

Suppose I have two competing forecasting methods, each designed for CECL or IFRS 9 loss provisioning. Both would pass muster with regulators and auditors. How do I decide which is better?

This is a critical question for builders of such systems. The statistical loss function – the criterion against which a model is judged – should always guide the modeler’s actions and inactions.

Given that CECL models seek to forecast lifetime expected losses (IFRS 9 also requires one-year expected losses to be predicted), the choice of loss function appears straightforward. The core criterion most modelers will employ will be an out-of-sample mean square forecast error or something of that ilk. The use of scenarios adds some complexity to this loss function, since the optimal forecast model must be able to cope with a wide variety of different underlying economic trajectories.

There are some further choices that must be made, like the forecast horizon over which the model will be optimized. In general, though, model validators in the CECL and IFRS 9 space will concentrate their attention on either conditional or unconditional forecast accuracy.

Before choosing a forecasting approach, there are other criteria that modelers should consider. To explore these fully, we need to step back and identify the ultimate clients of loan loss provision models.

Differing Demands

Accounting standards are designed primarily to provide the investment community with an accurate view of the financial position and performance of the bank in question. Standing between the analysts and the investors are the senior management of the institution, whose goals are often, but not always, in line with those of investors. The third client group are regulators – and, by extension, the general public – who want the whole game to be played safely, fairly and efficiently.

All of these groups value accuracy. Investors and managers will also demand stability of the computed forecasts.

Senior executives will tear their hair out if earnings numbers jump spectacularly from quarter to quarter. They know that investors will lose confidence if they are unable to discern performance from the published accounts, causing funding

costs to rise. Investors, for their part, want the financials to change if the bank experiences a material shock, but they do not want the numbers to move randomly.

By incorporating model-driven projections into the process, increased randomness is unfortunately assured. A bank with a stable portfolio facing a stable macroeconomic outlook will see earnings change every time the model is re-estimated.

Managers can either update models regularly (presenting investors with a constant drip feed of minor adjustments) or infrequently, offering quarter-to-quarter stability while risking a big jump when continued use of the model becomes untenable.

The modeler can also aim to build specifications that are less susceptible to major revision. This has been described as the holy grail of econometric model building and involves proposing specifications with exceptionally strong theoretical underpinnings. Models that result from data mining, by way of contrast, are typically much more prone to later revision.

The Recession Factor

The other source of volatility comes from economic forecasts and scenarios. Under the new accounting procedures, reserves will rise if baseline growth forecasts are marked down or if downside scenarios are accorded a higher likelihood of occurrence.

After any negative news event, you will be able to find an economist somewhere who will state that a recession is now inevitable. Sensible economists, meanwhile, move much more gingerly and will often choose not to swing at the curveballs thrown by the news cycle. Experience proves that it is very difficult to forecast a recession with any degree of confidence; it is, in fact, generally impossible to predict that a looming recession will be deep until it is already underway.

The interesting thing about the current situation is that although the U.S. economy is firing on all cylinders, a consensus is forming calling for a 2020 recession. Indeed, with tax cut stimulus timed to fade during that year, and with Congress or the Fed unlikely to provide renewed impetus, the signs are strong that a significant slowdown will soon result.

If CECL were already in place, therefore, we would expect to see relative provisions rising quite rapidly at present, with the associated curtailment of bank lending only adding to the likelihood that a 2020 – or 2019 – recession would result. CECL may improve the track record of economists in predicting recessions, but only because such forecasts will now be self-fulfilling prophecies, baked directly into the credit pie.

A 2020 recession, however, is not a foregone conclusion. In the context of the new loan loss accounting methods, and from the perspective of investors, the question to ask is whether a false positive recession prediction is better or worse than a false negative recession miss?

Parting Thoughts

While this issue is clearly related to their level of risk aversion, I suspect that most investors would prefer to err on the side of stronger growth. We must remember that high capital buffers are now in effect in most jurisdictions, implying that the introduction of model-based allowances will have little cumulative impact on the safety of banks should a 2020 recession actually occur.

Because forecasts and scenarios play such a crucial role in loss provision calculation, these asymmetries are critical factors in assessing forecast error risk. CECL and IFRS 9 model managers can take positive steps to promote model stability without giving up too much in terms of accuracy. They should feed their credit loss models with economic forecasts from a sensible source that resists the notion that the sky is always falling.

If firms achieve these loss-forecasting goals, investors and senior managers should be well pleased with the results.

