An Explained Extreme Gradient Boosting Approach for Identifying the Time-Varying Determinants of Sovereign Risk

Working paper

June 2023

Carlos Giraldo Iader Giraldo-Salazar Jose E. Gomez-Gonzalez Jorge M. Uribe



An Explained Extreme Gradient Boosting Approach for Identifying the Time-Varying Determinants of Sovereign Risk

Carlos Giraldo¹ Iader Giraldo-Salazar² Jose E. Gomez-Gonzalez^{3:4} Jorge M. Uribe⁵

Abstract

We use a combination of Extreme Gradient Boosting and SHAP Additive Explanations to uncover the determinants of sovereign risk across a wide range of countries from 2002 to 2021. By considering numerous variables established in existing literature within a single framework, we identify year-by-year determinants of sovereign credit risk. To gauge the liquidity and solvency aspects of sovereign risk, we utilize 5- and 10-year yield spreads as proxies. Our findings show that the key variables driving sovereign risk have remained relatively stable over time and exhibit similarities in both liquidity and solvency components. Among the prominent variables, various macroeconomic fundamentals play a crucial role, including the current account, GDP growth, per capita GDP growth, and the real exchange rate. Prior to the Global Financial Crisis, macroeconomic variables, particularly the current account, held the highest importance in explaining sovereign risk. However, following the GFC, the relative importance of these variables diminished, giving way to institutional variables, especially the rule of law.

Key words: Sovereign risk; Explainable AI; Extreme Gradient Boosting model; Macroeconomic and institutional factors JEL Classification: C33, F34, G15

¹ Latin American Reserve Fund, Bogotá, Colombia. Email: cgiraldo@flar.net

² Latin American Reserve Fund, Bogotá, Colombia. Email: <u>igiraldo@flar.net</u>

³ Department of Finance, Information Systems, and Economics, City University of New York - Lehman College, Bronx, NY, USA. Email: <u>jose.gomezgonzalez@lehman.cuny.edu</u>

⁴ Visiting Professor (Summer School), Escuela Internacional de Ciencias Económicas y Administrativas, Universidad de La Sabana, Chía, Colombia

⁵ Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain: Email. juribe@uoc.edu

Content

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Data and Methods	5
3.	Empirical Results	6
	3.1. Main determinants of 5-year yield spreads	6
	3.2. Main determinants of 10-year yield spreads	12
	3.3. Identification of uncertainty shocks in small open economies	9
4.	Conclusions	16
	References	18

1. Introduction

Sovereign risk is a critical element in understanding international capital flows. Investors carefully consider the default risk they face when making short- and long-term investments in a foreign country, especially when dealing with emerging or low-income countries for which information is opaque and lending is subject to greater informational asymmetries. For this reason, determinants of sovereign risk have been widely studied before (e.g., Sy, 2002; Longstaff et al., 2005; Thuraisamy et al., 2008; Hilscher and Nosbusch, 2010; Comelli, 2012; Ordoñez-Callamand et al., 2017; Montes et al., 2022; Andrade et al., 2023). Several papers examine individual countries, while others adopt a multi-country approach. Some focus on emerging countries, while others investigate sovereign risk in advanced economies. However, a shared characteristic among these previous studies is the use of linear models to identify the primary drivers of country risk. While some have incorporated the nonlinear impact of specific variables or variable groups, assuming specific functional forms, the underlying models remain linear, failing to fully capture potential nonlinear relationships.

This paper contributes by studying the determinants of sovereign risk, measured by government-bond yield spreads, using Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoots). XGBoots allows considering a large set of explanatory variables, even with relatively low number of observations, alongside unspecified nonlinearities in the estimated effects. In addition, aiming to incorporate explainability into the framework, we use SHAP Additive Explanations (Shap-Values). SHAP values are one of the most popular tools in computer science to conduct Explainable Artificial Intelligence. It is technique used to measure the contribution of each input variable on the prediction of a machine learning model. SHAP values allow identifying the determinants of country risk associated with its liquidity (i.e., 5 years) and solvency (i.e., 10 years) dimensions and to observe changes in the magnitude of the effects over time (*e.g.*, normal years versus crisis years).

We include a considerably larger set of variables in our framework compared to the previous literature. Selected covariates reflect the governments' debt situation, the state of the economy including external sector variables, international reserves, and institutional variables including the rule of law and indexes of central bank independence. Subsets of these determinants have been used in influential empirical papers like Hilscher and Nosbusch (2010), Longstaff *et al.* (2011), and Eichler and Maltritz (2013).

