

Predicting Probability of Default for Banca Massiccia

TEAM TURQUOISE:

- Inderpreet Singh Walia
- Pradyumn Bhale
- Shrey Jasuja



Introduction


Banca Massicia wants to understand how to reduce its portfolio default rate on individual loans.

Motivation is to calculate the probability of default for clients within a window of 12 months.

This is both a finance issue and a machine learning challenge.

Explainability of the model is of paramount importance because of the high cost associated with making bad decisions.

*Image generated by DALL-E. Notice the typos in the image. Even the most advanced ML algorithms aren't full proof yet!



Data Preparation and Feature Selection for Default Risk Modeling

- ¹ | Our team has addressed the gaps in our dataset by utilizing the available financial ratios to estimate missing values.
- ² | To handle skewed data within our dataset, we've implemented a sophisticated transcendental transformation technique on the affected features.
- ³ | The selection of model features was strategically conducted based on the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) of each feature, ensuring optimal relevance and accuracy.



Firm Year

A firm year (sometimes referred to as the fiscal year) is the period that a company uses for accounting purposes and preparing financial statements.


Why is a firm year important?

- 1 | In Italy, banks release their financial statements around July (07)*.
- 2 | We set up the problem by making the dependent variable (default flag = 1) if default date is within 7-18 months from the financial statements date.
- 3 | Model avoids future-peeking issue.

*<https://italianbusinessregister.it/en/annual-accounts>



Data Cleaning



- Calculated *net income* by multiplying *roa* with *total assets*.
- Filled in the missing *roe* values using the calculated *net income* & divided it by *total equity*.
- Calculated *non-current assets* by subtracting *total assets* with *current assets*.
- Calculated *operating revenue* by adding *COGS* and *operating profits*.
- Calculated *total liabilities* by subtracting *total equities* from *total assets*.
- Calculated *fixed assets* by adding *asset intangible fixed*, *asset tangible fixed* and *asset fixed fin*.
- Calculated *current liabilities* by subtracting *net working capital* from *current assets*.

Incorporating Financial Intuition

We start by analyzing some key financial ratios and dividing them into "buckets".

These financial ratios were arrived at by studying their use in past literature as well as referring to additional study materials provided for the class and the summary sheets that are posted.



Liquidity

- Cash Ratio
- Current Ratio
- CFO Ratio



Profitability

- ROA
- ROE
- Gross Profit Margin




Debt Coverage

- Leverage
- CFO to Total Liabilities
- Interest Coverage Ratio
- Debt-Service Coverage Ratio

Asset Management


- Asset Coverage Ratio
- ROA
- Fixed Assets

Exploratory Data Analysis



- Original (Uncleaned) data

Raw data is hard to observe and infer for conclusions.




- Data on cleaning

Observe the skew in the distribution



- Transcendental transformations

Transformations (like $\log(x)$, $\sqrt[3]{x}$) are important to make the distribution more normally distributed.




- After Transformation

The skew and kurtosis in the data has reduced after $\sqrt[3]{x}$ transformation.

These were found to be more essential for logit model but not for Tree-based models (XGB).


Sanity Checks



- Current liabilities was greater than total liabilities (<0.01% times).
- Made the simplifying assumption of non-current liabilities to be long term debt.
- Current liabilities = short term debt with 99.9% match.
- Skewness and kurtosis of data is decreasing on cleaning and performing relevant transformations.
- Net income positive with negative taxes were removed as these were observed as erroneous data.

Legal Structure of the Firm

Previous studies have often highlighted size of the firm as a significant factor in their outcomes. To account for this, we employed target encoding for the legal structure variable. It appears logical that the base default rate is higher for single-unit entities (SRUs) on average, while public-sector companies (SPAs) possess a rate lower than average. This could be attributed to the size advantage that SPAs usually possess in comparison to SRUs.



Mean Default rate: 1.29

- 1 | SRL: 1.24
- 2 | SPA: 0.91
- 3 | SRU: 1.85
- 4 | SRS: ~~10.00~~ 1.0
- 5 | SAA: 0.81
- 6 | SAU: 0.86



Introduction to Altman Z-Score

The Altman Z-Score is a financial formula used to predict the likelihood of a company filing for bankruptcy within two years. It was developed by Edward I. Altman in the 1960s and combines multiple financial ratios into a single score that can indicate if a company is headed for potential financial distress.

Calculating the Atman Z-Score

The Altman Z-Score provides an objective measure of bankruptcy risk based on established financial ratios. We use it to benchmark our model scores to understand how well or worse our model performs in different setting compared to a well-established and understood objective score.

Percentage ranges from 0 to 100. It is calculated as percentage of unitary change of each ratio.




Modeling Objectives

We developed 2 models - logit and XGBoost to predict PD. We also conducted a thorough ViF and Correlation analysis to finalize the variables we want to use.

1 Univariate Analysis for each variable.

2 ViF and Correlation Analysis.

3 Walk Forward Analysis (training).




Univariate Analysis Scores

These scores are generated using mutual information score which is a measure of dependency between the target variable and independent variable.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 Gross Profit Margin (0.003) | 7 Current Ratio (0.001) |
| 2 Legal Struct (0.12) | 8 Leverage (0.006) |
| 3 CFO to total liab (0.006) | 9 Cash Ratio (0.001) |
| 4 CFO ratio (0.005) | 10 ROA (0.005) |
| 5 Asset Cov ratio (0.002) | 11 Fixed Assets (0.001) |
| 6 DSCR (0.005) | |


Variance Inflation Factor (ViF) - Liquidity

Variables	ViF
Current Ratio	3.26
CFO Ratio	1.71
Cash Ratio	3.54




Variance Inflation Factor (ViF)- Debt Coverage

Variables	ViF
Leverage	3.74
CFO to total liabilities	4.07
DSCR	5.72
Interest Coverage Ratio	2.37
Asset Coverage Ratio	3.67




Variance Inflation Factor (ViF)- Profitability

Variables	ViF
Fixed Assets	1.37
ROA	1.56
ROE	5.61
Gross Profit Margin	4.24



Walk Forward Analysis

We performed a walk-forward analysis on the dataset to train our model. It involves a sequential, step-by-step approach where the model is continually adapted and validated against new data, mimicking real-world situations more closely than traditional backtesting methods.




