



Impact of Machine Learning–Based Credit Risk Modeling on Regulatory Compliance in Banking

Erlans Firman Susanto¹

¹ Universitas Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia

Abstract

Article history:

Received: January 5, 2025
Revised: February 21, 2025
Accepted: April 27, 2025
Published: June 30, 2025

Keywords:

Banking risk management,
Credit risk modeling,
Financial regulation,
Machine learning,
Regulatory compliance.

Identifier:

Zera Open
Page: 74-91
<https://zeraopen.com/journal/amos>

The increasing complexity of banking activities and regulatory requirements has intensified the need for more advanced approaches to credit risk modeling. Traditional credit risk assessment models, while widely used, often face limitations in capturing non-linear relationships and rapidly changing risk patterns. In response to these challenges, machine learning–based credit risk modeling has emerged as a promising tool to enhance risk identification and decision-making processes within banking institutions. This study conceptually examines the impact of machine learning–based credit risk modeling on regulatory compliance in the banking sector. Drawing on recent literature in banking risk management, financial regulation, and artificial intelligence, the paper analyzes how data-driven risk models can support compliance with prudential regulations, particularly in relation to capital adequacy, credit quality assessment, and supervisory expectations. The discussion highlights the potential benefits of machine learning techniques in improving model accuracy, risk sensitivity, and regulatory reporting, while also addressing key challenges such as model transparency, governance, and regulatory acceptance. The findings contribute to the growing discourse on the integration of advanced analytics into banking risk frameworks and provide insights for regulators and practitioners seeking to balance innovation with regulatory compliance.



1. Introduction

The stability of the banking sector is fundamentally shaped by the effectiveness of credit risk management and the ability of financial institutions to comply with increasingly complex regulatory requirements. Credit risk remains one of the most significant sources of vulnerability for banks, as excessive exposure to credit losses can undermine capital adequacy, weaken market confidence, and threaten overall financial stability (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, 2021; World Bank, 2022). In response to past financial crises and evolving risk landscapes, banking regulators have strengthened prudential frameworks, emphasizing robust credit risk assessment, transparent risk governance, and alignment with international prudential standards.

Traditionally, banks have relied on statistical credit risk models, such as logistic regression and scorecard-based approaches, to assess borrower creditworthiness and estimate default probabilities. Although these methods remain widely used, recent studies suggest that conventional models often struggle to capture non-linear risk dynamics and rapidly changing credit conditions in increasingly digitalized banking environments (Bussmann et al., 2021; European Central Bank, 2021). These limitations raise concerns regarding the adequacy of traditional modeling approaches in supporting both internal risk management objectives and external regulatory compliance.

Recent advances in artificial intelligence and data analytics have accelerated the adoption of machine learning techniques in credit risk modeling. Empirical and conceptual research indicates that machine learning-based models can enhance

predictive accuracy by processing large volumes of financial and behavioral data and identifying complex patterns that are difficult to detect using traditional statistical methods (Bussmann et al., 2021; Lessmann et al., 2021). From a banking risk perspective, these capabilities suggest potential improvements in early warning systems, credit portfolio monitoring, and the timeliness of risk assessments under volatile economic conditions.

Despite these advantages, the use of machine learning in credit risk modeling introduces significant regulatory and governance challenges. Banking supervisory frameworks emphasize the importance of model transparency, explainability, validation, and accountability, particularly within capital adequacy and supervisory review processes (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, 2022). Concerns regarding model opacity, algorithmic bias, and model risk management have intensified regulatory scrutiny of advanced analytics in financial institutions (Rudin et al., 2022). As a result, the alignment between machine learning–based credit risk models and regulatory compliance requirements remains an unresolved issue in banking supervision.

Within this context, a critical question arises as to whether machine learning–based credit risk modeling can effectively enhance regulatory compliance or whether it introduces additional complexities that challenge supervisory oversight. While improved predictive performance may support more accurate risk measurement and regulatory reporting, insufficient governance structures and limited regulatory guidance may constrain practical implementation (Bank for International Settlements, 2020). This tension underscores the need for a structured conceptual

examination of the interaction between advanced credit risk modeling and regulatory compliance in banking.

Accordingly, this study aims to conceptually examine the impact of machine learning–based credit risk modeling on regulatory compliance in the banking sector. By synthesizing recent literature on banking risk management, financial regulation, and artificial intelligence published between 2020 and 2024, the paper develops an integrated understanding of the opportunities and constraints associated with advanced modeling approaches. The analysis contributes to ongoing discussions on innovation in banking risk frameworks and provides a conceptual foundation for future research and regulatory policy development.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Credit Risk Modeling in Banking

Credit risk modeling has long been a core component of banking risk management, supporting credit approval, portfolio monitoring, and regulatory capital calculation. In the post–global financial crisis period, regulatory authorities have emphasized the need for robust, conservative, and transparent credit risk models to ensure banking system stability. Prudential frameworks increasingly require banks to demonstrate that their credit risk models are not only statistically sound but also aligned with supervisory expectations regarding capital adequacy and risk governance (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, 2021).

