

Validation

Dr. Jens Bruderhausen

2011-10-17

Evaluation

Agenda



General principles
External data and 3rd party elements
Backtesting
Validation of the rating process
Q & A



GENERAL PRINCIPLES

2011-10-17

Evaluation

Guidelines



Quality of prediction and embedding of estimates in the credit process
Adequate implementation
There is no universal method for validation
Validation is an iterative process
Validation consists of quantitaive and qualitative elements

Quality of prediction



Broad definition of validation Stresses ability to predict

Goals

Quality of prediction

Methods and processes for measuring ability to predict

Embedding of validation in bank's processes

Adequate implementation



Usetest

- Assessment of bank's internal validation methods and processes is key component of acceptance by supervisory authoritory
- Appropriate methods and proccesses depend on portfolio, rating methods, defaults

Validation process



Validation of the rating method's components

Data

Statistical modell

Overruling

Monitoring

Validation of result of the rating method

Process oriented validation

Rating procesesInterface to other processes



EXTERNAL DATA

2011-10-17

Evaluation

Basel rules for PD



Banks must meet all requirements

456 Basel II:

A bank must record actual defaults on IRB exposure classes using this reference definition. A bank must also use the reference definition for its estimation of PDs, and (where relevant) LGDs and EADs. In arriving at these estimations, a bank may use external data available to it that is not itself consistent with that definition, subject to the requirements set out in paragraph 462. However, in such cases, banks must demonstrate to their supervisors that appropriate adjustments to the data have been made to achieve broad equivalence with the reference definition. This same condition would apply to any internal data used up to implementation of this Framework. Internal data (including that pooled by banks) used in such estimates beyond the date of implementation of this Framework must be consistent with the reference definition.

462: Requirements specific to PD estimation

Basel rules for external data



IIRBA-rules allow use of external data

417 Basel II (excerpt)

The bank must demonstrate that the data used to build the model are representative of the population of the bank's actual borrowers or facilities.

462 Basel II (excerpt)

I (...) A bank may use data on internal default experience for the estimation of PD. The use of pooled data across institutions may also be recognised. A bank must demonstrate that the internal rating systems and criteria of other banks in the pool are comparable with its own. (...)

Banks may associate or map their internal grades to the scale used by an external credit assessment institution or similar institution and then attribute the default rate observed for the external institution's grades to the bank's grades. (...)

The bank's analysis must include a comparison of the default definitions used, subject to the requirements in paragraph 452 to 457.

Basel rules for external models



IRBA-rules allow the use of mathematical modells

417 Basel II:

Credit scoring models and other mechanical rating procedures generally use only a subset of available information. Although mechanical rating procedures may sometimes avoid some of the idiosyncratic errors made by rating systems in which human judgement plays a large role, mechanical use of limited information also is a source of rating errors. Credit scoring models and other mechanical procedures are permissible as the primary or partial basis of rating assignments, and may play a role in the estimation of loss characteristics. Sufficient human judgement and human oversight is necessary to ensure that all relevant and material information, including that which is outside the scope of the model, is also taken into consideration, and that the model is used appropriately.

Basel rules for external data



417 Basel II (ctd.)

- The burden is on the bank to satisfy its supervisor that a model or procedure has good predictive power and that regulatory capital requirements will not be distorted as a result of its use. The variables that are input to the model must form a reasonable set of predictors. The model must be accurate on average across the range of borrowers or facilities to which the bank is exposed and there must be no known material biases.
- The bank must have in place a process for vetting data inputs into a statistical default or loss prediction model which includes an assessment of the accuracy, completeness and appropriateness of the data specific to the assignment of an approved rating.
- The bank must demonstrate that the data used to build the model are representative of the population of the bank's actual borrowers or facilities.
- When combining model results with human judgement, the judgement must take into account all relevant and material information not considered by the model.

Basel rules for external data



417 Basel II (ctd.)

- The bank must have procedures for human review of model-based rating assignments. Such procedures should focus on finding and limiting errors associated with known model weaknesses and must also include credible ongoing efforts to improve the model's performance.
- The bank must have a regular cycle of model validation that includes monitoring of model performance and stability; review of model relationships; and testing of model outputs against outcomes.

Translation of Basel rules



Internal rating models consist of two stages:

Ranking

Quantification of risk (internal or external)

Possibly non-internal elements:

3rd-party data

3rd-party models

3rd-Party Elements



Verification of representativeness

Analysis of discriminatory power at least yearly (internal data)

Use-test

- Verification that all relevant data ist used in the credit decision process
- Development sample consists of data similar to internal data (in case external data is used)
- Control sample consists of internal data (in case external model is used)
- Parameters, their weight, and their direction of action known (in case external model is used)
- Scope of application and limits of application known (in case external model is used)

Use-test



444 Basel II

- Internal ratings and default and loss estimates must play an essential role in the credit approval, risk management, internal capital allocations, and corporate governance functions of banks using the IRB approach. (...)
- It is recognised that banks will not necessarily be using exactly the same estimates for both IRB and all internal purposes. (...)
- Where there are such differences, a bank must document them and demonstrate their reasonableness to the supervisor.

