

University of Ljubljana
School of Economics and Business

Portfolio Credit Risk Models: A Comprehensive Review

Risk Management 2025/26
Assignment No. 2

Author: Alja Dostal, Manca Kavčič
Date: December 2025

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Conceptual Foundations of Portfolio Credit Risk	2
3	Typology of Portfolio Credit Risk Models	3
3.1	Top-Down and Bottom-Up Models	3
3.2	Default-Mode and Mark-to-Market Models	3
3.3	Conditional and Unconditional Default Probability Models	4
3.4	Structural and Reduced-Form Models	4
4	Major Portfolio Credit Risk Models	5
4.1	CreditMetrics	5
4.2	CreditRisk+	6
4.3	Moody's KMV	7
4.4	Credit Portfolio View	7
4.5	Gaussian Copula Models	8
4.6	Vasicek One-Factor Model	8
5	Comparative Summary of Models	8
6	Conclusion	9

Abstract

This paper provides a comprehensive overview of portfolio credit risk modelling frameworks. It presents a taxonomy of models, discusses their theoretical foundations, evaluates practical applications, and highlights key strengths and limitations. A comparative table summarises the major portfolio credit risk models widely used in practice.

1 Introduction

Credit risk — the potential loss arising from a counterparty’s failure to meet contractual obligations — is one of the central risks managed by financial institutions. While traditional credit analysis focuses on individual borrowers, portfolio credit risk extends this perspective by explicitly accounting for the joint behaviour of multiple obligors, default correlations, and systemic effects. Financial institutions rely on portfolio credit risk models to quantify expected loss (EL), unexpected loss (UL), and tail risk measures such as Value-at-Risk (VaR) and Expected Shortfall (ES), which are essential for economic capital allocation, regulatory compliance, pricing, and portfolio optimisation (Hull, 2018; McNeil et al., 2015).

2 Conceptual Foundations of Portfolio Credit Risk

Portfolio credit losses can be expressed as

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^n EAD_i \cdot LGD_i \cdot D_i,$$

where EAD_i denotes exposure at default, LGD_i is loss given default, and D_i is a default indicator variable. The primary challenge in portfolio credit risk modelling lies in capturing the joint distribution of defaults and exposures, as losses are rarely independent across obligors (Bluhm et al., 2016).

Several fundamental modelling dimensions are commonly used to classify portfolio credit risk models. These include the distinction between top-down and bottom-up approaches, default-mode versus mark-to-market frameworks, conditional versus unconditional models, and structural versus reduced-form specifications. Each dimension reflects a different modelling philosophy and has important implications for practical applications.

3 Typology of Portfolio Credit Risk Models

3.1 Top-Down and Bottom-Up Models

Bottom-up models analyse credit risk at the level of individual obligors and then aggregate the results to the portfolio level. In this framework, each exposure is characterised by its probability of default, exposure at default, and loss given default, while portfolio risk emerges from the joint behaviour of defaults across obligors. Prominent examples include the Moody's KMV model, CreditMetrics, Gaussian copula models, and CreditRisk+ (Crouhy et al., 2000). The main advantage of bottom-up models lies in their ability to provide detailed and granular risk information, which allows for portfolio optimisation, risk attribution, and sensitivity analysis at the level of individual borrowers. At the same time, these models require extensive obligor-level data and robust estimates of default correlations, which can be difficult to obtain in practice. As portfolio size increases, the computational burden of simulation-based bottom-up models also becomes significant.

In contrast, top-down models treat the credit portfolio as a single aggregate entity and directly model portfolio losses without explicitly modelling individual borrowers. Default probabilities are typically conditioned on macroeconomic or systematic risk factors, such as economic growth or unemployment rates. Such approaches are computationally efficient and are often used for stress testing and high-level scenario analysis, particularly when the focus lies on systemic risk rather than individual exposures. Their main limitation lies in their lack of interpretability and inability to provide borrower-level insights, which restricts their usefulness for detailed credit portfolio management (Wilson, 1997).

3.2 Default-Mode and Mark-to-Market Models

Default-mode models focus exclusively on losses that occur at default. In these frameworks, credit risk is measured through default probabilities and loss given default assumptions, while changes in credit quality prior to default are ignored. Expected loss and unexpected loss are therefore driven entirely by the frequency and severity of default events. Examples include CreditRisk+, copula-based default models, and factor models such as the Vasicek framework (Vasicek, 2002). These models are conceptually simple and computationally efficient, which makes them particularly attractive for regulatory capital calculations. However, their inability to capture rating migrations or spread dynamics limits their applicability for pricing credit-sensitive instruments.

