

MOODY'S KMV RISKCALC™ V3.1 PORTUGAL

MODELINGMETHODOLOGY

AUTHORS

Lee Kelvin Chua

Douglas W. Dwyer

ABSTRACT

Moody's KMV RiskCalc is the Moody's KMV model for predicting private company defaults. It covers over 80% of the world's GDP, has more than 20 geographic-specific models, and is used by hundreds of institutions worldwide. While using the same underlying framework, each model reflects the domestic lending, regulatory, and accounting practices of its specific region.

Moody's KMV RiskCalc v3.1 incorporates both market- (systematic) and company- specific (idiosyncratic) risk factors. This document outlines the underlying research, model characteristics, data, and validation results for the RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal model.

Copyright© 2009, Moody's KMV Company. All rights reserved. Credit Monitor, CreditEdge, CreditEdge Plus, CreditMark, DealAnalyzer, EDFCalc, Private Firm Model, Portfolio Preprocessor, GCorr, the Moody's logo, the Moody's KMV logo, Moody's Financial Analyst, Moody's KMV LossCalc, Moody's KMV Portfolio Manager, Moody's Risk Advisor, Moody's KMV RiskCalc, RiskAnalyst, RiskFrontier, Expected Default Frequency, and EDF are trademarks or registered trademarks owned by MIS Quality Management Corp. and used under license by Moody's Analytics, Inc.

Published by:
Moody's KMV Company

To contact Moody's KMV, visit us online at www.moodyskmv.com. You can also contact Moody's KMV through e-mail at info@mkmv.com, or call us by using the following phone numbers:

NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA, NEW ZEALAND, AND AUSTRALIA:
1 866 321 MKMV (6568) or 415 874 6000

EUROPE, THE MIDDLE EAST, AFRICA, AND INDIA:
44 20 7280 8300

ASIA-PACIFIC:
852 3551 3000

JAPAN:
81 3 5408 4250

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	5
1.1	RiskCalc Modes	5
1.2	Differences Between RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal and RiskCalc v1.0 Portugal	5
2	DATA DESCRIPTION	5
2.1	Definition of Default	5
2.2	Data Exclusions	6
2.3	Descriptive Statistics of the Data	6
2.4	Central Default Tendency.....	9
3	MODEL COMPONENTS.....	9
3.1	Financial Statement Variables.....	10
3.2	Model Weights.....	13
3.3	Industry Adjustments	14
3.4	Credit Cycle Adjustment	15
4	VALIDATION RESULTS	16
4.1	Increase in Overall Model Power and Accuracy.....	17
4.2	Correlations and Variance Inflation Factors.....	18
4.3	Power Performance By Industry and Size Groups	19
4.4	Power Performance over Time.....	20
4.5	Out of Sample Testing: <i>k</i> -Fold Tests	20
4.6	Walk-forward Tests.....	22
4.7	Model Calibration and Implied Ratings	22
5	FURTHER MODEL IMPROVEMENTS.....	23
5.1	Continuous Term Structure	23
5.2	New Analytical Tools: Relative Sensitivity	24
5.3	Asset Value and Volatility Calculation.....	25
6	CONCLUSION.....	26

1 INTRODUCTION

The Moody's KMV RiskCalc™ v3.1 Portugal model is built using the results of extensive Moody's KMV research, including the following:

- Moody's KMV RiskCalc v1.0 and Moody's KMV Private Firm Model® (PFM)
- Moody's KMV Credit Research Database™ (CRD), the world's largest and cleanest private company default database
- Industry sector information, market information, and industry-specific default rates

RiskCalc v3.1 incorporates the structural and market-based comparables approach (used in PFM), and the localized financial statement-based approach (used in RiskCalc v1.0). This allows RiskCalc v3.1 to blend market-based (systematic) information with detailed firm-specific financial statement (idiosyncratic) information to enhance the model's predictive power.

1.1 RiskCalc Modes

RiskCalc v3.1 allows you to assess the risk of a private firm in two ways: Financial Statement Only (FSO) and Credit Cycle Adjusted (CCA).

The FSO mode delivers a firm's default risk based on only financial statements and sector information, adjusted to reflect differences in credit risk across industries. In this mode, the risk assessments produced by the model are relatively stable over time.

The CCA mode adjusts the default risk by taking into account the current stage of the credit cycle. The mode uses a sector-specific factor derived directly from the Moody's KMV public firm model's distance-to-default (DD). The CCA model reflects the market's current assessment of the credit cycle and is a forward-looking indicator of default.

The CCA mode is specific to the firm's sector and country and is updated monthly. The CCA mode also has the ability to stress-test Moody's KMV EDF™ (Expected Default Frequency) credit measures under different credit cycle scenarios—a requirement under the Basel Capital Accord (BIS II).

1.2 Differences Between RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal and RiskCalc v1.0 Portugal

Since the release of RiskCalc v1.0 Portugal, Moody's KMV significantly increased the size of the database for Portugal and improved its data cleansing technologies. Because of improved data coverage, RiskCalc Portugal v3.1 includes new ratios to expand the coverage on dynamic factors of private firms' credit risk. Furthermore, the new model allows for more granular industry adjustments, credit cycle adjustments, and a complete term structure of EDF credit measures. RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal also provides new analytic tools that increase model usability and transparency. Given the advances in modeling, RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal is a more powerful predictor of default than its predecessor.

2 DATA DESCRIPTION

The source of the data for RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal is the Moody's KMV CRD. Moody's KMV collects data from participating institutions, working closely with them to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the data.

2.1 Definition of Default

RiskCalc provides assistance to institutions and investors for determining the risk of default, missed payments, or other credit events. Proposals for BIS II have stimulated debates about what constitutes an appropriate definition of default. RiskCalc applies the criteria used by most of the advanced economies in the world. In model development, RiskCalc uses the local criteria for default. Accordingly, in Portugal, the events which we defined as defaults include bankruptcy,

insolvency, and liquidation of the company. At the calibration stage, the model outputs are adjusted to ensure a consistent interpretation throughout the world. Specifically, the model outputs are converted into a term structure of actual default probabilities (1- through 5-year EDF credit measures).

