Benchmark Analysis

LESE 306 Fall 2010

What is it?

- Benchmarks analysis is a simpler or "poor man's" version of data mining.
- Represents a "acceptable" borrower in a specific segment.
- Basis for comparison with other borrowers in the segment.

Risk and Uncertainty

- The 5-year strategic business plan typically reflects a "point" forecast of performance.
- Loan repayment capacity is affected by such random variables as commodity prices, unit input costs, weather and disease.
- Prudent planning requires an assessment of alternative scenarios with a realistic probability of occurrence.
- Typical approach used by FCS entities is to create and simulate "benchmark" borrowers.











Development Approach

- 1. We can use information gathered when conducting cash flow analysis at the time of loan application (i.e., hectares planted).
- 2. We can also available cost of production budgets updated to reflect current unit costs.
- **3**. Develop a spreadsheet capable of simulating all the benchmark farms in a particular location.
- 4. Link the benchmark worksheets to a simulation design worksheet complete with macros.

Stress Test Design

Forecast Approaches

- Three year average price, unit costs and yields - approach currently used in FCA cash flow analysis.
- Olympic average to remove highs and lows over previous 5-year period.
- Available outlook projections.
- ✓ Trend analysis.
- Econometric analysis.

Simulation Design

- 1. Revenue = *prices* x *yields* x hectares
- 2. Costs = *unit costs* per hectare x hectares
- 3. Random variables include prices, yields and unit costs.
- 4. Stress test random variables with adverse deviations.
- 5. Compare baseline scenario (forecasted values) performance indicators with those from alternative scenarios reflecting adverse deviations from historical trends.

Triangular Probability Distribution





The first step is to divide the loan and lease portfolio into segments. Each segment represents a key characteristic of borrowers comprising the portfolio. For example, segment #1 might be all loans or leases in the Ararat marz.



To learn more about the performance of the portfolio, one can further disaggregate all loans and leases in Ararat where the *primary crop* is tomatoes.



Benchmark Model 1.1

The average borrower is then used as a representative or "benchmark" operation. Its financial position should be compared to the lender's credit standards.





Option #1:

A generalized whole firm simulation model shell can be developed for a set of benchmark operations in each marz. Once in place, any updates focus almost entirely on the pro forma data base containing alternative trends. All benchmarks can be run simultaneously for both the "most likely" scenario and one or more adverse scenarios.



Option #1:

The model would generate annual trends in key financial indicators for each benchmark over a five-year interval.



Option #1 continued:

These indicators would then be compared to the thresholds established for the lender's credit standards.



Let's Look at an Example



Case Example

- Primary commodity is tomatoes.
- Other commodities grown are onions and cucumbers.
- Loan for new irrigation equipment.
- ✓ 13 total hectares planted.
- Current ratio when loan made = 1.25
- Loan-to-collateral value of assets = 0.35
- ✓ Use available production budgets.

Benchmark Analysis

| Commodity Tomatoes | Quantity | Price | Total Cost | Total Cost | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-------|------------|------------|------------|
| Costs per hectare: | | ADM | ADM | USD | |
| Fertilizer: | | | | | |
| Manure (MT) | 20 | 6,500 | 130,000 | \$356 | |
| Nitrogen (KG) | 220 | 100 | 22,000 | \$60 | |
| Potassium (KG) | 150 | 100 | 15,000 | \$41 | |
| Phosphorus (KG) | 175 | 100 | 47,500 | \$48 | |
| Total | | | 184,500 | \$505 | Costs con |
| Land Preparation: | | | | | COSIS Call |
| Soil preparation and cultivation | | | 65,000 | \$178 | also be |
| Land leveling and weeding | | | 113,000 | \$310 | treated as |
| Total | | | 178,000 | \$488 | random |
| Seed | | | 85,000 | \$233 | |
| Plant protection | | | 65,000 | \$178 | variables. |
| Irrigation | | | 85,000 | \$233 | |
| Harvesting | | | 262,500 | \$719 | |
| Labor 1/ | | | 180,000 | \$493 | |
| Total cash costs excluding interest | | | 1,040,000 | \$2,849 | |

| | Quantity | Price | Revenue | Revenue |
|---------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|---------|
| | | ADM | ADM | USD |
| Expected yield per hectare (MT) | (45) | | | |
| Expected sales price (KG) | | (40) | | |
| Revenue | \backslash | | 1,800,000 | \$4,932 |
| Net cash income (EBIT) | | \setminus / | 760,000 | \$2,082 |
| 1/ 177 doub: \$11.20 wage rate | | | | |
| 1/ 1// days, \$11.29 wage rate | 265 | wo random | | |
| 27 ADIW/USD exchange rate | 202 | variables | | |

