risks and systemic breakdowns.

HOW AI/ML COULD HAVE HELPED

- ML-driven correlation analysis could have detected rising dependence between mortgage defaults across regions.
- Network models could have revealed hidden contagion paths between banks, structured products, and funding markets.
- Generative AI could have produced forward-looking scenarios involving nationwide house price declines and simultaneous credit-liquidity stress.

Preventive Insight:
Earlier identification of systemic tail risk would have challenged capital adequacy assumptions well before the crisis.

CASE STUDY 02 Lehman Brothers (2008)

CONTEXT

Lehman appeared well-capitalized under prevailing regulatory stress tests shortly before its collapse.

OUTCOME

A rapid liquidity crisis led to bankruptcy within days.

STRESS TESTING GAPS

- Focused primarily on market risk.
- Ignored funding liquidity risk and counterparty confidence loss.
- Assumed continuous access to short-term repo funding.

KEY LESSON

Capital adequacy stress tests are insufficient without integrated liquidity stress testing.

HOW AI/ML COULD HAVE HELPED

- AI-based liquidity stress models could have simulated rapid withdrawal of repo funding under confidence shocks.
- Behavioural ML could have incorporated counterparty reactions and non-linear run dynamics.
- Scenario optimization techniques could have identified liquidity thresholds leading to firm failure.

Preventive Insight:
Liquidity-driven failure modes would have been visible despite apparently adequate capital ratios.

CASE STUDY 03 Silicon Valley Bank (2023)

CONTEXT

SVB faced a high concentrated depositor base and significant interest rate exposure.

OUTCOME

Rapid deposit outflows forced asset sales at losses, leading to bank failure.

STRESS TESTING GAPS

- Underestimated speed and magnitude of interest rate hikes
- Assumed deposit stickiness
- Did not combine interest rate shocks with deposit run scenarios

KEY LESSON

Forward-looking stress tests must account for behavioural responses and compound risk events.

HOW AI/ML COULD HAVE HELPED

- ML models trained on depositor behaviour could have flagged concentration risk and non-sticky deposits.
- AI-driven scenario engines could have combined rapid rate increases with accelerated deposit outflows.
- Dynamic balance-sheet simulations could have captured the interaction between unrealized losses and liquidity pressure.

Preventive Insight:
The speed and severity of the bank run could have been anticipated under compound stress scenarios.

CASE STUDY 04 Archegos Capital and Credit Suisse (2021)

CONTEXT

Credit Suisse acted as a prime broker to Archegos Capital, which used extreme leverage through total return swaps.

OUTCOME

Credit Suisse incurred losses exceeding USD 5.5 billion.

STRESS TESTING GAPS

- Client-level stress tests ignored cross-bank exposure concentration
- Margin models assumed orderly liquidation
- Failed to model simultaneous market exits by multiple counterparties

KEY LESSON

Stress testing must extend beyond single-entity views to capture ecosystem-level risks.

HOW AI/ML COULD HAVE HELPED

- Graph-based ML could have identified cross-bank exposure concentration to the same client and underlying assets.
- Agent-based simulations could have modeled multiple banks liquidating identical positions concurrently.
- AI-enhanced market impact models could have quantified fire-sale losses under disorderly liquidation.

Preventive Insight:
Loss amplification from crowded trades and herd behaviour would have been visible before margin thresholds were breached.

Challenges Faced in Implementing Forward Stress Testing

While Forward Stress Testing (FST) offers significant strategic and risk-management benefits, its implementation presents a set of technical, organisational, and governance challenges. Addressing these challenges is essential for institutions seeking to move from traditional stress testing to a fully forward-looking framework.

DATA AVAILABILITY, QUALITY & INTEGRATION

Stress Testing 2.0 requires large volumes of high-quality, granular, and timely data across markets, products, counterparties, and behaviours.

MODEL RISK & EXPLAINABILITY

Advanced ML models can be complex and difficult to interpret, raising concerns around transparency and trust.

REGULATORY ACCEPTANCE & SUPERVISORY SCRUTINY

Regulatory frameworks were largely designed around traditional stress testing methodologies.

SCENARIO GOVERNANCE & HUMAN OVERSIGHT

AI can generate a vast number of scenarios, creating governance and prioritisation challenges.

COMPUTATIONAL & TECHNOLOGY CONSTRAINTS

Advanced simulations, network models, and agent-based stress tests are computationally intensive.

TALENT & SKILL GAPS

Effective implementation requires a combination of quantitative risk expertise, data science, and regulatory knowledge.

INTEGRATION INTO DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

Many institutions struggle to translate stress test outputs into actionable business decisions.

ETHICAL, BIAS & MODEL DRIFT RISKS

AI models may unintentionally encode biases or degrade over time.

Implementing Forward Stress Testing is as much an organisational transformation as a technical one. Institutions that successfully overcome these challenges typically adopt a phased approach, strengthening data foundations, governance, and cross-functional collaboration while gradually introducing advanced analytics. When executed effectively, forward stress testing becomes a powerful tool for anticipatory risk management and strategic decision-making.

Real-world examples of banks and financial institutions that are using AI and ML to evolve stress testing into a more advanced (Stress Testing 2.0) framework

HSBC

HSBC has publicly integrated AI and machine learning models into its stress testing and scenario analysis frameworks, enabling it to simulate complex macroeconomic stress with greater sophistication than traditional models. These models help assess balance-sheet resilience under extreme market conditions and identify risks that traditional techniques might miss.