2.2 Data Exclusions

Excluded Companies

The goal of the RiskCalc model is to provide an EDF credit measure for private Portuguese companies in the middle market. The firms and industries covered in the model must have similar default characteristics. To create the most powerful model for Portuguese middle-market companies, companies that did not reflect the typical company in this market were eliminated. The following types of companies are not included in the data:

- **Small Companies**—Companies with Real Total Assets less than €250,000 (in 2002 EUR) are not reflective of typical middle-market companies and are excluded from the database.
- **Financial Institutions**—The balance sheets of financial institutions (banks, insurance companies, and investment companies) exhibit higher leverage than the typical private firm. The regulation and capital requirements of these institutions make them dissimilar to the typical middle-market company. Therefore, they are excluded from the database.
- **Real Estate Development Companies**—The annual accounts of real estate development and investment companies provide only a partial description of the dynamics of these firms and, therefore, their likelihood to default. This is because their financial health often hinges on a particular development.¹
- **Public Sector and Non-profit Institutions**—Government-run companies' default risks are influenced by the states' or municipalities' unwillingness to allow them to fail. As a result, their financial results are not comparable to other private firms. Not-for-profit financial ratios are different from for-profit firms, particularly with regard to variables relating to net income.
- **Start-up Companies**—Our experience has shown that the financial statements for a company during its first two years are extremely volatile and are a poor reflection of the creditworthiness of the company. The special nature of start-ups is reflected in the fact that many financial institutions have separate credit departments for dealing with these companies.

Excluded Financial Statements

The financial statements of smaller companies can be less accurate and lower quality than those of larger companies. The financial statements in the CRD are cleaned to eliminate highly suspect financial statements. Plausibility checks of financial statements are conducted, such as Assets not equal to Liabilities plus Net Worth, and financial statements covering a period of less than twelve months. If errors are detected, those statements are excluded from the analysis.

2.3 Descriptive Statistics of the Data

Overview of the Data

The source of data for RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal is Moody's KMV CRD. Moody's KMV collects data from both participating institutions and data vendors. Figure 1 presents the distribution of Portuguese financial statements and defaults by year. Table 1 summarizes the total data used in the development, validation, and calibration of the RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal model.

¹ The success of many types of project finance firms depends largely on the outcome of a particular project. We recommend using separate models for such firms. At the time of writing, this characteristic is explicitly recognized within the proposals for BIS II.




FIGURE 1 Distribution of Portuguese Financial Statements and Defaults

TABLE 1 Portuguese Private Firm Sample Data

Portuguese Private Firms	RiskCalc v1.0 Portugal	RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal	Change
Financial statements	69,000 +	154,000 +	↑ 123%
Unique number of firms	18,000 +	42,000 +	↑ 133%
Defaults	416	792	90%
Time period	1993–2000	1993–2007	+ 7 years

Robustness of the Data

In building a model, potential database weaknesses need to be examined. Not only does the database need to cover a large number of firms and defaults, but the defaults also need to be distributed among industries and company types covered. For example, if the database has significant numbers of small firms, or firms in one particular industry without sufficient defaults in those areas, the model may not be a good default predictor. The CRD used in developing the RiskCalc models addresses both of these issues.

Figure 2 presents the distributions of Portuguese firms by industry and the proportion of defaults in each industry. Trade is the largest sector with about 40% of the firms and 32% of the defaults in the sample. Figure 3 presents the distributions by the size of firms measured as Total Assets in 2002 EUR. These figures demonstrate how the proportion of defaults in any one industry group or size group is roughly comparable to the proportion of firms in these groupings. The size distribution shows that about 42% of the firms hold assets less than 1 million EUR.




FIGURE 2 Distribution of Portuguese Defaults and Firms by Industry




FIGURE 3 Distribution of Portuguese Defaults and Firms by Size

2.4 Central Default Tendency

Because most companies do not default, companies that do default are relatively rare and thus more valuable in building a default prediction model. Much of the lack in default data comes from the data storage issues within financial institutions (e.g., defaulting companies being purged from the system after troubles begin), not all defaults being captured, or other sample errors. Also, if the date of default is uncertain, the financial statement associated with the firm may be excluded from model development, depending on the severity of the problem. This can result in a sample that has lower default rates than what actually occurs in the general population. If the underlying sample is not representative, then it needs to be adjusted for the true central default tendency (CDT). When default definitions used in the data sample understate the defaulting population, the CDT can be used to realign the default rates.

The estimate of long-run aggregate probabilities of default (i.e., CDT) is important as an anchor for a model. The best estimation of a default probability is a ratio that reflects the number of obligors that defaulted in one year compared with the total obligors at the beginning of that year. Often these types of data are not available.

The estimate of the central default tendency for Portugal is based on several sources.

- Loan loss provision data examined by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).
- Provisioning data were gathered from financial statements of large Portuguese banks.
- Confirmation of the CDT exceeding the default rates observed in our development sample.

The multiple sources of external data led us to an estimate of 1.7% as the CDT figure for the 1-year model.

Calculating a 5-year Central Default Tendency

There is a lack of publicly-available data for direct calculation of the CDT of a cumulative 5-year default probability. Based on extensive Moody's KMV research, a 5-year cumulative default tendency is derived from the 1-year estimate. This research, combined with the information provided by the CRD, shows that the 5-year cumulative default rate is, on average, four times the level of the 1-year default rate. Therefore, 6.8% is used as the CDT for the 5-year model.

Central Default Tendency in FSO and CCA Modes

In FSO mode, the central default tendency remains constant over time. In CCA mode, the central default tendency is equal to the central default tendency of the FSO mode when the effects of the credit cycle are neutral. When the forward-looking prediction of the credit cycle indicates increasing default risk, the central default tendency of the CCA mode will be larger; when the effects of the credit cycle indicate reducing default risk, the central default tendency will be smaller.