| ntity 3 30 50 | Price ADM 6,500 100 | Total Cost ADM 149,500 | Total Cost USD \$410 | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 3 30 00 | ADM 6,500 100 | ADM 149,500 | USD \$410 | | |
| 3 30 00 | 6,500 100 | 149,500 | \$410 | | |
| 3 30 00 | 6,500 100 | 149,500 | \$410 | | |
| 30 00 | 100 | | ¥ 1 1 ¥ | | |
| 00 | | 48,000 | \$132 | | |
| | 100 | 30,000 | \$82 | | |
| 00 | 100 | 10,080 | \$27 | | |
| | 5 | 237,500 | \$651 | Costs c | can |
| | | | | also h | |
| | | 4,500 | \$12 | | |
| | | 240,000 | \$658 | <u> </u> | as |
| | | 244,500 | \$670 | rando | m |
| | | 50,000 | \$137 | variable | es |
| | | 202,000 | \$553 | Variable | 55. |
| | | 55,000 | \$151 | | |
| | | 150,000 | \$411 | | |
| | | 105,000 | \$288 | | |
| | | 1,044,000 | \$2,860 | | |
| | 00 |)0 100 | 100 10,080 237,500 4,500 240,000 244,500 50,000 202,000 55,000 150,000 105,000 1,044,000 | 100 10,080 \$27 237,500 \$651 4,500 \$12 240,000 \$658 244,500 \$670 50,000 \$137 202,000 \$553 55,000 \$151 150,000 \$411 105,000 \$288 1,044,000 \$2,860 | 100 10,080 \$27 237,500 \$651 Costs of also be treated also be treated and of the second |



Benchmark Analysis

| Commodity: Onions | Quantity | Price | Total Cost | Total Cost | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-------|------------|------------|------------|
| Costs per hectare: | | ADM | ADM | USD | |
| Fertilizer: | | | | | |
| Manure (MT) | 20 | 6,500 | 130,000 | \$356 | |
| Nitrogen (KG) | 200 | 100 | 20,000 | \$55 | |
| Potassium (KG) | 100 | 100 | 10,000 | \$27 | |
| Phosphorus (KG) | 100 | 100 | 10,000 | \$27 | |
| Total | | | 170,000 | \$466 | Costs can |
| Land Preparation: | | | | | |
| Soil preparation and cultivation | | | 95,000 | \$260 | |
| Land leveling and weeding | | | 100,000 | \$274 | |
| Total | | | 195,000 | \$534 | random |
| Seed | | | 70,000 | \$192 | |
| Plant protection | | | 65,000 | \$178 | variables. |
| Irrigation | | | 60,000 | \$164 | |
| Harvesting | | | 105,000 | \$288 | |
| Labor 1/ | | | 170,000 | \$466 | |
| Total cash costs excluding interest | | | 835,000 | \$2,288 | |
| | Quantity | Drico | Bayanus | Poyopus | |
| | Quantity | Flice | Revenue | Revenue | |

| | Quantity | Price | Revenue | Revenue |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------|-----------|---------|
| | | ADM | ADM | USD |
| Expected yield per hectare (MT) | (30) | \frown | | |
| Expected sales price (KG) | × | 80 |] | |
| Revenue | | | 2,400,000 | \$6,575 |
| Net cash income (EBIT) | | | 1,565,000 | \$4,288 |
| 1/ 134 days; \$11.29 wage rate | Two | random | | |
| 2/ ADM/USD exchange rate | 36 <mark>: va</mark> | riables | | |

Assume the benchmark borrower had a current ratio (CR) of **1.25** and a debt-to-collateral value (D/CV) was **0.35** at the time the loan was made.

Assume the benchmark borrower had a current ratio (CR) of **1.25** and a debt-to-collateral value (D/CV) was **0.35** at the time the loan was made.

The net cash income (EBIT) per hectare where shown on the previous slides to be **\$2,082** for tomatoes, **\$3,852** for cucumbers and **\$4,288** for onions.

Assume the benchmark borrower had a current ratio (CR) of **1.25** and a debt-to-collateral value (D/CV) was **0.35** at the time the loan was made.

The net cash income (EBIT) per hectare where shown on the previous slides to be **\$2,082** for tomatoes, **\$3,852** for cucumbers and **\$4,288** for onions.

The variable expense ratio, a measure of operation efficiency, was *0.58* or 58% for tomatoes, *0.44* or 44 % for cucumbers and *0.35* or 35% for onions. This excludes interest and all fixed costs.

Assume the benchmark borrower had a current ratio (CR) of **1.25** and a debt-to-collateral value (D/CV) was **0.35** at the time the loan was made.

The net cash income (EBIT) per hectare where shown on the previous slides to be **\$2,082** for tomatoes, **\$3,852** for cucumbers and **\$4,288** for onions.

The variable expense ratio, a measure of operation efficiency, was *0.58* or 58% for tomatoes, *0.44* or 44 % for cucumbers and *0.35* or 35% for onions. This excludes interest and all fixed costs.

Assume the benchmark borrower operates 13 hectares and normally withdraws \$15,000 for family living expenses. Further assume that the scheduled principal plus interest expense this year is \$8,905. Given this set of assumptions, the term debt and capital lease coverage ratio (TFCLC) would be 2.25.