Mark-to-market models extend the analysis by accounting for changes in credit quality before default, typically through rating migrations or credit spread movements. In this setting, portfolio losses may arise even if no default occurs, reflecting deterioration in creditworthiness. CreditMetrics is the most well-known example of this approach (J.P. Morgan, 1997). While mark-to-market models provide a more comprehensive and economically meaningful view of credit risk, they require richer datasets, including rating

transition matrices and market-based spread information, and involve more complex calibration and simulation procedures.

3.3 Conditional and Unconditional Default Probability Models

Probability of default (PD) is the likelihood that over a specified period a borrower will not be able to make their scheduled repayments on a particular debt. Higher interest rates are associated with higher default risk.

For businesses, a probability of default is implied by their credit rating from independent rating agencies, such as S&P Global Ratings, Fitch Ratings, or Moody's Investors Service, but it can also be estimated using historical data and statistical techniques. PD is used along with loss given default (LGD) and exposure at default (EAD) in a variety of risk management models to estimate possible losses faced by lenders.

The conditional default probability refers to the likelihood that a borrower will default on their obligations within a specific period, given that they have survived up to that point without defaulting.

$$\text{Conditional Default Probability} = \frac{\text{Number of Defaults}}{\text{Number of Survivors}}$$

In contrast, the unconditional default probability reflects the likelihood that a borrower will default on their obligations within a specific period, irrespective of their survival up to that point.

$$\text{Unconditional Default Probability} = \frac{\text{Number of Defaults}}{\text{Total Number of Borrowers}}$$

The main distinction between conditional and unconditional default probabilities is in the context within which these probabilities are used. While conditional probabilities focus on survival to a specific point in time, unconditional probabilities provide a broader assessment of default likelihood.

3.4 Structural and Reduced-Form Models

Structural credit risk models originate from the seminal work of Merton (1974). In these models, default occurs when the value of a firm's assets falls below a predefined default barrier, usually related to the book or market value of its liabilities. Asset values are assumed to follow a stochastic process, and default is an endogenous outcome of the firm's capital structure and asset volatility. Structural models offer strong economic intuition and provide market-implied default probabilities that can respond quickly to new information. However, they often suffer from unrealistic default timing, as default can occur only at specific horizons, and from limited applicability to privately held firms for which market data on equity values and volatility are unavailable.

Reduced-form, or intensity-based, models treat default as an exogenous and unpredictable jump process governed by a stochastic default intensity (Jarrow and Turnbull, 1995). In this framework, default arrives randomly according to a Poisson process, and the probability of default over a given horizon depends on the level and dynamics of the default intensity. These models are flexible and mathematically tractable and are widely used in the pricing of credit derivatives, where the timing of default is crucial. However, reduced-form models lack a direct economic interpretation of default events, as default is not explicitly linked to the firm's balance sheet or asset dynamics.

4 Major Portfolio Credit Risk Models

4.1 CreditMetrics

CreditMetrics, developed by J.P. Morgan in 1997, is a market-to-market credit risk model that captures both default and migration risk through rating transition matrices, spread volatility, and correlated asset value dynamics (J.P. Morgan, 1997). It is a bottom-up model, driven by movements in bonds ratings. Other commitments can be included, such as bonds, loans, swaps. Impact of market volatility on expected exposures at maturity has to be assessed by analysts. Each instrument in the portfolio is assigned a credit rating, and future rating states are simulated using empirical transition probabilities. In the event of default, losses are computed using historical recovery rates differentiated by seniority. Correlations between obligors are introduced through correlated asset returns, typically assumed to follow a multivariate normal distribution. The final portfolio loss distribution is obtained via Monte Carlo simulation. The main strength of CreditMetrics lies in its ability to integrate credit risk into a value-at-risk framework similar to market risk models, while its main weakness stems from the difficulty of estimating reliable correlations and transition probabilities.

Example. Consider a single 5-year corporate bond with face value $F = 10$ million USD and current credit rating $r_0 = \text{BBB}$. Let $P_{r_0, r}$ denote the one-year rating transition probability from rating r_0 to rating $r \in \{A, \text{BBB}, \text{BB}, D\}$.