3 MODEL COMPONENTS

The RiskCalc v3.1 model incorporates various components to determine the EDF credit measure. The inputs to the model include a selection of the financial ratios, transforms of those ratios, the inclusion of industry information, and the credit cycle adjustment.

The development of a RiskCalc model involves the following steps:

1. Choosing a limited number of financial statement variables for the model from a list of possible variables.²
2. Transforming the variables into interim probabilities of default using non-parametric techniques.
3. Estimating the weightings of the financial statement variables using a probit model, combined with industry variables.
4. Creating a final transform (non-parametric) that converts the probit model score into an actual EDF credit measure.

² These variables are often ratios, but not always. For example, one measure of profitability is Net Income to Total Assets, which is a ratio, and one measure of size is Inflation-adjusted Total Assets, which is not a ratio.

In FSO mode, the models are based on the following functional form.

$$FSO\ EDF = F \left(\Phi \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i T_i(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^K \gamma_j I_j \right) \right) \quad (1)$$

where x_1, \dots, x_N are the input ratios; I_1, \dots, I_K are indicator variables for each of the industry classifications (if applicable); β and γ are estimated coefficients; Φ is the cumulative normal distribution; F and T_1, \dots, T_N are non-parametric transforms; and $FSO\ EDF$ is the financial-statement-only EDF credit measure.³ The T s are the transforms of each financial statement variable, which capture the non-linear impacts of financial ratios on the default likelihood, as is shown in Figure 4 and discussed in detail later in the document. F is the final transform (i.e., the final mapping). The final transform captures the empirical relationship between the probit model score and actual default probabilities. The final transform is described as calibrating the model score to an actual EDF credit measure. The difference between the FSO EDF and the CCA EDF credit measure is that in CCA mode the final transform is adjusted to reflect our assessment of the current stage of the credit cycle, while in FSO mode it remains constant.

3.1 Financial Statement Variables

Selecting the Variables

Our variable selection process starts with a long list of possible financial statement variables addressing various risk factors. The working list of ratios is divided into groups that represent different underlying concepts regarding a firm's financial status (Table 3). A model is then built with at least one variable per group. When it is possible to increase model performance and maintain model robustness, several variables from each group will be used in the model.

We ask the following questions when deciding which variables to include in the final model:

- Is the variable readily available?
- Are the definitions of the inputs to the variable unambiguous?
- Is the meaning of the variable intuitive?
- Does the variable predict default activity?
- Is the variable not highly correlated with other variables in the model?

³ By non-parametric, we mean that the $T(x_i)$ is a continuous function of x not requiring a specification of a specific closed (i.e., parametric) functional form. We estimate these transforms using a variety of local regression and density estimation techniques.

TABLE 2 Groupings of Financial Statement Ratios

Activity ratios include inventories to sales and accounts receivable to sales. These ratios may measure the extent to which a firm has a substantial portion of assets in accounts that may be of subjective value. For example, a firm with large inventories may not be selling its products and may have to write off these inventories. → A large stock of inventories relative to sales increases the probability of default; other activity ratios have different relationships to default.

Debt Coverage is the ratio of cash flow to interest payments or some other measure of liabilities. → High debt coverage reduces the probability of default.

Growth variables are typically the change in Return on Assets (ROA) and sales growth. These variables measure the stability of a firm's performance. → Growth variables behave like a double-edged sword: both rapid growth and rapid decline (negative growth) tend to increase a firm's default probability.

Leverage ratios include liabilities to assets and long-term debt to assets. → High leverage increases the probability of default.

Liquidity variables include pure cash or cash and marketable securities to assets, the current ratio, and the quick ratio. These variables measure the extent to which the firm has liquid assets relative to the size of its assets or liabilities. → High liquidity reduces the probability of default.

Profitability ratios include net income, net income less extraordinary items, profit before tax, and operating profit in the numerator; and total assets, tangible assets, fixed assets and sales in the denominator. → High profitability reduces the probability of default.

Size variables include sales and total assets. These variables are normally deflated to a specific base year to ensure comparability (e.g., total assets are measured in 2002 EUR). → Large firms default less often.

TABLE 3 Financial Statement Variables in RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal

Category	Definition
Activity	Interest Expense to Net Sales
Debt Coverage	EBITDA to Interest Expense ⁴
Growth	Change in AR Turnover: $AR\ Turnover(t) - AR\ Turnover(t-1)$ ⁵ Sales Growth: $Net\ Sales(t) / Net\ Sales(t-1) - 1$
Leverage	Liabilities Less Cash & Securities to Assets
Liquidity	Current Ratio: Current Assets to Current Liabilities Cash & Securities to Current Assets
Profitability	ROA ⁶

Variable Transforms

After the variables are selected, they are transformed into a preliminary EDF value. Figure 4 presents the transformations used in the model. The horizontal axis gives the percentile score of the ratio, and the vertical axis gives the default probability of that ratio in isolation (univariate). The percentile score represents the percent of the database that had a

⁴ EBITDA is defined as the following: Operating Profit (or Loss) + Amortization and Depreciation.

⁵ AR Turnover is defined as the following: Accounts Receivable / Net Sales.

⁶ ROA is defined as the following: Net Income / Total Assets.

ratio below that of the company (e.g., if ROA is in the 90th percentile, then 90% of the sample had a lower ROA than that firm).

The shape of the transformation indicates how significantly a change in level impacts the EDF value. If the slope of the transform is steep, a small change will have a larger impact on risk than if the slope were flat.