Our findings reveal that the relative effect of the various variables included in the model undergoes changes over time throughout the study period from 2002 to 2021. While only a limited number of variables emerge as consistent determinants across the entire period, they align with conventional indicators of sovereign risk. These variables are the current account, openness, output growth, foreign direct investment, and external debt. Interestingly, the importance of international reserves, which played a substantial role in determining sovereign risk during the initial years of the sample, diminishes following the Global Financial Crisis (GFC). This outcome can be attributed to a couple of factors. Firstly, there has been a notable trend in the international monetary landscape characterized by a substantial increase in international reserves held by central banks of emerging economies. Notably, China has made a significant contribution to the accumulation of reserves among emerging economies, although other countries have also played significant roles. As a result, the international reserves of emerging economies have surged from less than \$500 billion in the mid-1990s to nearly \$10 trillion in 2022. These reserves have reached a level sufficient to exceed the entirety of their public external debt. Consequently, while private sector borrowing has increased, governments have become net external creditors. Therefore, many countries have achieved an adequate level of international reserves, suggesting that further increases may be unnecessary to further mitigate sovereign risk.

Second, in response to the GFC, major central banks worldwide implemented quantitative easing measures that significantly augmented global liquidity. Although these central banks have made efforts to taper these policies in recent years, many, particularly the Federal Reserve (Fed), have maintained an accommodative monetary stance, thus sustaining elevated levels of global liquidity. The ample liquidity in international financial markets has facilitated governments' access to abundant financing, even amidst the Covid-19 pandemic. As a result, the importance of international reserves appears to have diminished. In the same sense, their importance could increase in expectation of a reduction in US dollar global liquidity.

Interestingly, institutional variables like the rule of law and an index of central bank independence are also relevant during most of the sample period. Moreover, their relative importance has increased over the last decade. This may be since social unrest has lately risen, adding to risks for the global economy, according to the Reported Social Unrest Index calculated by the IMF (Barrett, 2022). Large and long-running anti-government protests have occurred in some advanced economies and in various emerging and low-income economies coups have sparked widespread protests.

2. Data and Methods

Our study utilizes XGBoost by Chen and Guestrin (2016) as an efficient implementation of Gradient Tree Boosting (GTB), which is a variant of Gradient Boosting that employs decision trees as base learners (Firedman, 2001). GTB iteratively fits regression trees to the residuals of the previous trees, with the aim of reducing the loss function of the model. On its side, XGBoost works by iteratively building an ensemble of decision trees, where each new tree is trained to correct the prediction errors of the prior models. As it is based on decision trees, XGBoost is a natural option to handling datasets with many features, especially in relation with the number of observations.

Models are fit using any arbitrary differentiable loss function, in our case a standard square loss, and gradient descent optimization algorithm.

To interpret the results of our models we use SHAP values by Lundberg and Lee (2017). SHAP values work by computing the contribution of each feature to the final prediction, considering the interactions between features (*e.g.*, covariates) and the value ranges of each feature. This can provide more accurate and intuitive explanations of how the model arrived at its prediction. Using SHAP values with XGBoost is especially helpful in cases where it's important to understand the factors driving the model's predictions, such as in understanding the determinants of sovereign debt markets. By understanding the SHAP values of each feature, we can identify which features have the most significant impact on the spread over time and how they are related to each other in the cross-section of markets.

Our data come from a variety of sources. Spreads and other market variables come from Bloomberg, while macroeconomic and debt related variables come from the World Bank and International Monetary Fund web pages. Proxies for central bank independence come from Romelli (2022), given the virtually inexistent variability in time of these variables, we extend the original sample period, which concludes in 2017, to encompass data until 2022, aligning with the end of our own sample.

3. Empirical Results

We present our results for both 5-year and 10-year spreads on an annual basis. Our approach provides insights into the dynamics of risk determinants over time, while facilitates the evaluation of the relative significance of different variables associated with liquidity and solvency dimensions (see Ordoñez-Callamand, 2017 and others).

3.1. Main determinants of 5-year yield spreads

We divide the sample period into three, 2002 to 2007 (pre-GFC), 2008 to 2011 (GFC) and 2012 to 2021 (post-GFC and first pandemic year). Regarding the first period, several things are worth noting (Figure 1). First, the current account is among the main determinants of the 5-year spread and its effect on sovereign credit risk is as expected. Countries with a larger current account surplus tend to have lower spreads. This result is in line with recent literature that has shown that countries with more complex and diversified production and export structures tend to have lower risk of fiscal crises (Gomez-Gonzalez *et al.*, 2023).



Figure 1. SHAP values for 15 main determinants of 5-year yield spreads, 2002-2007

The real exchange rate also emerges as a significant factor influencing sovereign risk. Real depreciations are found to contribute to an increase in country risk. While the degree of economic openness has been among the main determinants for certain periods, it does not hold the same level of importance as other macroeconomic and institutional factors. This suggests that, when considering sovereign risk, the focus should extend beyond solely measuring the openness or closedness of an economy.

