

Assignment 1 RM, Group 16

Alice Vailati, Andrea Tarditi, Jacopo Stringara, Nicolò Toia

Hazard Rate Curve

We take into consideration two hazard curves, one for each class of asset. For simplicity's sake we take two piece-wise constant functions. To find the two needed values for each curve we perform a bootstrapping procedure. First of all we linearly interpolate the zero-rates curve in order to reconstruct the discount factor at the needed dates. We also assumed a constant recovery rate $R = 0.4$ (for a face value of 100). Then we find the h_1 that best fits the one year bond by writing the price of the bond as a function of h_1 and the discount factors, and then finding the zeroes of the difference with the observed market price, using MATLAB's *fzero* function. Afterwards we repeat the process to find h_2 by also employing the value of h_1 found above.

Z-Spread

In this section we computed 4 different scalar values for the z-score. We defined the z-score to be the spread (i.e. parallel shift) to be applied to zero-rate curve in order for the defaultable and risk-free bonds to have the same price. Like we did above, we computed the discount factors and applied the shift caused by a constant z-score (i.e. $e^{-z \cdot T}$), then found the zeroes of the difference with the market price.

Let us note that this operations can be parallelized, since for each maturity and firm we have chosen a constant shift.

Furthermore, by looking at the table in the numerical results section, we can also observe that the z-score is always lower than the corresponding hazard rate. Indeed, this was to be expected from theory since we have $\pi > 0$ here.

Lastly let us also remark that the z-score obtained can be seen as a measure of risk. A bit unusually we observe that the z-score of the two year High Yield bond is lower than the one year bond. This is probably due to a combination of the two sources of randomness at play here: the default event and the recovery rate. Indeed for the market the default event is a seamless event, it can simply be seen as an acceleration of the coupon payments.

Market-implied rating transition matrix

In this section we suppose the transition matrix to be time homogeneous. In other words the transition matrix Q only depends on the time step $\tau = T - t$ and can be factorized using the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation. In particular in our case we impose the following:

$$Q(0, 2) = Q(0, 1) \cdot Q(1, 2) = Q^2(\tau = 1)$$

Where the two matrices $Q(0, 1)$ and $Q(1, 2)$ are supposed to be equal since we have assumed time homogeneity. Furthermore we can also leverage the conservation of probability (i.e. $\sum_{j=1}^N q_{i,j} = 1 \forall i$).

We can immediately compute the last column of the matrix as the one-year and two-year unconditional probabilities of default by using the previously computed hazard rate curves. In particular

$$q_{i,3}(t, T) = 1 - e^{-\int_t^T h_i(s) ds} \text{ with } i = IG, HY$$

Thus we arrive to a relatively linear system which can be solved analytically to compute the transition matrix for the one-year time horizon.

Numerical results

| | h_1 | h_2 |
|----|-------|-------|
| IG | 50.0 | 125.0 |
| HY | 400.0 | 250.0 |

Table 1: hazard rates expressed in basis points

| | z_1 | z_2 |
|----|-------|-------|
| IG | 30.5 | 52.9 |
| HY | 241.5 | 197.1 |

Table 2: z-scores expressed in basis points

| | IG | HY | Def |
|-----|--------|--------|--------|
| IG | 0.7789 | 0.2161 | 0.0050 |
| HY | 0.4076 | 0.5532 | 0.0392 |
| Def | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Table 3: Market-implied rating transition matrix