- For the **Activity** group, the transform for Interest Expense to Net Sales is upward-sloping (Figure 4). The slope of the transform increases as activity increases. This indicates that firms with large Interest Expense relative to Net Sales have higher default probabilities.
- For the **Debt Coverage** group, the transform for EBITDA (earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) to Interest Expense is downward-sloping (Figure 4). The slope of the transform decreases as debt coverage increases. This indicates that firms with large EBITDA relative to Interest Expense have lower default probabilities.
- For the **Growth** group, the ratios are Change in Accounts Receivable Turnover and Sales Growth (Figure 4). The transforms of these ratios are U-shaped, indicating that large increases or decreases in, for example, Sales are associated with higher default probabilities, while stable Sales year-upon-year decreases the probability of default.
- For the **Leverage** group, the transform for the Liabilities Less Cash & Securities to Assets is upward-sloping (Figure 4). The slope of the transform increases as leverage increases. This indicates that firms with large Liabilities Less Cash relative to Assets have higher default probabilities.
- For the **Liquidity** group, the ratios are Current Assets to Current Liabilities and Cash and Securities to Current Assets (Figure 4). The transforms of these ratios are downward-sloping, indicating that firms with large, for example, cash holdings are associated with lower default probabilities.
- For the **Profitability** group, the transform for ROA is downward-sloping (Figure 4). The slope of the transform decreases as profitability increases. This indicates that firms with large ROA have lower default probabilities.




FIGURE 4 Transformations of Financial Statement Variables in RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal

3.2 Model Weights

Importance

The relative value of each variable used in calculating an EDF credit measure is important in understanding a company's risk. The non-linear nature of the model makes the weight of the variables more difficult to determine, because the actual impact on the risk depends on the coefficient, the transformation shape, and the percentile ranking of the company. The model weights, therefore, are calculated based on the average EDF value for the transformation and its standard deviation. A variable with a flat transformation could have a low weight, even if the coefficient is large (Figure 4).

Calculation of Weights

To calculate the weighting of a variable, the EDF credit measure is computed for a theoretical firm with all its variables at the average transformation values. The variables are then increased one at a time by one standard deviation. The EDF level change for each variable (in absolute value) is computed and added together. The relative weight of each variable is then calculated as the EDF level change for that variable as a percent of the sum of EDF level changes across all variables. This gives the variable with the largest impact on the EDF level the largest weight, and the variable with the smallest impact on the EDF level the smallest weight. Because the weights are a percentage of the total change in EDF levels, they sum to 100%. The weight of each category is the sum of the weights of each variable in that category. Table 4 presents the weights in RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal. The most important category is Activity with a weight of 26%.

TABLE 4 Risk Drivers in RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal

Category	Weights
Activity	26%
Debt Coverage	22%
Liquidity	18%
Leverage	16%
Profitability	10%
Growth	8%

3.3 Industry Adjustments

While the variables included in the RiskCalc model explain most of the risk factors, the relative importance of the variables can be different among industries. In the FSO mode of RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal, the EDF value is adjusted for industry effects. Table 5 presents the increase in model power and accuracy from introducing industry controls into the FSO model. Both the power and the accuracy of the EDF credit measure increase, as measured by the Accuracy Ratio (AR) and the gain in log likelihood. A large gain in likelihood indicates that the industry controls are especially important in producing an accurate EDF credit measure. Table 5 presents the average FSO EDF value by industry for the validation sample.

TABLE 5 Increase in Model Power and Accuracy from Introducing Industry Controls

FSO Mode	1-year Model		5-year Model	
	Accuracy Ratio	p-value for the Increase in Log Likelihood	Accuracy Ratio	p-value for the Increase in Log Likelihood
Without Industry Controls	69.6%	---	55.8%	---
With Industry Controls	70.3%	0.1205	57.1%	0.0080

In this table, and hereafter, AR is the measure of the model's ability to rank order credits. Increases in log likelihood measure the extent to which the model's EDF values match observed default rates.⁷ In Table 6, the values show the combined impact of the industry adjustment and the average levels of each ratio for a particular industry. The combination of the two determines the average FSO EDF credit measure for a company.

⁷ For further details, see Dwyer and Stein (2004), *Technical Document on RiskCalc v3.1 Methodology*.

TABLE 6 Average FSO EDF Credit Measure by Sector

Sector	Average 1-year FSO EDF	Average 5-year FSO EDF
Agriculture	1.6%	6.53%
Business Products	1.1%	5.08%
Telecommunications and High Tech	1.3%	5.02%
Construction	1.0%	4.23%
Consumer Products	1.7%	6.41%
Mining, Transportation, Utilities, and Natural Resources	2.6%	9.78%
Services	1.3%	5.72%
Trade	1.4%	5.41%

3.4 Credit Cycle Adjustment

EDF credit measures are impacted not only by the financials of a company, but also by the general credit cycle in the economy. To capture this effect, RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal includes a credit cycle adjustment (CCA) factor. The CCA is designed to incorporate the current credit cycle into the estimate of private firm default risk.

Selecting an Adjustment Factor

The RiskCalc v3.1 model uses the DD calculation from the Moody's KMV public firm model. This measure is specifically designed to be a forward-looking indicator of default risk. It extracts signals of default risk from the stock market performance of individual firms.⁸ This measure was chosen because it is available for a large universe of industries and it has been extensively validated.⁹

If the DD factor for public firms in an industry indicates a level of risk above the historical average for that industry, then the private firms' EDF values in that industry are adjusted upward. Conversely, if the level of risk is below the historical average for that industry, then the private firms' EDF values are adjusted downward. When the credit cycle adjustment factor is neutral, the CCA EDF value coincides with the FSO EDF value.

Adjustment Factor Used in the Model

For the Portuguese model, the DD factor for each industry is a weighted average of two indices. The average is based on the aggregation of DD factors in each industry for all public firms in Portugal together with Spain, and public firms in a basket of fifteen continental European countries. The weight on the Portugal and Spain index is industry-specific and determined by the market value of assets of Portuguese and Spanish firms in each industry relative to all firms in the basket. In the event that a firm cannot be associated with a specific industry, the model uses a credit cycle adjustment based on an aggregation of all public firms in the associated countries.

The DD factor is meant to be a forward-looking indicator of default risk. One way to measure the market's current assessment of credit risk is to examine credit spreads on corporate bonds. When the market expects higher levels of default on public debt, the yield spread over a risk-free bond increases to compensate for the extra risk. Figure 5 presents the evidence of the Portuguese DD factor and yield spreads on Western European corporate bonds. The DD factor is inverted when graphed so that higher values on the graph indicate higher probabilities of default for Portuguese public firms. One would expect a concurrent relationship between the series, because both are forward-looking, which is what the figure shows.