445 Basel II

A bank must have a credible track record in the use of internal ratings information. Thus, the bank must demonstrate that it has been using a rating system that was broadly in line with the minimum requirements articulated in this document for at least the three years prior to qualification.



Verification of representativeness of external data

- External data includes observed rates of default as well as non-modelled PDs
- Existing internal data on observed rates of default can be accounted for
- Validation based on internal data at least yearly
- Appropriate mapping of the definition of default to Basel II definition of default, in case external data does not conform with this definition. Mapping has to be based on internal data.

Basel II Defintion of default



456 Basel II

- A bank must record actual defaults on IRB exposure classes using this reference definition. A bank must also use the reference definition for its estimation of PDs, and (where relevant) LGDs and EADs.
- In arriving at these estimations, a bank may use external data
- available to it that is not itself consistent with that definition, subject to the requirements set out in paragraph 462. However, in such cases, banks must demonstrate to their supervisors that appropriate adjustments to the data have been made to achieve broad equivalence with the reference definition.
- This same condition would apply to any internal data used up to implementation of this Framework. Internal data (including that pooled by banks) used in such estimates beyond the date of implementation of this Framework must be consistent with the reference definition.

3rd-Party Risk Quantification



Not acceptable in case of unknown external model

Use of external data acceptable, provided

- Rating classes / rating segments, on which the external model was built, are compatible with the risk content of internal data
- External data used for building the model consists of observed default rates and not on PDs calculated with a model
- Use of internal data on observed default rates
- Validation based on internal data at least yearly
- Appropriate mapping of the definition of default to Basel II definition of default, in case external data does not conform with this definition. Mapping has to be based on internal data.

3rd-Party Rating



Adoption of 3rd-party ratings comprises:

Fundamentals: Data, risk parameters, methods etc., or

Results: e.g. subsidiary company adopts rating issued by parent company

Requirements

No curtailing with internal risk measurement and risk control

All relevant internal data is used in the external rating to full extent

Internal validation methods are able to detect misjudged external ratings

Validation can be externalised (e.g. pool projects)

Defined set of rules for adopted external elements



BACKTESTING

2011-10-17

Evaluation



Compare predicted performance with observed performance

501 Basel II

- Banks must regularly compare realised default rates with estimated PDs for each grade and be able to demonstrate that the realised default rates are within the expected range for that grade. Banks using the advanced IRB approach must complete such analysis for their estimates of LGDs and EADs.
- Such comparisons must make use of historical data that are over as long a period as possible.
- The methods and data used in such comparisons by the bank must be clearly documented by the bank. This analysis and documentation must be updated at least annually.



Comparison between internal market risk models and internal rating based models of default risk

	Market risk	IRB
Prediction	VaR	PD, EL
Observed data	Clean P&L	Default rate, loss
Frequency	250 times a year	Once a year
Pre-requisite	Eavaluation of clean P&L, time series of VaR and clean P&L	Time series of default and migration events
Backtest method	Binominal	??? (Confidence level > 99.0 %)



I Measuring default rate

(observed) default rate = number of defaulted loans per period per rating class
IDefine!

Period of time and number of defaulted loans
Total number

ICompeting definitions (forthcoming):

Static pools vs. dynamic pools
Showing that observed default rates are subject to

Method of detection of default
Susceptible to manipulation



Static pools

All ratings frozen in at a given point in time.

Nominator: Number of defaulted loans within a 1-year period beginning with the fixed point in time

Denominator: Fixed by frozen ratings

Disadvantages

(Cf. forthcoming example)

Data on defaulted loans may be lost

Assignment of defaulted loans may be incorrect

Susceptible to manipulation



Static pool (ctd.)

A small example: Two periods (p1, p2), two rating classes for perforing loans (a1,a2), one rating class for defaulted loans (d). Pool is created at time T, where t1 < t2 < T < t3 < t4 < T + 1 < t5 < t3 + 1 < T + 2

			p1		p2
Loan	t1	t2	t3	t4	t5
1	a1	a1	a1	a1	d
2	a1	a1	a1	d	
3	a1	a2	a1	a1	a1
4	a1	a2	a1	d	
5	a1	a2	a1	a1	d
6			a1	d	



Dynamic pool

A new period starts ervery new day

Numerator: Number of every loan dafaulted in one of the 250 (static) pools

Denominator: Number of loans present in at least one of the 250 (static) pools

Advantage:

No loss of default data

Disadvantages

At least 2 years of data needed for measuring a one-year default rate

(Weighted) mean of default rates is not the prior default rate



Dynamic pools (ctd.)