At horizon $T = 1$, the mark-to-market value of the bond conditional on rating r is

$$V_r = \sum_{t=1}^4 \frac{cF}{(1 + s_r)^t} + \frac{F}{(1 + s_r)^4},$$

where c is the coupon rate and s_r is the credit spread associated with rating r . In the event of default ($r = D$), the value is

$$V_D = (1 - \text{LGD})F.$$

Let asset returns follow a correlated multivariate normal distribution,

$$\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma),$$

which determines joint rating migrations across obligors. Monte Carlo simulation yields the portfolio value distribution, and the credit value-at-risk at confidence level α is

$$\text{Credit VaR}_\alpha = V_0 - \inf\{v : \mathbb{P}(V_T \leq v) \geq \alpha\}.$$

4.2 CreditRisk+

CreditRisk+ is an actuarial portfolio credit risk model that treats defaults as Poisson-distributed events with sector-specific risk factors (Bluhm et al., 2016). It was published by Credit Suisse in 1997. Instead of modelling asset values or credit migrations, the model focuses on the frequency and severity of default losses. Default intensity can be modeled with factors that change in time. Correlation across obligors is introduced by grouping exposures into homogeneous sectors that share common systematic risk factors. Losses are modelled using exposure bands, and the overall portfolio loss distribution is obtained by aggregating losses across bands and sectors. Its computational efficiency and modest data requirements make CreditRisk+ attractive for large loan portfolios, although it ignores rating migrations and assumes simplified dependence structures.

Example. Consider a portfolio of N homogeneous loans with exposure E , loss given default LGD, and unconditional default probability p . Defaults are modelled as a Poisson random variable

$$D \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda), \quad \lambda = Np.$$

Sectoral dependence is introduced via a stochastic default intensity,

$$\lambda = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \lambda_k,$$

where λ_k are Gamma-distributed sector factors. The total portfolio loss is

$$L = E \cdot \text{LGD} \cdot D.$$

The probability generating function of the loss distribution allows analytical derivation of expected loss,

$$\mathbb{E}[L] = E \cdot \text{LGD} \cdot \lambda,$$

and high-quantile unexpected loss without Monte Carlo simulation.

4.3 Moody's KMV

The KMV model builds on Merton's structural framework and introduces the concept of distance-to-default, defined as

$$DD = \frac{\ln(V/A) + (\mu - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)T}{\sigma\sqrt{T}}.$$

This measure captures how far a firm's asset value is from the default boundary, expressed in units of asset volatility. In Merton's model - which KMV model is based on - value of equity is a call option on the value of the firm's assets. It is a structural model. The distance-to-default is then mapped to empirical default probabilities using large historical databases of default events. The model provides forward-looking and market-based default estimates and has been shown to anticipate changes in credit ratings. However, it requires high-quality market data and relies on simplifying assumptions regarding capital structure, asset volatility, and the timing of default (Merton, 1974).

Example. Let firm asset value V_t follow a geometric Brownian motion,

$$dV_t = \mu V_t dt + \sigma V_t dW_t.$$

Define the default point A as short-term debt plus half of long-term debt. The distance-to-default at horizon T is

$$DD = \frac{\ln(V_0/A) + (\mu - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)T}{\sigma\sqrt{T}}.$$

The empirical default probability is obtained via a mapping function $f(\cdot)$,

$$PD = f(DD),$$

calibrated from historical default data. This PD can then be used as an input into portfolio credit risk models or pricing applications.

4.4 Credit Portfolio View

Credit Portfolio View - published by McKinsey in 1997 - explicitly incorporates macroeconomic variables such as GDP growth, unemployment, and interest rates into the modelling of default probabilities. Default probabilities are estimated using econometric models, typically logit specifications, and vary systematically with the state of the economy. Portfolio losses are then simulated conditional on macroeconomic scenarios. This approach makes Credit Portfolio View particularly well suited for stress testing and scenario analysis. However, its top-down nature limits its ability to capture firm-specific credit risk, and its calibration requires long and reliable macroeconomic time series (Wilson, 1997).

Example. Let the default probability for obligor i at time t be modelled using a logit specification,

$$\log \left(\frac{PD_{i,t}}{1 - PD_{i,t}} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{GDP}_t + \beta_2 \text{UNEMP}_t.$$

Given a macroeconomic scenario $\{\text{GDP}_t, \text{UNEMP}_t\}$, conditional default probabilities are computed and portfolio loss is simulated as

$$L_t = \sum_{i=1}^n EAD_i \cdot LGD_i \cdot D_{i,t}, \quad D_{i,t} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(PD_{i,t}).$$

This framework allows scenario-dependent estimation of expected loss and stress losses.

4.5 Gaussian Copula Models

Gaussian copula models link individual defaults through a common dependence structure, typically represented as

$$D_i = \mathbf{1}(Z_i < \Phi^{-1}(PD_i)).$$

In this framework, default occurs when a latent variable falls below a threshold determined by the obligor's marginal default probability. Dependence across obligors is captured through correlations among the latent variables. These models gained widespread popularity in structured credit markets due to their analytical convenience and flexibility. However, their inability to capture extreme tail dependence became evident during the global financial crisis, leading to systematic underestimation of joint default risk (Crouhy et al., 2000).