⁸ cf. Bohn and Crosbie, 2003.

⁹ cf. Dwyer and Korablev, 2007.




FIGURE 5 Portuguese DD Factor and Western European Corporate Yield Spreads: 2000–2008

Figure 5 displays the Portuguese DD factor (red solid line) against historical credit spread levels in Western Europe (blue dotted line). Bond prices and yields are from Reuters EJV, and the yield spread is over the benchmark LIBOR rate. The spread statistics are compiled using Moody’s KMV CreditEdge® for the Western European Corporate Bond group.

4 VALIDATION RESULTS

After a model is developed, it must be proven effective in predicting defaults. In this section, testing results are presented on the model’s ranking power (i.e., the model’s ability to sort credits from worst to best).

The tests need to check not only the model effectiveness, but also its robustness and how well it works on data outside the sample. Both *k*-Fold and Walk-Forward analyses were performed for out-of-sample testing. The results of the testing showed that the model is uniformly more powerful than other models across different time periods, sectors, and size classifications.

In Portugal, rank-order validation was performed for this model in both CCA and FSO modes. As in other countries, data issues can complicate the interpretation of the differences in AR between these modes. Therefore, the focus is on determining whether the new model outperforms the old model and other benchmarks in both modes. Changes in the definition of default, legal environment, or simply the process of collecting defaults can skew the difference in AR between the two modes. For example, in Figure 1 on page 7, we see a small number of defaults in 1999. This small number of defaults is the result of a transition between two different data sources of default information. We present the

ARs for the FSO model relative to RiskCalc v1.0 and Z-score for the power tests across periods, sectors, and size classifications as they are more robust to the data issues encountered in this sample.¹⁰

4.1 Increase in Overall Model Power and Accuracy

Table 7 presents the in-sample overall measures of power for RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal versus alternative models for the validation sample.

In CCA mode, the model’s performance improves by 6.7% at the 1-year horizon, and 7.8% at the 5-year horizon compared with RiskCalc v1.0 Portugal.

Table 7 also contains p-values for the statistical test to display how the accuracy ratio from the RiskCalc v3.1 CCA model and the benchmark is less than or equal to zero. A p-value of less than .05 indicates we can reject the hypothesis that the difference in the accuracy ratios is less than or equal to zero with 95% confidence.¹¹

Relative to other available alternatives, the results were more dramatic. The new RiskCalc v3.1 model, in CCA mode, outperformed the Z-score model by 21.9% at the 1-year horizon and 18.7% at the 5-year horizon.¹²

TABLE 7 Power Enhancements of the RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal Model—Validation Sample

Mode	1-year Model		5-year Model	
	Accuracy Ratio	p-value	Accuracy Ratio	p-value
RiskCalc v3.1	70.3%	---	57.1%	---
RiskCalc v1.0	63.0%	<.0001	49.3%	<.0001
Z-score	48.4%	<.0001	38.4%	<.0001




FIGURE 6 Power of Alternative Models (1- and 5-year)—Portugal Validation Sample

¹⁰ In the overall sample, the ARs for the CCA is 67.9% for 1-year and 57.7% for 5-year.

¹¹ For more details on the computation of the p-value, see Hood (2007), *Comparing the Performance of Two Models: Analytical and Bootstrapping Methods*.

¹² cf. Altman, Hartzell, and Peck, 1995.

Figure 6 presents the cumulative accuracy profiles for the 1- and 5-year models corresponding to Table 7. The power improvements are uniformly significant across different regions of the distribution relative to RiskCalc v1.0.

4.2 Correlations and Variance Inflation Factors

To ensure model robustness, the model must be tested for excessive multicollinearity, which occurs if a number of the variables used in the model are highly correlated. Excessive multicollinearity can cause instability in parameter estimates. To check for this issue, the correlation coefficients in Table 8 for the financial statement ratios in the model and the variance inflation factors (VIF) in Table 9 are computed on the transformed variables displayed in Figure 4.¹³

Model Results

This section shows the results of the model, after being tested for excessive multicollinearity. Table 8 displays the correlations among the transformed input factors. Table 9 displays the VIF levels.

TABLE 8 Correlations Among the Transformed Input Factors (Spearman Rank)

	Interest Expense to Sales	EBITDA to Interest Expense	Change in AR Turnover	Sales Growth	Liabilities Less Cash & Securities to Assets	Current Ratio	Cash & Securities to Current Assets	Return on Assets
Interest Expense to Sales	1.00							
EBITDA to Interest Expense	0.25	1.00						
Change in AR Turnover	0.25	0.02	1.00					
Sales Growth	0.17	0.11	0.30	1.00				
Liabilities Less Cash & Securities to Assets	0.22	0.11	0.09	0.07	1.00			
Current Ratio	0.18	-0.02	0.04	0.01	0.58	1.00		
Cash & Securities to Current Assets	0.13	0.18	0.11	0.04	0.27	0.01	1.00	
Return on Assets	0.22	0.59	0.08	0.18	0.28	0.18	0.14	1.00

The VIF levels in Table 9 for the financial statement variables represent how much of the variation in one independent variable can be explained by all the other independent variables in the model. The correlation coefficient, however, measures only the relationships between two variables. The VIF levels are all below 2, indicating that the collinearity between the variables is low.¹⁴ The two ratios with the highest correlation are EBITDA to Interest Expense and Return on Assets in Table 8.

¹³ For further definitions and technical discussion of the testing procedures in “Validation Results” on page 16, refer to the Technical Document.

¹⁴ As Wooldridge (2000) shows, VIF is inversely related to the tolerance value (1-R²), such that a VIF of 10 corresponds to a tolerance value of 0.10. Clearly, any threshold is somewhat arbitrary and depends on the sample size. Nevertheless, if any of the R² values are greater than 0.75 (so that VIF is greater than 4.0), we would typically suspect that multicollinearity could be a problem. If any of the R² values are greater than 0.90 (so that VIF is greater than 10) we then conclude that multicollinearity is likely to be a serious problem.