Tony Hughes is a managing director of economic research and credit analytics at Moody's Analytics. His work over the past 15 years has spanned the world of financial risk modeling, from corporate and retail exposures to deposits and revenues. He has also engaged in forecasting of asset prices and general macroeconomic analysis.

This article was originally published on GARP's Risk Intelligence website on January 11, 2019.

AUTHORS



Dr. Tony Hughes

Managing Director, Economic Research

Tony oversees the Moody's Analytics credit analysis consulting projects for global lending institutions. An expert applied econometrician, he has helped develop approaches to stress testing and loss forecasting in retail, C&I, and CRE portfolios and recently introduced a methodology for stress testing a bank's deposit book.

© 2018 Moody's Corporation, Moody's Investors Service, Inc., Moody's Analytics, Inc. and/or their licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ISSUED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE, INC. AND ITS RATINGS AFFILIATES ("MIS") ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY INCLUDE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES. MOODY'S DEFINES CREDIT RISK AS THE RISK THAT AN ENTITY MAY NOT MEET ITS CONTRACTUAL, FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THEY COME DUE AND ANY ESTIMATED FINANCIAL LOSS IN THE EVENT OF DEFAULT. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S OPINIONS INCLUDED IN MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY ALSO INCLUDE QUANTITATIVE MODEL-BASED ESTIMATES OF CREDIT RISK AND RELATED OPINIONS OR COMMENTARY PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ANALYTICS, INC. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. NEITHER CREDIT RATINGS NOR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS AND PUBLISHES MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL, WITH DUE CARE, MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY RETAIL INVESTORS AND IT WOULD BE RECKLESS AND INAPPROPRIATE FOR RETAIL INVESTORS TO USE MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS OR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WHEN MAKING AN INVESTMENT DECISION. IF IN DOUBT YOU SHOULD CONTACT YOUR FINANCIAL OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL ADVISER.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY ANY PERSON AS A BENCHMARK AS THAT TERM IS DEFINED FOR REGULATORY PURPOSES AND MUST NOT BE USED IN ANY WAY THAT COULD RESULT IN THEM BEING CONSIDERED A BENCHMARK.

All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources MOODY'S considers to be reliable including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process or in preparing the Moody's publications.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability to any person or entity for any indirect, special, consequential, or incidental losses or damages whatsoever arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information, even if MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers is advised in advance of the possibility of such losses or damages, including but not limited to: (a) any loss of present or prospective profits or (b) any loss or damage arising where the relevant financial instrument is not the subject of a particular credit rating assigned by MOODY'S.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability for any direct or compensatory losses or damages caused to any person or entity, including but not limited to by any negligence (but excluding fraud, willful misconduct or any other type of liability that, for the avoidance of doubt, by law cannot be excluded) on the part of, or any contingency within or beyond the control of, MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers, arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information.

NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY SUCH RATING OR OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

Moody's Investors Service, Inc., a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO"), hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by Moody's Investors Service, Inc. have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to Moody's Investors Service, Inc. for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,500 to approximately \$2,500,000. MCO and MIS also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of MIS's ratings and rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold ratings from MIS and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at www.moody.com under the heading "Investor Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

Additional terms for Australia only: Any publication into Australia of this document is pursuant to the Australian Financial Services License of MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657 AFSL 336969 and/or Moody's Analytics Australia Pty Ltd ABN 94 105 136 972 AFSL 383569 (as applicable). This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. MOODY'S credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail investors. It would be reckless and inappropriate for retail investors to use MOODY'S credit ratings or publications when making an investment decision. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.

Additional terms for Japan only: Moody's Japan K.K. ("MJKK") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Group Japan G.K., which is wholly-owned by Moody's Overseas Holdings Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of MCO. Moody's SF Japan K.K. ("MSFJ") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of MJKK. MSFJ is not a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization ("NRSRO"). Therefore, credit ratings assigned by MSFJ are Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings. Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings are assigned by an entity that is not a NRSRO and, consequently, the rated obligation will not qualify for certain types of treatment under U.S. laws. MJKK and MSFJ are credit rating agencies registered with the Japan Financial Services Agency and their registration numbers are FSA Commissioner (Ratings) No. 2 and 3 respectively.

MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) hereby disclose that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from JPY200,000 to approximately JPY350,000,000.

MJKK and MSFJ also maintain policies and procedures to address Japanese regulatory requirements.