Goals for this Presentation

- Illustrate how equity factor risk models and structural models of credit risk can be linked to provide consistent measures of equity risk, default risk and default correlation.
- Introduce a quantitative measure of the “sustainability” of firms.
- Describe results in an empirical analysis of all US listed equities from 1992 to present.
- Show that common conception of “sustainable” investing is confirmed in these results.
- Illustrate an alternative use of this method as a way to define the level of systemic risk to developed economies.
Merton (1974) poses the equity of a firm as a European call option on the firm’s assets, with a strike price equal to the face value of the firm’s debt

- Alternatively, lenders are short a put on the firm assets
- Default can occur only at debt maturity

Black and Cox (1976) provide a “first passage” model

- Default can occur before debt maturity
- Firm extinction is assumed if asset values hit a boundary value (i.e. specified by bond covenants)

Leland (1994) and Leland and Toft (1996)

- Account for the tax deductibility of interest payments and costs of bankruptcy
- Estimate boundary value as where equity value is maximized subject to bankruptcy
Default Correlations

- Hull and White (2001) and Overbeck and Schmidt (2005)
  - You can estimate default correlation if you knew the (unobservable) true interdependence between firms
- Estimate default correlation from asset correlation
  - Zhou (2001) derives default correlations from asset correlation
  - Frey, McNeil and Nyfeler (2005) use a factor model to describe asset correlations
- Include effect of correlation of changes in default boundary to asset correlations
  - Giesecke (2003, 2006)
- Take the easy way out: assume asset correlation is equal to equity return correlation
  - DeSerigny and Renault (2002) provide negative empirical results
  - CreditMetrics, Hull and White (2004)
  - Close if leverage levels are low and horizons are short
Equity Return Properties Help Out

- Defaults are usually rare events so it’s impossible to directly observe default correlations over time.
- The book value of firm assets is a very incomplete measure of firm assets, so observing asset volatility and asset correlations across firms are very weak estimates.
- Equity return volatility and correlation are readily observable.
- Zeng and Zhang (2002) shows asset correlations must arise from correlation of both equity and debt components.
- Qi, Xie, Liu and Wu (2008) provide complex analytical derivation of asset correlations given equity return correlation.
Bring on the Factor Models

- If you have an “equity only” factor model
  - Estimate pair-wise correlations for equity returns
  - See diBartolomeo 1998 for algebra
  - Convert to asset correlation using method of Qi, Xie, Liu and Wu

- If you have a “multi-asset class” factor model you can use the fundamental accounting identity to get a factor representation of asset volatility and equity
  - Assets = Liabilities + Equity
  - Asset volatility is just equity volatility de-levered, adjusted for covariance with the market value of debt
  - When interest rates rise equity values usually drop, but market value of debt definitely declines, reducing leverage
  - Convert to pair-wise asset correlation values
In Theory, We’re Ready to Go

• With asset volatility and correlations estimated we can use our preferred structural model to estimate default probability of a firm

• Use method from Zhou to convert asset correlations to default correlations

• We can now produce joint default probabilities across firms

• However there are some pretty restrictive assumptions
  • Firm must have debt today
  • Firm must have positive book value today
  • Balance sheet leverage must stay fixed in the future
Reverse the Concept: Sustainability

• Instead of trying to estimate how likely it is that a firm goes bankrupt, let’s reverse the logic.

• We will actually estimate the “market implied expected life” of firms using contingent claims analysis.

• Firms with no debt can now be included since it is possible that they get some debt in the future and default on that.

• A quantitative measure of the fundamental and “social” concept of sustainability.
Our Basic Option Pricing Exercise

- Underlying is the firm’s assets with asset volatility determined from the factor model as previously described.
- Solve numerically for the “implied expiration date” of the option that equates the option value to the stock price:
  - *Market implied expected life of the firm*
- Include a term structure of interest rates so that as the implied expiration date moves around, the interest rate changes appropriately.
- If you choose Black-Scholes as your option model, then you can solve BS for the implied time to expiration using a Taylor series approximation.
- More complex option models allow for stochastic interest rates.
Filling in with “Distance to Run”

- For firm’s with no debt or negative book value, we simply assume that non-survival will be coincident with stock price to zero, since a firm with a positive stock price should be able to sell shares to raise cash to pay debt
  - If you have a stock with 40% a year volatility you need a 2.5 standard deviation event to get a -100 return
  - Convert to probability under your distributional assumption

- We convert both measures to the median of the distribution of future survival in years
  - What is the number of years such that the probability of firm survival to this point in time is 50/50
  - Highly skewed distribution so we upper bound at 300 years

- Z-score the “median of life” for both measures and map the distance to run Z-scores into the “option method” distribution for firms with no debt
Empirical Study Design