TABLE 9 Variance Inflation Factors

Variable	VIF
Liabilities Less Cash & Securities to Assets	1.81
Return on Assets	1.72
EBITDA to Interest Expense	1.70
Current Assets to Current Liabilities	1.64
Interest Expense to Sales	1.26
Change in AR Turnover	1.21
Cash & Securities to Current Assets	1.17
Sales Growth	1.16

4.3 Power Performance by Industry and Size Groups

It is important to test the power of a model not only overall, but also among different industry segments and firm sizes.

Table 10 and Table 11 present the power comparisons by sector for the 1-year and 5-year models, respectively. The highest power in the 1-year horizon (Table 10) is found in Trade (73.7%), while the lowest is found in Construction (57.9%). At the 5-year horizon (Table 11), the highest power is in Business Products (65.8%), and the lowest is in Construction (39.6%).

TABLE 10 Power by Industry 1-year Portugal Model—Validation Sample

	Percentage of Defaults	AR v3.1	AR v1.0	v3.1–v1.0 p-value	AR Z-score
Business Products	6%	73.4%	67.7%	0.1478	63.2%
Construction	16%	57.9%	56.7%	0.7133	43.4%
Consumer Products	28%	72.5%	65.9%	0.0004	54.2%
Mining, Transportation, Utilities & Natural Resources	8%	63.7%	59.2%	0.2915	42.5%
Services	4%	66.7%	59.4%	0.2155	45.2%
Trade	38%	73.7%	66.4%	<.0001	49.1%

TABLE 11 Power by Industry 5-year Portugal Model—Validation Sample

	Percentage of Defaults	AR v3.1	AR v1.0	v3.1–v1.0 p-value	AR Z-score
Business Products	6%	65.8%	65.5%	0.9540	51.2%
Construction	15%	39.6%	45.4%	0.0376	32.6%
Consumer Products	27%	57.2%	46.2%	<.0001	41.1%
Mining, Transportation, Utilities & Natural Resources	8%	48.2%	49.8%	0.6984	28.8%
Services	6%	50.4%	51.5%	0.7635	43.6%
Trade	38%	57.5%	46.7%	<.0001	37.5%

Table 12 and Table 13 present the power comparisons by firm size (Total Assets in 2002 Euros) for the 1-year and 5-year models, respectively. RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal outperforms both RiskCalc v1.0 Portugal and Z-score in all size groups. The highest powers in the 1-year and 5-year are both found in the 1 mm to 5 mm range, while the lowest powers in the 1-year and 5-year are both found below 1 mm range.

TABLE 12 Power by Size (Total Assets in 2002 Euros) 1-year Portugal Model—Validation Sample

Range	Percentage of Defaults	AR v3.1	AR v1.0	v3.1–v1.0 p-value	AR Z-score
< € 1 MM	26%	62.4%	55.8%	0.0095	38.1%
€ 1 MM to 5 MM	50%	73.9%	66.5%	<.0001	53.7%
€ 5 MM to 10 MM	12%	67.0%	58.5%	0.0055	52.1%
€ 10 MM to 25 MM	8%	71.6%	62.0%	0.0044	55.8%
> € 25 MM	4%	68.7%	66.7%	0.5815	41.1%

TABLE 13 Power by Size (Total Assets in 2002 Euros) 5-year Portugal Model—Validation Sample

Range	Percentage of Defaults	AR v3.1	AR v1.0	v3.1–v1.0 p-value	AR Z-score
< € 1 MM	25%	47.7%	39.2%	0.0006	31.1%
€ 1 MM to 5 MM	46%	62.5%	55.2%	<.0001	46.0%
€ 5 MM to 10 MM	15%	62.1%	52.5%	0.0033	43.2%
€ 10 MM to 25 MM	9%	61.9%	51.7%	0.0104	45.0%
> € 25 MM	4%	60.8%	57.6%	0.4560	43.3%

4.4 Power Performance over Time

Because models are implemented at various points in a business cycle by design, power tests by year were conducted to examine whether the model performance is excessively time-dependent.

Table 14 and Table 15 present the results from this analysis at the 1- and 5-year horizons, respectively. The AR of RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal is compared with RiskCalc v1.0 Portugal and Z-Score for each year. RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal outperforms both RiskCalc v1.0 Portugal and Z-Score in all years.

TABLE 14 Power over Time: 1-year Horizon, Portugal Model—Validation Sample

Year	Percentage of Defaults	AR v3.1	AR v1.0	v3.1–v1.0 p-value	AR Z-score
1994–1996	39%	58.62%	58.49%	0.9371	28.32%
1997–1999	26%	68.09%	64.56%	0.0554	34.70%
2000–2002	11%	66.74%	61.19%	0.1519	62.42%
2003–2005	23%	72.21%	58.78%	<.0001	53.81%

TABLE 15 Power over Time: 5-year Horizon, Portugal Model—Validation Sample

Year	Percentage of Defaults	AR v3.1	AR v1.0	v3.1–v1.0 p-value	AR Z-score
1994–1996	46%	45.69%	44.77%	0.5203	17.40%
1997–1999	18%	64.06%	59.32%	0.0086	29.42%
2000–2002	21%	52.19%	48.34%	0.0922	38.17%
2003–2005	15%	62.01%	54.74%	0.0045	45.40%

4.5 Out-of-sample Testing: *k*-Fold Tests

The model exhibits a high degree of power in distinguishing good credits from bad ones (Table 7), but whether this power is attributable to the overall model effectiveness or the impact of a particular sub-sample also needs to be tested. A standard test for evaluating this is the *k*-Fold test, which divides the defaulting and non-defaulting companies into *k* equally-sized segments. This yields *k* equally-sized observed sub-samples that exhibit the identical overall default rate and

are temporally and cross-sectionally independent. The model is then run on $k-1$ sub-samples and these parameter estimates are used to score the k -th sub-sample. This procedure is repeated for all possible combinations, and the k scored out-of-sample sub-samples are put together to calculate an accuracy ratio on this combined data set.