- Walk forward analysis is used to avoid overfitting.
- We train our model on out of sample, out of time and out of universe samples to ensure best performance for our model on unseen data.
- The model is trained for 1st year of data with a holdout sample based on firm year.
- Model is validated on unseen data along with the next years' data and this analysis is carried forward till the last year to train and validate the model.

Model Input/Output:

Inputs:

- Legal Structure
- Current Ratio
- CFO Ratio
- Leverage
- ROA
- Fixed Assets




Outputs:

Probability
of Default
(PD)

Results:

Model	AUC Score
Logit	0.827
XGBoost	0.857
Z-Score	0.748



Interpretability of Logit Model

Logit Regression Results

Dep. Variable:	target	No. Observations:	822400
Model:	Logit	Df Residuals:	822393
Method:	MLE	Df Model:	6
Date:	Sat, 25 Nov 2023	Pseudo R-squ.:	0.1089
Time:	01:00:35	Log-Likelihood:	-45059.
converged:	True	LL-Null:	-50565.
Covariance Type:	nonrobust	LLR p-value:	0.000

	coef	std err	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-10.0152	0.174	-57.470	0.000	-10.357	-9.674
legal_struct	0.0680	0.013	5.403	0.000	0.043	0.093
CF0_ratio	-0.9950	0.036	-27.886	0.000	-1.065	-0.925
current_ratio	-0.4096	0.032	-12.867	0.000	-0.472	-0.347
roa	-0.2941	0.009	-30.975	0.000	-0.313	-0.275
leverage	6.4752	0.162	39.990	0.000	6.158	6.793
fixed_assets	-7.339e-08	5.88e-09	-12.475	0.000	-8.49e-08	-6.19e-08

Counterfactual Analysis (on XGB)

Counterfactuals are "what-if" scenarios where a model is tested by systematically generating synthetic data by modifying features of the factual data to understand the impact of different variable on outcomes (probability of default) in our case.

- **Decision to explain**

We begin by setting our target variable (PD) as the model decision to be explained.

- **Defining Causes**

Used standard machine learning techniques to train a model to predict default risk based on the factual data

- **Counterfactual data generation**

Programmatically generated synthetic counterfactual data by modifying features of the factual data

- **Develop Counterfactual Scenarios**

Evaluated the trained model on the counterfactual data to analyze its sensitivity on independent variables.

- **Drawing Insights and conclusions**

Our analysis concluded with CFO ratio and current ratio having the highest sensitivity while fixed assets having the lowest sensitivity.

Feature Importance

We have calculated the feature importance by weight, gain and "shap" values for each input feature to the XGB model.

- **Weight (frequency) Importance**

This represents the number of times a feature is used to split the data across all trees. Legal Structure is least important (77 times) and CFO ratio and leverage are most important (272 times).

- **Gain Importance**

It refers to the average gain of a feature when it is used in trees. It's a measure of the contribution of each feature to the model's performance. The most important is leverage (118.79) and legal structure is least important (12.93)

- **Cover Importance**

It measures the average coverage of a feature when it is used in trees. It refers to the number of samples affected by the split based on that feature. The most important is leverage (8820.95) and least important is legal structure (2735.91)

Summary

- **Most frequently used for Splits:**
CFO ratio and leverage
- **Most Impactful (Gain)**
Leverage, followed by CFO ratio
- **Wildest Influence (Cover)**
Leverage, indicating its splits involve the most observations.
- **Least Impactful**
legal structure, both in terms of frequency and gain.

Conclusions

- **Benchmarking Results**

Our model significantly outperforms a good baseline model of Altman Z-Score.

- **XGB vs Logit**

While a logit model is more explainable, we have preferred XGB as it gave slightly more powerful results. We performed sensitivity analysis through counterfactuals for better explainability along with a univariate and multivariate analysis.

- **Accuracy**

Our final XGB model has an AUC of 0.85 on the validation set in a walk forward analysis.

- **Feature Importance**

Based on our analysis, our input features in descending order of their importance are: Leverage, CFO ratio, Return on Assets, Current Ratio, Fixed Assets, Legal Structure.

Contributions

The contributions of the three of us are briefly outlined below.



Pradyumn Bhale

Major contributions in reports, slide deck, and problem formulation. Minor contribution in coding.



Shrey Jasuja

Major contributions in coding, and problem formulation. Minor contributions in report and slide deck.



Inderpreet Singh Walia

Major contributions in coding, and problem formulation. Minor contributions in report and slide deck.

References

- ¹ | Bank of Slovenia. (2014). Estimating the probability of default and comparing it to credit rating classification by banks.
- ² | Retrieved from Bohn, J. R., & Stein, R. M. (2010). Active Credit Portfolio Management in Practice. John Wiley & Sons.
- ³ | Investopedia.com
- ⁴ | Stein, R. (1993). Preprocessing data for neural networks.