UBS, Wells Fargo, Barclays & Other Major Global Banks

A number of large global banks — including UBS, Wells Fargo, HSBC, and Barclays — are adopting next-generation generative AI tools tied to risk testing frameworks. They have engaged with AI solution providers (e.g., H2O. ai) to build AI-driven risk and model validation platforms, which can support more dynamic testing and model risk management.

Natixis

While not a bank per se, Natixis (a major French financial group) has implemented machine learning algorithms to improve quantitative stress testing of trading portfolios and risk compliance. Its systems detect anomalous outputs and refine stress test calculations automatically, involving millions of computations each night.

JPMorgan Chase

Although public disclosures often focus on broader AI uses (e.g., cashflow forecasting, automation), JPMorgan is widely known internally to leverage advanced AI/ML for risk analytics and scenario simulation, including in areas like portfolio risk, market forecasting, and predictive modeling. Industry research notes its use of ML for detecting risk signals in trading and investment operations.

Citigroup & Bank of America

Banks like Citigroup and Bank of America also use proprietary AI/ML systems to strengthen risk analytics, including predicting operational disruptions and potential market stress indicators — critical inputs when designing stress test scenarios.

Reserve Bank of India (Regulator Level)

While not a bank, the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) is explicitly exploring the use of AI/ML in stress testing functions for supervised entities. RBI's analytic standing committee is being re-mandated to support predictive analysis, early detection of market disruptions, and multivariate stress testing with AI tools.

Conclusion / Strategic Takeaways:

The evolution from traditional stress testing to Stress Testing 2.0 marks a fundamental shift in how financial institutions understand, anticipate, and manage risk. Historical, static, and compliance-driven approaches have repeatedly failed to capture the speed, interconnectedness, and non-linearities of modern financial crises. Forward Stress Testing addresses these limitations by enabling institutions to model how risks unfold over time, rather than merely measuring the impact of isolated shocks.

By leveraging AI, machine learning, dynamic balance-sheet modelling, and forward-looking scenario generation, Stress Testing 2.0 transforms stress testing from a backward-looking regulatory requirement into a strategic decision-support capability. Institutions can now identify emerging vulnerabilities earlier, quantify second-order effects, and evaluate the resilience of capital, liquidity, and business models under a wide range of plausible future states.

Strategic Takeaways

01 **Traditional stress testing is no longer sufficient.**
Backward-looking, static scenarios fail to capture fast-moving, interconnected, and non-linear risks seen in recent crises.

02 **Forward Stress Testing strengthens resilience, not just compliance.**
Dynamic, multi-year scenario analysis enables earlier identification of vulnerabilities across capital, liquidity, and business models.

03 **Scenario quality matters more than model complexity.**
Forward-looking, severe but plausible scenarios—capturing behavioural responses and contagion—drive better strategic insight than isolated shocks.

04 **Risk must be viewed holistically.**
Credit, market, liquidity, climate, and operational risks interact and amplify each other; stress testing must reflect these interdependencies.

05 **AI and advanced analytics enhance foresight.**
Machine learning enables richer scenario generation and early-warning signals but must be governed by strong explainability and oversight.

06 **Stress testing should directly inform strategic decisions.**
Outputs should guide capital allocation, liquidity buffers, portfolio rebalancing, pricing, and growth initiatives —not remain theoretical exercises.

07 **Forward stress testing improves crisis preparedness.**
Institutions can simulate evolving stress paths and pre-define management actions before adverse conditions materialise.

08 **Regulatory expectations are moving forward-looking.**
Supervisors increasingly expect dynamic, forward-looking stress testing aligned with ICAAP, ILAAP, climate risk, and enterprise resilience.

09 **Early adopters gain a competitive advantage.**
Institutions embedding Stress Testing 2.0 into strategy and governance are better positioned to manage uncertainty and outperform peers in volatile environments.

12

Glossary

AI (Artificial Intelligence) Systems capable of performing tasks that normally require human intelligence, such as pattern recognition and scenario generation.	**Balance Sheet Dynamics** Modelling how assets, liabilities, and capital evolve over time under stress scenarios.
CCAR (Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review) U.S. Federal Reserve's forward-looking capital stress-testing program.	**Climate Stress Testing** Assessment of financial resilience under climate transition and physical risk scenarios.
Contagion Risk Risk that stress in one institution or market spreads to others.	**Early Warning Indicators (EWI)** Forward-looking metrics signaling emerging risks before materialisation.
Forward Stress Testing (FST) Stress testing approach that simulates future risk paths, balance-sheet evolution, and management actions over time.	**ICAAP (Internal Capital Adequacy Assessment Process)** Firm-led assessment of capital adequacy under normal and stressed conditions.
ILAAP (Internal Liquidity Adequacy Assessment Process) Framework for assessing liquidity sufficiency under stress scenarios.	**Machine Learning (ML)** Subset of AI that enables systems to learn patterns from data without explicit programming.
Scenario Path A time-evolving sequence of economic, market, or environmental conditions.	**Static Stress Testing** One-time shock applied without modelling future evolution or behavioural response.
Stress Testing 1.0 Traditional, compliance-focused stress testing framework.	**Stress Testing 2.0** Advanced, forward-looking stress testing integrating AI, dynamic balance sheets, and multi-risk interactions.

13

Appendix

https://www.investopedia.com

https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/2025-stress-test-scenarios.htm?

https://www.bis.org/publ/bcbs147.pdf

https://www.regcompliancewatch.com/report-blasts-fundamental-failure-in-archegos-collapse/

https://chatgpt.com/