Table 16 summarizes the k -Fold test results (with $k=5$) for the development sample. The reported figures are the accuracy ratios by the corresponding sample and time horizons. The out-of-sample model consistently outperforms RiskCalc v1.0 Portugal. Figure 7 presents the cumulative accuracy profiles associated with the overall out-of-sample results against the in-sample results. The model performance is maintained both in- and out-of-sample in the k -Fold analysis.

TABLE 16 RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal k -Fold Test Results

	Out-of-sample AR		RiskCalc v1.0	
	1-year AR	5-year AR	1-year AR	5-year AR
Sub-sample 1	67.6%	63.6%	60.2%	54.5%
Sub-sample 2	66.7%	62.0%	62.7%	55.6%
Sub-sample 3	66.4%	60.3%	61.1%	53.3%
Sub-sample 4	67.1%	63.2%	61.1%	53.6%
Sub-sample 5	68.5%	60.1%	62.2%	52.1%
k -fold Overall	69.3%	56.8%	---	---
In-sample AR	70.0%	57.1%	62.9%	49.2%




FIGURE 7 Out-of-sample Performance (1- and 5-year) Portugal k -Fold

The k -Fold testing does not control for time-dependence. Each of the k sub-samples contains data from all periods. As a result, if there were a particularly high period of default rates, this would be included in each of the k samples. Such testing does not give a true sense of how the model would have performed during those volatile periods, because the model is estimated with full information on those time periods.

Results

The in- and out-of-sample plots are virtually indistinguishable at both the 1- and 5-year horizons in Figure 7. The difference in AR between the overall in-sample and out-of-sample results is not larger than 70 basis points for the 1-year

and not larger than 30 basis points for the 5-year. Furthermore, RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal outperforms RiskCalc v1.0 Portugal in an out-of-sample context at both the 1- and 5-year horizons (Table 16).

4.6 Walk-forward Tests

An alternative out-of-sample test developed by Moody's KMV is a walk-forward test, which is designed along similar lines as the k -Fold test, except that it controls for the effects of time. The model is estimated up to a certain year and the parameter estimates are then used to score the observations in the next year. These model scores are out-of-time. The model is re-estimated including one more year of data. The analysis is then repeated for the next year, and continued until the end of the sample. These out-of-sample out-of-time scores are combined into a single prediction set, so that the accuracy ratio and the power curve can be calculated for the combined set. The out-of-sample accuracy ratio is then compared to the corresponding in-sample accuracy ratio and power curve.

No data from a future period is used in fitting the model, and data from only future periods is used for testing it. The parameter estimates are checked for stability across the different samples. Figure 8 presents the results from this analysis.

The difference in ARs between the in-sample and out-of-sample results is 3.3% for the 1-year and 1.1% for the 5-year.¹⁵




FIGURE 8 Out-of-sample Performance (1- and 5-year) Portugal Walk-forward

4.7 Model Calibration and Implied Ratings

As many credit analysts are trained to differentiate credit quality in terms of letter grades, the model maps the EDF credit measure to an EDF-implied rating utilizing Moody's bond default studies. All RiskCalc v3.1 models to date have used the same mapping. This mapping is designed with the following considerations:

- There is a large range of EDF-implied ratings (as required for economic and regulatory applications).
- No one rating contains too many credits (as required for economic and regulatory applications).

¹⁵ The out-of-sample AR is 68.0% for the 1-year model and 55.4% for the 5-year model. The out-of-sample AR is 5.1% higher than RiskCalc v1.0 Portugal for the 1-year model and 2.3% for the 5-year model.

- The distribution of the 5-year ratings is approximately the same as the distribution of 1-year ratings (for consistency with rating-based analysis applications).
- The EDF value associated with an EDF rating is approximately the same as the observed historical default rate associated with a Moody's bond rating (for consistency with rating-based analysis applications).

Figure 9 shows the distribution of CRD observations by rating category in the development sample (for the CCA EDF credit measures over the full time period). Note that 15 categories between Aa2 and Caa/C are utilized, and that less than 15% of the observations are in any one category. The distributions peak at Ba1 for the 1-year rating and Baa3 for the 5-year rating. While not reported here, other research has shown that the distribution of the CCA EDF-implied ratings changes over time with the credit cycle, while the distribution of the FSO EDF-implied ratings remains relatively stable over time.




FIGURE 9 EDF-implied Ratings for the 1- and 5-year Models in the Development

5 FURTHER MODEL IMPROVEMENTS

This section outlines some other improvements to the model.¹⁶

5.1 Continuous Term Structure

The previous version of the RiskCalc model provided two discrete default probability estimates: a 1-year and a 5-year EDF credit measure. In this version, utilizing the two-point estimates for 1- and 5-year estimates fits a Weibull function, and thus achieves a continuous term structure of EDF values for each credit. In other words, users of RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal can now obtain EDF values for any point between one and five years. In addition, RiskCalc v3.1 provides EDF values for alternative definitions, such as the forward EDF value and the annualized EDF value (Table 17).

¹⁶ For a detailed discussion of these improvements, refer to the Technical Document.

Cumulative EDF Credit Measures

A cumulative EDF credit measure gives the probability of default over that time period. For example, a 5-year cumulative EDF credit measure of 13.44% means that that company has a 13.44% chance of defaulting over that five year period. The second column of Table 17 provides an example of the cumulative 1- to 5-year credit measures produced by the model.

Forward EDF Credit Measures

The forward EDF credit measure is the probability of default between $t-1$ and t conditional upon survival until $t-1$. In other words, the 4-year forward EDF credit measure is the probability that a firm will default between years three and four assuming the firm survived to year three.¹⁷ The third column of Table 17 displays the forward 1- to 5-year EDF credit measures that are derived from the cumulative EDF values.