Benchmark Analysis

| | | Planted | EBIT per | Total |
|--------------------------------|--------------|----------|------------|--------------|
| Crop Commodity | Crop | Hectares | hectare | EBIT |
| Primary commodity | Tomatoes | 9.0 | \$2,082 | \$18,740 |
| Secondary commodity #1 | Cucumbers | 2.0 | \$3,852 | \$7,704 |
| Secondary commodity #2 | Onions | 2.0 | \$4,288 | \$8,575 |
| Secondary commodity #3 | None | 0.0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Secondary commodity #4 | None | 0.0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Secondary commodity #5 | None | 0.0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Secondary commodity #6 | None | 0.0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | 13.0 | | \$35,019 |
| Other relevant data: | | | | |
| FCA scheduled PI payment | , \$8,905 | 5 | | |
| Family living expenses | \$15,000 |) | | |
| Other known debt payments | \$0 |) | | |
| <u>Data at time of loan:</u> | | | | |
| Current ratio | 1.25 | 5 | | |
| Loan to collateral value ratio | 0.35 | 5 | | |
| Credit standards: | | | | |
| Current ratio | 1.00 | Minimum | | antions abou |
| L/CV ratio | 0.50 | Maximum | iviy assur | |
| TDCLC ratio | 1.00 | Minimum | credit sta | ndards |
| Borrower ratios: | | | | |
| Current ratio | 1.25 | | | |
| L/CV ratio | 0.35 | _ | | |
| TDCLC ratio | 2.25 | | | |

Loan Classification Scheme

| Accept- able | Special Mention | Sub- standard | Doubtful | Loss |
|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|----------|------|
|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|----------|------|

One approach would be to tie the calculated Term Debt and Capital Lease Coverage Ratio (TDCLC) to each of these classes when doing stress testing. For example: Acceptable = TDCLC \geq 1.25 Special mention = 1.10 \leq TDCLC < 1.25 Substandard = 1.00 \leq TDCLC < 1.10 (CR < 1.10 and D/CV > 0.75) Doubtful = 0.90 < TDCLC < 1.00 (CR < 1.05 and 0.75 < D/CV \leq 0.80) Loss = TDCLC < 0.90 (CR < 1.00 and D/CV \geq 0.80)

You can also consider the borrower's present liquidity (CR) and debt to collateral value (D/CV) when classifying loans below the Special mention category.

Loan Classification Scheme



You can also consider the borrower's present liquidity (CR) and debt to collateral value (D/CV) when classifying loans below the Special mention category.



Thus we would conclude based on the loan classification thresholds on the previous slide that this benchmark borrower would be considered a *"acceptable"* loan.

Let's Look at the Model and Do Some Stress Testing



| Crop | Baseline |
|-------------|----------|
| Tomato | \$2,982 |
| Cucumber | \$3,852 |
| Onion | \$4,288 |
| TDCLC ratio | 2.25 |

| Crop | Baseline | 10↓5↑10↑ |
|-------------|----------|----------|
| Tomato | \$2,982 | \$1,526 |
| Cucumber | \$3,852 | \$3,197 |
| Onion | \$4,288 | \$3,697 |
| TDCLC ratio | 2.25 | 1.41 |

| Crop | Baseline | 10↓5↑10↑ | 5↓ 5↑10↑ |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Tomato | \$2,982 | \$1,526 | \$1,785 |
| Cucumber | \$3,852 | \$3,197 | \$3,549 |
| Onion | \$4,288 | \$3,697 | \$4,042 |
| TDCLC ratio | 2.25 | 1.41 | 1.82 |

| Crop | Baseline | 10↓5↑10↑ | 5↓ 5↑10↑ | 5↓5↓10↑ |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------|---------|
| Tomato | \$2,982 | \$1,526 | \$1,785 | \$1,316 |
| Cucumber | \$3,852 | \$3,197 | \$3,549 | \$2,912 |
| Onion | \$4,288 | \$3,697 | \$4,042 | \$3,418 |
| TDCLC ratio | 2.25 | 1.41 | 1.82 | 1.07 |

| Crop | Baseline | 10↓5↑10↑ | 5↓ 5↑10↑ | 5↓5↓10↑ | 15↓5↑10↑ |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Tomato | \$2,982 | \$1,526 | \$1,785 | \$1,316 | \$1,267 |
| Cucumber | \$3,852 | \$3,197 | \$3,549 | \$2,912 | \$2,844 |
| Onion | \$4,288 | \$3,697 | \$4,042 | \$3,418 | \$3,352 |
| TDCLC ratio | 2.25 | 1.41 | 1.82 | 1.07 | 0.99 |

Use of Benchmarks

- Evaluate all farms falling below benchmark borrower under baseline scenario.
- Evaluate the impacts of adverse scenarios on the benchmark borrowers based on the assumption that they are representative of a particular segment. This is an alternative to data mining simulation.

This can be done by examining the effects of potential adverse trends in key random variables (i.e., commodity prices, yields per hectare and costs of production).