Above example re-considered

			p1		p2
Loan	t1	t2	t3	t4	t5
1	a1	a1	a1	a1	d
2	a1	a1	a1	d	
3	a1	a2	a1	a1	a1
4	a1	a2	a1	d	
5	a1	a2	a1	a1	d
6			a1	d	



Binomial test: Results

- Unrealistic, because in real life[™] correlation between defaults exists and is far too influential to be ignored
- Correlation between defaults suggests, that the number of defaults will be higher than predicted by the binomial model. This effect will grow with PD, pool size and confidence level

Models incorporating default correlation

Creid Risk+ (JP Morgan)

Credit Metrics (Credit Suisse)

Special case: One-factor model (Gory model)

Test can only be part of a bottom-up-approach



Asset correlation

- Single risk factor in Gordy's (Basel) model
- Factors chosen for Basel II are politically influenced (no loss of capital in the banking system)
- Divergent values across econometric studies, depending on analytical method used, period evaluated, sector evaluated etc.



VALIDATION OF THE RATING PROCESS

2011-10-17

Evaluation

Validation of the rating process



Most important issue for supervision Examination comprises

Examination of the rating processInterdependency with other processes

Validation of the rating process



438 Basel II

All material aspects of the rating and estimation processes must be approved by the bank's board of directors

444 Basel II

Internal ratings and default and loss estimates must play an essential role in the credit approval, risk management, internal capital allocations, and corporate governance functions of banks using the IRB approach. Ratings systems and estimates designed and implemented exclusively for the purpose of qualifying for the IRB approach and used only to provide IRB inputs are not acceptable.

445 Basel II

A bank must have a credible track record in the use of internal ratings information. Thus, the bank must demonstrate that it has been using a rating system that was broadly in line with the minimum requirements articulated in this document for at least the three years prior to qualification.

Validation of the rating process



Suggested issues for examination

Rating takes place before credit approval?

Can the bank assign a rating to all creditors the rating system is designed for?

Is bank's staff aware of the mode of operation and the limits of the rating sytem?

Updating of ratings takes place in a timely manner and at least yearly?

How does the bank conform to the timely manner?

How do staff and rating system collaborate?

When does the rating system has to be re-calibrated?

Comparison between default rate derived from the rating class suggested by the system (clean default rate) and the rating class assigned by staff (dirty default rate). A working system should give evidence that staff is able to detect adverse loans.

I rating-dependent pricing of loans

Credit portfolio



Use of credit risk models is mandatory (de factor) and the exmantion should be part of the supervisory review process (SRP)

733 (691) Basel II

- Banks should have methodologies that enable them to assess the credit risk involved in exposures to individual borrowers or counterparties as well as at the portfolio level.
- For more sophisticated banks, the credit review assessment of capital adequacy, at a minimum, should cover four areas: risk rating systems, portfolio analysis/aggregation, securitisation/complex credit derivatives, and large exposures and risk concentrations.

735 (693) Basel II

- The analysis of credit risk should adequately identify any weaknesses at the portfolio level, including any concentrations of risk.
- It should also adequately take into consideration the risks involved in managing credit concentrations and other portfolio issues through such mechanisms as securitisation programmes and complex credit derivatives.





2011/10/10 09:35—10:15 Features of IRB Approaches



SUGGESTED READING

2011-10-17

Evaluation

Suggested reading



 Blochwitz / Hohl, Reconciling Raings, Risk Magazine, 2001 (June), pp. 87ff.
 Huschens / Stahl, A General Framework for IRBA Backtesting, Dresdner Beiträge zu quantitativen Verfahren 39/04, 2004

Gordy, A Comparative Anatomy of Credi Risk Models, Journal of Banking and Finance, 24 (2000), pp. 119ff.



APPENDIX

2011-10-17

Evaluation

Monte Carlo simulation



Szenario: Rating agencies' default studies

Static pool

Insufficient quantity of data

High degree of variation in the data

Assumptions related to PDs

There exsists a (unique) relationship between individual probability of default and rating class

Individual probability of default is observable (with low error)

No correlation between defaults

within each static pool as well as

I between each static pool

Binomial test



ΛT

ICalculation of defaults per rating class No. of objects in rating class: N_{tot} PD identical: p

Default indicator
$$D_i = \begin{cases} 1 \ i \ defaults \\ 0 \ else \end{cases}$$

Estimated default rate:
$$\hat{p} = \frac{1}{N_{tot}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{tot}} D_i$$

2011-10-17

Evaluation

Binomial test



Application of central limit theorem

One Factor Model



Simulate predicted default rate via one factor model One factor model s.t. different talk