

# **Machine Learning in the Service of Policy Targeting: The Case of Public Credit Guarantees**

M. Andini E. Ciani A. D'Ignazio G. de Blasio (Bank of Italy)

M. Boldrini (University of Bologna)

A. Paladini (University of Rome La Sapienza)

# ML for policy targeting

- The effectiveness of a public policy depends (also) on who benefits from it (**targeting**). ML algorithms can be used to predict those for whom the policy is most likely to be effective (providing the policy maker with a rule to assign a treatment)
- Application: Italian public credit guarantee scheme (**FG**). In principle, credit guarantee programs should target firms that are both credit-worthy (for financial stability of the scheme) and credit-rationed (to increase additionality)
- We use ML (d-Tree, Lasso, RF) to predict firms that are **both credit-worthy** ( $y = \text{no NPL}$ ) **and credit-rationed** ( $y = \text{no credit after a PI request}$ ) and we contrast the ML targeting rule with the actual allocation rule
- Results: 20% of the firms that are FG eligible are discarded by ML; 75% of the FG non eligible are retrieved by ML → the actual allocation places **too much weight on firm creditworthiness**, neglecting credit rationing

# Ex-post evidence and issues

- We exploit data on FG beneficiary and run **3 exercises**: 1) compare observed outcomes for treated (beneficiary) ML targeted firms vs treated-non ML targeted firms; 2) compare counterfactual outcomes for non-treated ML-targeted firms vs observed outcomes of treated non-ML-targeted firms; 3) elaborate on the actual allocation rule and estimate a F-RDD by target status
- **Huge gains in terms of effectiveness** (the resources granted to firms that are not targeted by ML reach 46.5%) but many issues (information requirements, contamination, etc):
  - ✓ RF is kind of a **black box**. A d-Tree provides more transparency, but we lose quite a lot in accuracy
  - ✓ **Formal vs substantive transparency**: targeting via ML forces us to clearly indicate the policy objective and assess whether the rule is fit for it
  - ✓ **Additional policy objectives**: the distribution across regions and across different banks