- Use a simple Merton model (Black-Scholes European put)
- Use equity volatilities from Northfield US Fundamental Model
  - One year horizon for risk forecast
  - Near horizon” model are more suitable but less history available
- Estimate monthly for all firms in Northfield US equity universe from December 31, 1991 to March 31, 2010
- Study three samples:
  - All
  - Financial firms
  - Non-financial firms
- Sources of Time series variation
  - Stock prices, debt levels, Northfield risk forecasts
  - Mix of large and small firms, $4660 \leq N \leq 8309$
Let’s Start at the End (March 31, 2010)

- Current life expectations for all (5068) firms in years
  - Median 23, Mean 22.18, Cap Weighted 25.71
- Financials firms only (1132)
  - Median 24, Mean 21.69, Cap Weighted 18.95
  - Surprising (or maybe not) cap-weighted is a lot lower
- Non-Financials (3936)
  - Median 23, Mean 22.33, Cap Weighted 27.36
- Highlights:
  - AIG 7, Citicorp 6, GS 6
  - IBM 30, MSFT 32
  - RD 30/39, XOM 54
Time Series Properties Full Sample

- Calculate the cross-sectional mean, cap weighted mean and median for 220 months, average sample = 6587
  - Time series average of the monthly medians, 21.63 years
  - Time series average of the monthly means, 24.42
  - Time series average of cap weighted means 22.66

- Lowest expectations, January 1992
  - median 10, mean 13.20, cap weighted mean 11.05

- Highest expectations, January 2005
  - median 30, mean 41.09, cap weighted mean 32.36
Time Series Properties Sub Samples

- Financials (average sample size = 1630)
  - Time series average of the monthly medians, 31.03
  - Time series average of the monthly means, 31.51
  - Time series average of cap weighted means 24.09

- Non Financials (average sample size = 4955)
  - Time series average of the monthly medians, 20.03
  - Time series average of the monthly means, 22.13
  - Time series average of cap weighted means 22.23

- Note that for the full time series, financial firms were expected to survive about 50% longer than non-financials
  - At last date, financials have slightly lower expected lives
Another Angle on Default Correlations

- Once the time series of expected lives have been calculated, we can estimate default correlation as the correlation of percentage changes in expected lives across firms.

- As expected lives shorten, changes of a given magnitude become larger percentage changes.
  - Since correlation is a bounded function (-1 to +1) larger events drive the correlation values toward the extreme value.
  - Two bonds that have one day of expected life each will have a very high default correlation.

- Better than trying to correlate OAS spreads since bond prices are driven by liquidity effects.
Quantifying “Sustainability”

- FTSE/KLD DSI 400 index of US large cap firms considered socially responsible, 20 year history
  - Typically about 200 firms in common with the S&P 500

- July 31, 1995
  - DSI 400, Median 17, Average 17.91, Standard Deviation 9.93
  - S&P 500, Median 14, Average 15.40, Standard Deviation 9.28
  - Difference in Means is statistically significant at 95% level

- March 31, 2010
  - DSI 400, Median 30, Average 26.39, Standard Deviation 11.45
  - S&P 500, Median 30, Average 24.93, Standard Deviation, 10.92
  - Difference in Means is statistically significant at 90% but not 95%

- Testing on Disjoint Sets (DSI NOT S&P, S&P NOT DSI)
  - Statistically significant difference in means for every time period tested
A Measure of Systemic Risk?

- Obviously, if the market thinks public companies are not going to be around very long, the economy is in a bad way.
- Low equity valuations and high leverage equate to short life expectancy.
  - Higher leverage can be sustained with higher growth rates that cause higher equity valuations.
  - We propose “revenue weighted” expected average life as a measure of systemic stress on an economy.
  - By revenue weighting we capture the stress in the real economy.
  - Avoids bias of cap weighting since failing firm’s have small market capitalization and don’t count as much.
- Full sample low values are in the 6-7 range (1997-1998) with high value above 30.
  - From July 2007 to July 2008, went from over 29 to below 12.
Next Steps

- Use more sophisticated option pricing model that allows for stochastic interest rates and possibly stochastic volatility

- Use expected life data at the firm level to predict changes in credit ratings
  - We have hand collected (copied from Barron’s week by week) every credit rating downgrade and upgrade since 1991
  - Relate changes in expected life to subsequent rating changes
  - Relate expected life values that are outliers within their rating category to subsequent rating changes
  - Adjust credit risk expectations for bond issuers and financial counterparties in our fixed income risk model
Conclusions

- Combining factor models and structural models of credit risk allows for consistent estimation of equity risk, credit risk and default correlation.

- Structural models based on contingent claims methods are a direct and informative approach to assessing the expected survival of firms.

- Comparison of SRI and conventional US stock indices reveals a positive and significant difference in expected lives, confirming the existence of “sustainability”.

- We believe this technology will have usefulness as a measure of systemic risks in developed economies.