4.6 Vasicek One-Factor Model

The Vasicek one-factor model, which forms the basis of the Basel II and Basel III IRB capital framework, represents default risk as driven by a single systematic factor (Gordy, 2003):

$$Z_i = \sqrt{\rho}Y + \sqrt{1 - \rho}\epsilon_i.$$

In this framework, default correlations arise naturally from exposure to the common systematic factor. The model offers closed-form solutions for portfolio loss quantiles and provides a transparent regulatory standard. However, the assumption of a single risk factor oversimplifies correlation structures, particularly during periods of financial stress.

5 Comparative Summary of Models

Model	Type	Key Inputs	Key Remarks
CreditMetrics	Bottom-up, MTM, Conditional, Structural	Rating transitions, correlations, spreads	Explicit migration risk; MTM valuation sensitive to spread dynamics
CreditRisk+	Bottom-up, Default, Unconditional, Reduced-form	PDs, exposures, sector factors	Defaults follow Poisson law; no migration or MTM effects
Moody's KMV	Bottom-up, MTM, Conditional, Structural	Equity value, volatility, debt structure	Defaults linked to firm value crossing barrier; market-implied PDs
Credit Portfolio View	Top-down, MTM, Conditional, Reduced-form	Macroeconomic variables, credit spreads	PDs conditioned on macro states; ideal for stress testing
Gaussian Copula	Bottom-up, Default, Unconditional, Reduced-form	Marginal PDs, asset correlations	Standard dependence model for CDOs; weak tail dependence
Vasicek (Basel ASRF)	Bottom-up, Default, Conditional (from unconditional PD), Reduced-form	PD, LGD, asset correlation ρ	One-factor model; regulatory benchmark for capital

Table 1: Comparative summary of major portfolio credit risk models.

6 Conclusion

Portfolio credit risk modelling seeks to quantify losses arising from correlated default events in a manner that is both theoretically sound and practically implementable. This paper has shown that no single modelling framework can fully capture the complexity of credit risk, as each approach reflects different assumptions about default behaviour, dependence structures, data availability, and intended use cases.

Bottom-up models offer granular insights and are well suited for portfolio management and regulatory capital assessment, while top-down approaches provide computationally efficient tools for stress testing and macroeconomic scenario analysis. Similarly, default-mode models prioritise simplicity and robustness, making them attractive for large portfolios and regulatory purposes, whereas mark-to-market models deliver a richer representation of credit risk by incorporating migration and spread dynamics. Structural models ground default events in firm value dynamics and offer strong economic intuition, but reduced-form models provide greater flexibility and are better suited for modelling default timing and pricing credit derivatives.

This paper shows that each of the major portfolio credit risk models - CreditMetrics, CreditRisk+, Moody's KMV, Credit Portfolio View, Gaussian copula models, and the Vasicek one-factor framework - is not a universal solution and is rather used as a specialised tool. It is best to use multiple models in complementary ways to address different dimensions of credit risk.

Ultimately, effective portfolio credit risk management depends not only on model

sophistication but also on sound judgement, high-quality data, and a clear understanding of model limitations. Recognising these limitations is essential, particularly in stressed market environments where simplifying assumptions may break down.

References

- Bluhm, C., Overbeck, L., and Wagner, C. (2016). *Introduction to Credit Risk Modeling*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2 edition.
- Crouhy, M., Galai, D., and Mark, R. (2000). A comparative analysis of current credit risk models. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 24(1–2):59–117.
- Gordy, M. B. (2003). A risk-factor model foundation for ratings-based bank capital rules. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 12(3):199–232.
- Hull, J. C. (2018). *Risk Management and Financial Institutions*. Wiley, 5 edition.
- Jarrow, R. A. and Turnbull, S. M. (1995). Pricing derivatives on financial securities subject to credit risk. *Journal of Finance*, 50(1):53–85.
- J.P. Morgan (1997). Creditmetrics technical document. Technical report.
- McNeil, A., Frey, R., and Embrechts, P. (2015). *Quantitative Risk Management*. Princeton University Press, 2 edition.
- Merton, R. C. (1974). On the pricing of corporate debt: The risk structure of interest rates. *Journal of Finance*, 29(2):449–470.
- Vasicek, O. (2002). Loan portfolio value. *Risk Magazine*, 15(12):160–162.
- Wilson, T. C. (1997). Portfolio credit risk (parts i & ii). *Risk Magazine*.