Recent literature highlights that traditional credit risk models—primarily based on linear statistical techniques—remain widely used due to their

interpretability and regulatory familiarity. However, studies published in the last decade increasingly question their ability to capture complex borrower behavior, macroeconomic interactions, and non-linear risk dynamics, particularly in data-rich banking environments (Bussmann et al., 2021; Lessmann et al., 2021). These limitations have motivated a growing body of research exploring alternative modeling approaches capable of enhancing predictive performance while maintaining regulatory relevance.

2.2. Machine Learning Applications in Credit Risk Modeling

Machine learning has emerged as a prominent methodological advancement in credit risk modeling research. Compared to traditional approaches, machine learning algorithms offer greater flexibility in handling high-dimensional data and identifying non-linear patterns that are often present in financial datasets. Empirical benchmarking studies demonstrate that machine learning models frequently outperform conventional statistical models in predicting default risk, particularly when large and heterogeneous datasets are available (Lessmann et al., 2021).

In the banking context, recent studies emphasize that machine learning–based credit risk models can enhance early warning systems and improve the sensitivity of risk assessments to changing economic conditions (Bussmann et al., 2021). These advantages are particularly relevant for regulatory compliance, as more accurate risk measurement can support more precise capital allocation and improved risk reporting. Nevertheless, the literature also notes that performance gains alone are insufficient to justify widespread adoption in regulated environments, where transparency and accountability remain paramount

2.3. Regulatory Compliance and Model Governance

Regulatory compliance represents a critical dimension in the evaluation of advanced credit risk models. Banking supervisors require that internal models used for regulatory purposes adhere to strict standards related to validation, documentation, and governance. Recent regulatory guidance underscores the importance of model risk management frameworks that address data quality, methodological soundness, and ongoing model monitoring (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, 2022; European Central Bank, 2021).

The literature suggests that machine learning models introduce new governance challenges due to their algorithmic complexity and potential lack of interpretability. Concerns related to explainability, bias, and model transparency are frequently cited as key barriers to regulatory acceptance (Rudin et al., 2022). As a result, recent studies emphasize the growing importance of explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) techniques as a means of reconciling predictive performance with regulatory expectations. Explainability is increasingly viewed as a prerequisite for supervisory trust, particularly when machine learning models are used to inform capital requirements and credit decisions.

2.4. Machine Learning, Regulation, and Banking Supervision

An emerging stream of literature focuses explicitly on the interaction between machine learning–based credit risk modeling and regulatory compliance. Policy-oriented studies argue that advanced analytics can enhance supervisory outcomes by improving risk identification and enabling more forward-looking assessments of bank resilience (Bank for International Settlements, 2020; World Bank, 2022). From

this perspective, machine learning is framed not as a regulatory challenge, but as a potential enabler of more effective prudential oversight.

Conversely, other scholars caution that insufficient regulatory guidance and inconsistent governance practices may undermine the compliance benefits of machine learning adoption. Without clear supervisory standards, banks may face uncertainty regarding acceptable model complexity, validation procedures, and disclosure requirements. This tension reflects a broader debate within the literature concerning the balance between innovation and regulatory conservatism in banking risk management.

2.5. Research Gap and Conceptual Positioning

Despite the growing body of research on machine learning in credit risk modeling, the literature remains fragmented with respect to its implications for regulatory compliance. While numerous studies document performance improvements and methodological advancements, fewer contributions explicitly integrate regulatory perspectives into their analysis. In particular, there is limited conceptual synthesis examining how machine learning–based credit risk models align with prudential objectives, supervisory expectations, and governance requirements within the banking sector.

Accordingly, this study positions itself within this gap by conceptually examining the impact of machine learning–based credit risk modeling on regulatory compliance in banking. By synthesizing insights from recent academic and policy-oriented literature published between 2020 and 2024, the study seeks to provide a

structured understanding of the opportunities and constraints associated with advanced credit risk modeling in regulated banking environments.

3. Methods

This study employs a qualitative research design based on a systematic literature review (SLR) to examine the impact of machine learning–based credit risk modeling on regulatory compliance in the banking sector. The SLR approach is adopted to ensure a transparent, structured, and replicable synthesis of existing knowledge, while avoiding the use of original empirical data. This methodological design is appropriate given the conceptual focus of the study and its objective to integrate insights from diverse academic and regulatory sources within the field of banking risk management.