Real economic growth and per capita growth are also important and have the expected signs, indicating that higher product growth reduces the yield spread. International reserves, either measured in relation to GDP or in relation to imports, are also among the main determinants of country risk. Although in most years the dispersion between countries is low, the effect tends to be as expected, increases in international reserves tend to reduce the yield spread.

Countries with more independent central banks have a lower yield spread. This result is consistent with the hypothesis that an independent central bank helps fiscal discipline and contributes to macroeconomic stability. Institutional factors are mainly fixed in time, and therefore are associated with idiosyncratic perceptions of countries by investors. Their inclusion helps us to control for such difficult to measure fixed effects.

Figure 2 covers the years associated to the GFC. It is evident the increasing importance of the rule of law as a determinant of short-term risk. In fact, it has the highest SHAP value for all years except for 2008. This result suggests that during times of high uncertainty and turbulence in the financial sector, international investors pay more attention to the institutional strength of the countries they invest in than during normal times. In line with the above, variables related to central bank independence are also very relevant, especially during the most intense crisis moments experienced between 2008 and 2009. The current account is still among the main determinants, but its relative importance has decreased compared to the previous period, before the GFC.

International reserves are not as relevant as during the period prior to the crisis. This may be due to two factors that are not mutually exclusive. On the one hand, several emerging economies had accumulated a considerable level of reserves between 2002 and 2007, taking advantage of the depreciation of the dollar against the currencies of these countries. For this reason, many emerging economies entered the period of the GFC with adequate levels of international reserves, which is why higher increases in them would have less impact on sovereign risk. On the other hand, the enormous infusion of liquidity generated by the central banks of developed economies in response to the GFC led countries to have enough liquidity without the need to use their international reserves to fulfill foreign currency debt payments.



Figure 2. SHAP values for 15 main determinants of 5-year yield spreads, 2008-2011

The other variables that were among the main determinants of the short-term spread in the previous period remain so in this one. The relationship between international reserves and imports stands out, as it occupies one of the top places according to SHAP values in 2010 and 2011.

Figure 3 depicts 5-year yield spreads for the post-GFC period. This period is relatively long and when considering year-by-year information, the SHAP values of the main determinants exhibit considerable variation. However, even though the relative order changes from year to year, the main determinants of the 5-year spread remain relatively intact throughout the period. As during the GFC, the most important variable is the rule of law, which in several years occupies the first place according to the SHAP values. Countries with a higher index have a lower yield spread. The post-GFC period is also one of turbulence both in the economic (European debt crisis in 2012 and 2013) and in the political and social realms (increases in the IMF's social unrest index and the Covid-19 pandemic).



Figure 3. SHAP values for 15 main determinants of 5-year yield spreads, 2012-2021



Feature Value

Low

High

Feature Value

Low

High



Figure 3. SHAP values for 15 main determinants of 5-year yield spreads, 2012-2021

The variables related to central bank independence continue to be relevant, and only in two years (2012 and 2014) do not appear among the top fifteen. In fact, they become especially relevant between 2018 and 2021, a period in which several governments carried out considerable fiscal expansions. This shows the importance of the central bank acting independently of the government in times when the latter may have incentives to considerably increase public spending. Although the relative importance of the current account as a determinant of country risk has diminished compared to the pre-Global Financial Crisis (GFC) period, it still holds significance among the main factors. Similarly, other macroeconomic variables such as GDP growth and per capita GDP growth continue to exert influence on country risk, albeit to a lesser extent than before.

3.2. Main determinants of 10-year yield spreads

The figures 4, 5, and 6 show the main determinants of 10-year spreads year by year according to SHAP values. It is interesting to contrast these results with those of the previous subsection to analyze solvency and liquidity dimensions of sovereign risk. As seen in the graphs, the variables that are relevant to explain the 5-year spread are also relevant to explain the 10-year spread. While at the beginning of the sample, macroeconomic variables and especially the current account occupied the top spots, from the GFC onwards; the most relevant spots are occupied by institutional variables. In fact, the rule of law and central bank independence variables become more relevant after the GFC. The rule of law occupies the first place according to SHAP values. These results indicate that the longer the yield spread period, the more relevant institutional variables become as its determinants. This is justified by the fact that when taking positions in longer-term assets, investors are more careful in considering the institutional structure of countries. On the other hand, as financial markets integration and asset volatility in global markets increase, the importance of these fundamental factors for the long-term stability of countries has become more relevant.

