

Session III.A

Finding the Right Balance Between Modeling and Judgment in the Projection Process

Andreas Lehnert

Fourth Annual Stress Test Modeling Symposium

Federal Reserve Bank of Boston

June 26, 2015

Disclaimer: The views expressed here
are my own and not that of the
Federal Reserve System or its staff.

- Today's session:
 - When to use judgment, overlays etc. vs formal "model"
 - Right governance and controls around judgmental adjustments
 - Expectations for larger vs. smaller BHCs
- A few introductory points
 - Judgment is everywhere, even in equations
 - Why do we like formal models in stress testing?
 - A provocative thought on complex vs. simple models

Even judgment is a “model”

Q. What stress loss rate should we write down for this portfolio?
A. I don't know – how about twice as much as we lost last time?

Projected Loss Rate

=

2.0

X

*Maximum Observed
Loss Rate*

How volatile are loss rates?
How sensitive are they to scenario variables?

Do we have data for stressful episodes?
Are portfolio characteristics roughly similar?

Models reflect deep judgment

World is mean-reverting

$$R(t) = a_0 + \rho_0 R(t-1) + b_0 X(t) + \dot{\mathbf{o}}_t$$

$$\Delta R(t) = a_1 + \rho_1 \Delta R(t-1) + b_1 \Delta X(t) + u(t)$$

World is random walk

Benefits of using models in stress tests

- Represent *structural* forces driving objects of interest
 - Examples: borrower default decision, equilibrium asset price dynamics
 - Very powerful when thinking about big rare shocks
 - Not true if statistical model used to represent an *empirical* relationship
- Transparent and repeatable mapping from data, risk factors and scenario to losses
 - Disciplines “thumb on the scale” (but doesn’t eliminate it)
- Widely used criteria for judging model fit
 - Please: Use out-of-sample criteria

Pitfalls of statistical models in stress tests

- Limited data under forces at work in stress scenario
 - Dynamics observed during normal times may not apply
 - Overall structural break in data generating process
- Results sharply contradict intuition
- In general: fragile models are dangerous—worse than useless

Models: Complex or simple?

- BIS Joint Forum, June 2015
 - “Supervisors should be cautious against over-reliance on internal models for credit risk management and regulatory capital. Where appropriate, simple measures could be evaluated in conjunction with sophisticated modelling to provide a more complete picture.”
- Simpler models are harder to build:
 - “My model was complex when I started, too, but I just kept working on it till it got simple,” H. Varian
- Models that work in normal times—
 - Benefit from increasing fanciness
 - Fancy features may behave strangely in stress scenarios