The literature review process followed a structured three-stage procedure consisting of identification, screening, and inclusion. During the identification stage, relevant publications were retrieved through systematic searches in Google Scholar using predefined keywords such as “credit risk modeling,” “machine learning in banking,” “regulatory compliance,” “model risk management,” and “banking supervision.” These keywords were selected to capture studies addressing both technical developments in credit risk modeling and their regulatory implications. To ensure the relevance and timeliness of the reviewed literature, the search was restricted to publications released between 2020 and 2024.

In the screening stage, retrieved studies were evaluated based on predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Peer-reviewed journal articles and institutional

reports from internationally recognized regulatory bodies were included to ensure academic rigor and policy relevance. Studies focusing exclusively on algorithmic development without explicit discussion of regulatory compliance, governance, or supervisory considerations were excluded. This screening process ensured that the final body of literature directly addressed the intersection of machine learning, credit risk modeling, and banking regulation.

The final stage involved qualitative content analysis of the selected literature. Each study was systematically reviewed and coded using a thematic analysis approach. The coding process focused on identifying recurring concepts, regulatory concerns, and governance challenges associated with the adoption of machine learning-based credit risk models. The analysis was structured around three core analytical dimensions: (1) methodological advancements in machine learning-based credit risk modeling, (2) regulatory compliance requirements and supervisory expectations, and (3) challenges related to model transparency, explainability, and risk governance.

By synthesizing findings across these dimensions, the study develops an integrated conceptual understanding of how advanced credit risk modeling techniques interact with regulatory frameworks in the banking sector. This qualitative synthesis provides a structured foundation for discussing the implications of machine learning adoption for regulatory compliance and banking risk management, while also identifying areas for future research and policy development

4. Results

This section presents and discusses the key findings derived from the systematic literature review. Rather than reporting statistical results, the analysis synthesizes recurring themes and conceptual insights related to the impact of machine learning–based credit risk modeling on regulatory compliance in banking. The results are organized around the core analytical dimensions identified in the Method section and are discussed in relation to existing regulatory and academic debates.

4.1. Key Themes Identified from the Literature

The reviewed literature consistently highlights that machine learning–based credit risk modeling influences regulatory compliance through multiple interconnected mechanisms. These mechanisms relate not only to improvements in predictive performance, but also to changes in governance practices, supervisory expectations, and risk management processes.

Table 1. Key Themes in Machine Learning–Based Credit Risk Modeling and Regulatory Compliance

Analytical Dimension	Key Findings from Literature	Regulatory Implications
Predictive accuracy	ML models improve default prediction and risk sensitivity	Potential for more accurate capital assessment
Risk measurement	Enhanced detection of non-linear risk patterns	Improved risk-based supervision
Model transparency	Limited interpretability remains a concern	Increased supervisory scrutiny
Governance & validation	Stronger model risk management required	Higher compliance standards

Analytical Dimension	Key Findings from Literature	Regulatory Implications
Regulatory reporting	Data-driven insights support reporting quality	Alignment with supervisory expectations

The table indicates that while machine learning offers technical advantages, regulatory compliance outcomes depend heavily on governance and validation frameworks rather than predictive performance alone.

4.2. Machine Learning and Regulatory Compliance Outcomes

The literature suggests that improved predictive accuracy associated with machine learning–based models can support regulatory compliance by enhancing the quality of risk measurement and internal reporting. More accurate estimates of credit risk exposure may enable banks to allocate capital more efficiently and demonstrate stronger alignment with prudential requirements. From this perspective, machine learning is often framed as a tool that can strengthen compliance outcomes when appropriately integrated into existing risk frameworks.

However, the results also reveal that regulatory compliance is not automatically enhanced by the adoption of advanced models. Several studies emphasize that supervisors remain cautious toward complex algorithms, particularly when model logic cannot be clearly explained or validated. As a result, banks adopting machine learning–based credit risk models may face additional compliance burdens, including more stringent documentation, validation, and governance requirements. This finding highlights a trade-off between innovation and regulatory conservatism that characterizes the current regulatory environment.

4.3. Governance, Explainability, and Supervisory Acceptance

A central theme emerging from the literature concerns the role of model governance and explainability in determining supervisory acceptance. The reviewed studies consistently identify explainability as a critical condition for regulatory approval of machine learning–based models. Without sufficient transparency, advanced models may be viewed as sources of model risk rather than compliance-enhancing tools.

Table 2 presents a conceptual comparison between traditional credit risk models and machine learning–based models from a regulatory perspective.

