

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 14, 2025

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Conceptual Foundations of Portfolio Credit Risk</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Typology of Portfolio Credit Risk Models</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Top-Down and Bottom-Up Models . . . . .	3
3.2	Default-Mode and Mark-to-Market Models . . . . .	3
3.3	Structural Models . . . . .	4
3.4	Reduced-Form Models . . . . .	4
<b>4</b>	<b>Major Portfolio Credit Risk Models</b>	<b>4</b>
4.1	CreditMetrics . . . . .	4
4.2	KMV / Merton Model . . . . .	5
4.3	CreditRisk+ . . . . .	5
4.4	Gaussian Copula Models . . . . .	5
4.5	Credit Portfolio View . . . . .	6
4.6	Vasicek One-Factor Model . . . . .	6
<b>5</b>	<b>Comparative Summary of Models</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>6</b>

## Abstract

This paper provides a comprehensive overview of portfolio credit risk modelling frameworks, including structural, reduced-form, actuarial, copula-based, and macro-econometric approaches. 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).

This paper provides a structured overview of the most important portfolio credit risk modelling frameworks and critically evaluates their assumptions, strengths, and limitations.

# 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 Merton/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 Structural 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.

### **3.4 Reduced-Form Models**

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). 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.

## 4.2 KMV / Merton Model

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. 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).

## 4.3 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). Instead of modelling asset values or credit migrations, the model focuses on the frequency and severity of default losses. 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.

## 4.4 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).

## 4.5 Credit Portfolio View

Credit Portfolio View 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).

## 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

## 6 Discussion

Portfolio credit risk modelling has evolved from economically intuitive structural models to actuarial and copula-based frameworks, as well as regulatory factor models. Following the global financial crisis, greater emphasis has been placed on stress testing and macroeconomic sensitivity. In practice, institutions often combine multiple models to compensate for individual limitations.

## 7 Conclusion

Portfolio credit risk models are indispensable tools in modern risk management. Each modelling framework embodies specific assumptions and trade-offs, making it essential to understand their limitations and appropriate use cases. Future developments are likely to further integrate macro-financial feedback mechanisms and advanced analytical techniques.

Model	Type	Mode	Inputs	Strengths	Weaknesses
Credit Metrics	Bottom-up	MTM	Transition matrices, correlations	Captures migrations; detailed VaR	Correlation estimation; rating lag
KMV/Merton	Structural	MTM	Equity, volatility, liabilities	Economic foundation; market PDs	Requires market data; barrier issues
Credit Risk+	Bottom-up	Default	PDs, exposures, sector factors	Efficient; minimal data	No migration; Poisson assumption
Gaussian Copula	Bottom-up	Default	PDs, correlations	Flexible dependence modelling	Underestimates tail risk
Credit Portfolio View	Conditional	MTM	Macroeconomic variables	Ideal for stress tests	Calibration complexity
Vasicek (Basel)	Bottom-up	Default	PD, LGD, $\rho$	Closed forms; regulatory standard	One-factor oversimplifies correlation

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

## 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*.