Slightly more pronounced than in the case of the 5-year spread, the relative importance of international reserves has decreased since the GFC. However, this does not mean that maintaining an adequate level of international reserves is no longer important. In fact, they will likely regain relevance as central banks of advanced economies continue to normalize their monetary policy stance. For example, as shown in the graphs of this subsection, when the taper tantrum occurred in 2013, international reserves reappeared as one of the main determinants of sovereign risk.



Figure 4. SHAP values for 15 main determinants of 10-year yield spreads, 2002-2007



Figure 5. SHAP values for 15 main determinants of 10-year yield spreads, 2008-2011



Figure 6. SHAP values for 15 main determinants of 10-year yield spreads, 2012-2021



Figure 6. SHAP values for 15 main determinants of 10-year yield spreads, 2012-2021

4. Conclusions

We use recent tools form explainable AI known as SHAP Values, for analyzing predictions of a sequence of XGBoot models of year-by-year determinants of sovereign debt markets. Doing this we can observe the variation in their fundamental determinants over time, emphasizing the GFC as a turning point. Our results show that the set of variables that matter in explaining the behavior of sovereign risk are relatively stable over time and similar for the liquidity and solvency components. Among the most relevant variables are several macro-economic fundamentals, such as the current account, GDP growth and per capita GDP growth, and the real exchange rate. International reserves and institutional variables such as central bank independence and the rule of law are also found to be relevant.

Both in the case of the 5-year yield spread and the 10-year yield spread, before the GFC, macroeconomic variables were the most important, especially the current account. However, the relative importance of these variables decreased after the GFC, giving way to institutional variables, especially the rule of law. This effect is more pronounced in long-term spreads than in short-term spreads. This result may indicate that as the international environment has become more volatile and political unrest has increased in countries, international investors have become more cautious and pay closer attention to institutional variables when making investment decisions in countries.

References

- Andrade, S., Ekponon, A., Jeanneret, A. (2023). Sovereign risk premia and global macroeconomic conditions. Journal of Financial Economics 147: 172-197.
- Barrett, P. (2022). Social Unrest is Rising, Adding to Risks for Global Economy, IMF Blog. Retreived on March 13 2023.
- Chen, T. and Guestrin, C. (2016). XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System, 22nd SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, 2016, https://arxiv.org/abs/1603. 02754.
- Comelli, S. (2012). Emerging market sovereign bond spreads: Estimation and back-testing. Emerging Markets Review 13: 598-625.
- Eichler, S., Maltritz, D. (2013). The term structure of sovereign default risk in EMU member countries and its determinants. Journal of Banking and Finance 37: 1810-1816.
- Friedman (2001). Greedy function approximation: a gradient boosting machine. Annals of Statistics, 29(5):1189–1232.
- Gomez-Gonzalez, J.E., Uribe, J.M., Valencia, O.M. (2023). Does economic complexity reduce the probability of a fiscal crisis? World Development 168: Article 106250.
- Hilscher, J., Nosbusch, Y. (2010). Determinants of sovereign risk: Macroeconomics fundamentals and the pricing of sovereign debt. Review of Finance 14: 235-262.
- Longstaff, F., Mithal, S., Neis, E. (2005). Corporate yield spreads: Default risk or liquidity? New evidence from the credit default swap market. The Journal of Finance 60: 2213-2253.
- Longstaff, F., Pan, J., Pedersen, L., Singleton, K. (2011), How sovereign is sovereign credit risk? American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics 3: 75-103.
- Lundberg, S. M., and Lee, S.-I. (2017). A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions. In Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS'17) (pp. 4765–4774). Curran Associates Inc.
- Montes, G.C., Nicolay, R., Pereira, F. (2022). Does fiscal sentiment matter for sovereign risk? The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance 86: 18-30.
- Ordoñez-Callamand, D., Gomez-Gonzalez, J.E., Melo-Velandia, L.F. (2017). Sovereign default risk in OECD countries: Do global factors matter? North American Journal of Economics and Finance 42: 629-639.
- Romelli, D. (2022). The Political Economy of Reforms in Central Bank Design: Evidence from a New Dataset. Economic Policy, eiac011.
- Sy, A.N.R. (2002). Emerging market bond spreads and sovereign credit ratings: Reconciling market views with economic fundamentals. Emerging Market Review 3: 380-408.
- Thuraisamy, K.S., Gannon, G.L., Batten, J.A. (2008). The credit spread dynamics of Latin American euro issues in international bond markets. Journal of Multinational Financial Management 18: 328-345.



Fondo Latinoamericano de Reservas | FLAR Calle 84A No. 12-18 Piso 7 | Bogotá, Colombia Correo electrónico: flar@flar.net Tel: (571) 634 4360