Annualized EDF Credit Measures

The annualized EDF credit measure is the cumulative EDF value for a given period, stated on a per-year basis. For example, a company with a cumulative 5-year EDF value of 13.44% would have a 5-year annualized EDF value of 2.84%.¹⁸ This means that the average default rate per year for a 13.44% cumulative default rate is 2.84%. The last column of Table 17 presents the annualized EDF credit measures for years one to five. These credit measures are derived from the cumulative EDF values.

TABLE 17 Term Structure of EDF Credit Measures: An Example

EDF	Cumulative	Forward	Annualized
Year 1	4.23	4.23	4.23
Year 2	7.00	2.90	3.57
Year 3	9.37	2.55	3.23
Year 4	11.49	2.34	3.01
Year 5	13.44	2.20	2.84

5.2 New Analytical Tools: Relative Sensitivity


The RiskCalc v3.1 application provides an analytical tool to gauge the relative impact of each variable—as a deviation from the mean of each ratio. Relative sensitivities (also known as sensitivity multiples) exhibit the EDF sensitivity to each of the model variables at the point of evaluation. This feature is especially useful when addressing the topic of identifying variables to improve the EDF value of a company.

The relative sensitivity gives the impact of a small change in a variable on the EDF level of the company. It indicates which variables are most sensitive to an increase. A positive number means an increase in the variable will increase risk, and a negative number will decrease risk. The percentile is the sensitivity of the variable relative to the average.

For example, a small increase in ratio for (Liabilities - Cash & Securities) / Assets increases the risk of the company. It is about 110% (5-year) as sensitive as the average variable (Figure 10).

¹⁷ Specifically, $FEDF_{t-1,t} = (CEDF_t - CEDF_{t-1}) / (1 - CEDF_{t-1})$, where $FEDF_{t-1,t}$ is the forward EDF from years $t-1$ to t , and $CEDF_t$ is the cumulative EDF for year t .

¹⁸ Specifically, $AEDF_t = 1 - (1 - CEDF_t)^{1/t}$, where $AEDF_t$ is the annualized EDF for year t .



(c) Copyright 2008 Moody's KMV


FIGURE 10 Relative Sensitivities for the RiskCalc v3.1 Model

5.3 Asset Value and Volatility Calculation

One of the features of the PFM model that users appreciate is an implied asset value and an estimate of the firm's volatility. This feature is useful, for example, in analyzing IPO activities. To address this, as an add-on to the model, the asset volatility of the firm is estimated using its industry and size and a methodology that is similar to the PFM model. A structural model framework is solved for the implied asset value from the estimated EDF value, the estimated volatility, and the firm's liability structure.

5.4 Percentile Map

Another feature is the percentile map that allows the user to quickly isolate the problematic ratios for a given company. Each horizontal bar represents a ratio that is labeled on the right (e.g., Return on Assets). The column on the right gives the actual value of the ratio. The percentage number within the horizontal bar graph represents what percentile the ratio was within the development sample (e.g., 96.2% of the development sample had a Return on Assets of less than 12.50%). The shading represents the risk level associated with the ratio. Green is low risk, red is high risk, and grey is neutral risk. The variables that are shaded red to green are the "good" ratios for which high values lower risk, while the variables that are shaded green to red are the "bad" ratios for which high values increase risk. Change in AR to Sales and Sales Growth are shaded red to green to red. This indicates that both high and low values of Change in AR to Sales are indicative of high risk, while moderate Change in AR to Sales is indicative of low risk. For this hypothetical firm, the ratios Current Ratio, EBITDA to Interest Expense, Change in AR to Sales, and Interest Expense to Sales are the problematic ones.



(c) Copyright 2008 Moody's KMV

FIGURE 11 Percentile Graph for the RiskCalc v3.1 Model

6 CONCLUSION

The RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal model is based on a substantially larger database than RiskCalc v1.0 Portugal and has an additional five years of data. Improved data coverage allowed us to refine our financial statement model and achieve a robust prediction model of private firm default behavior.

The model is more powerful than any publicly available alternatives that we have tested. We demonstrated how the increase in power is consistent across industry sectors and size classifications, as well as for different time periods. And we also demonstrated how the power advantage is maintained both in- and out-of-sample.

The RiskCalc v3.1 Portugal model controls for differences in the default risk across industries in the FSO mode. In addition, in the CCA mode, it adjusts the EDF level to reflect the current stage of the credit cycle in the given industry. If default risk in a given firm's industry is high, the EDF level is adjusted upward. Likewise, when default risk is low, the EDF level is adjusted downward. This additional feature of the model increases the model power and precision and allows users to monitor their portfolios on a monthly basis.

The RiskCalc v3.1 model is useful for financial institutions seeking to implement quantitative tools for originating loans, managing portfolio risk, and meeting regulatory requirements. It also provides these institutions an objective external benchmark of the risk associated with a private firm, useful in securitizing middle-market debt. Finally, as an established benchmark, RiskCalc v3.1 enables institutions to communicate with one another about their exposures.

REFERENCES

1. Altman, E., J Hartzell, and M. Peck. "Future of Emerging Market Flows." New York: Salomon Brothers, Inc, 1995.
2. Crosbie, Peter J. and Jeff R. Bohn. "Modeling Default Risk." San Francisco: KMV, 2003.
3. Dwyer, Douglas, Ahmet Kocagil, and Roger Stein. "The Moody's KMV RiskCalc v3.1 Model: Next-Generation Technology for Predicting Private Firm Credit Risk." Moody's KMV, 2004.
4. Dwyer, Douglas and Irina Korablev. "Power and Level Validation of Moody's KMV EDF™ Credit Measures in North America, Europe and Asia," Moody's KMV, 2007.
5. Dwyer, Douglas and Roger Stein. "Technical Document on RiskCalc v3.1 Methodology." Moody's KMV, 2004.
6. Hood, Frederick. "Comparing the Performance of Two Models: Analytic and Bootstrapping Methods," Moody's KMV, 2007.
7. Murphy, Adrian, Ahmet Kocagil, Phil Esott, and Frank Glorman. "Moody's RiskCalc™ For Private Companies: Portugal," Moody's Investors Services, July 2002.
8. Woolridge, J.M. Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach, South Western, 2000.