Table 2. Conceptual Comparison of Credit Risk Models under Regulatory Considerations

Aspect	Traditional Models	Machine Learning–Based Models
Interpretability	High	Often limited
Predictive flexibility	Limited	High
Regulatory familiarity	Strong	Emerging
Governance requirements	Standardized	More complex
Supervisory acceptance	Well-established	Conditional

The comparison illustrates that machine learning models introduce both opportunities and challenges for regulatory compliance. While their analytical capabilities exceed those of traditional models, their acceptance depends on the ability of banks to demonstrate robust governance, validation, and explainability

5. Discussion

The findings suggest that the relationship between machine learning–based credit risk modeling and regulatory compliance is inherently conditional. Machine learning can enhance compliance outcomes when embedded within strong governance structures that address transparency, accountability, and supervisory expectations. Conversely, weak governance frameworks may transform advanced models into sources of regulatory risk.

This discussion aligns with broader debates in banking regulation concerning the balance between innovation and prudential stability. Regulators appear willing to accommodate advanced analytics, provided that banks can ensure that technological complexity does not undermine risk control and supervisory oversight. Accordingly, the results support a conceptual view in which machine learning serves as a complementary, rather than substitutive, component of regulatory-compliant credit risk management..

6. Conclusion

This study conceptually examines the impact of machine learning–based credit risk modeling on regulatory compliance in the banking sector through a systematic review and qualitative synthesis of recent literature. The analysis highlights that machine learning techniques offer significant potential to enhance the accuracy and responsiveness of credit risk assessment, thereby supporting more effective risk measurement and regulatory reporting. These capabilities are

increasingly relevant in a banking environment characterized by digitalization, data intensity, and heightened supervisory expectations.

However, the findings also indicate that the contribution of machine learning to regulatory compliance is not automatic. While advanced models may improve predictive performance, their regulatory acceptance depends critically on governance structures, transparency, and explainability. Supervisory authorities continue to emphasize the importance of model validation, documentation, and accountability, particularly for models used in regulatory capital assessment and supervisory review processes. As a result, machine learning–based credit risk models must be embedded within robust model risk management frameworks to ensure alignment with prudential objectives.

The study further underscores that regulatory compliance outcomes are shaped by the balance between innovation and regulatory conservatism. Machine learning should be viewed as a complementary tool that enhances, rather than replaces, traditional credit risk management practices. When supported by strong governance and clear regulatory guidance, advanced analytics can contribute to more resilient and forward-looking banking risk frameworks.

This research contributes to the literature by providing an integrated conceptual perspective on the interaction between machine learning–based credit risk modeling and regulatory compliance. It offers insights for banking practitioners and regulators seeking to harness technological innovation while maintaining prudential soundness. Future research may extend this conceptual analysis by empirically examining regulatory outcomes across different banking systems or by

exploring supervisory approaches to explainable artificial intelligence in credit risk management.

References

- Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. (2021). Principles for the management of credit risk. Bank for International Settlements. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://www.bis.org>
- Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. (2022). Principles on model risk management. Bank for International Settlements. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://www.bis.org>
- Bank for International Settlements. (2020). Sound practices: Implications of fintech developments for banks and bank supervisors. Bank for International Settlements. Retrieved October 15, 2024, from <https://www.bis.org>
- Bank for International Settlements. (2021). Supervisory challenges associated with the use of artificial intelligence by banks. Bank for International Settlements. Retrieved October 15, 2024, from <https://www.bis.org>
- Bussmann, N., Giudici, P., Marinelli, D., & Papenbrock, J. (2021). Explainable artificial intelligence in credit risk management. *Computational Economics*, 57(1), 203–216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-020-10042-0>
- Carmona, J., Climent, F., & Momparler, A. (2021). Credit risk modeling and machine learning: A systematic review. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 14(10), 475. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm14100475>

- European Central Bank. (2021). Guide on model risk management. ECB Banking Supervision. Retrieved November 10, 2024, from <https://www.bankingsupervision.europa.eu>
- European Central Bank. (2022). Supervisory expectations on the use of machine learning in internal models. ECB Banking Supervision. Retrieved November 10, 2024, from <https://www.bankingsupervision.europa.eu>
- Fuster, A., Goldsmith-Pinkham, P., Ramadorai, T., & Walther, A. (2022). Predictably unequal? The effects of machine learning on credit markets. *The Journal of Finance*, 77(1), 5–47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.13090>
- García, V., Marqués, A. I., & Sánchez, J. S. (2020). Improving risk predictions by preprocessing imbalanced credit data. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 31(8), 2773–2786. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNNLS.2019.2934996>
- Heaton, J. B., Polson, N. G., & Witte, J. H. (2020). Deep learning in finance. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 36(1), 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asmb.2488>
- Kou, G., Ergu, D., Chen, Y., & Lin, C. (2021). Pairwise comparison matrix in multiple criteria decision making. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 27(4), 853–877. <https://doi.org/10.3846/tede.2021.14728>
- Lessmann, S., Baesens, B., Seow, H.-V., & Thomas, L. C. (2021). Benchmarking state-of-the-art classification algorithms for credit scoring. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 286(3), 1249–1266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2020.05.030>

- McKinsey Global Institute. (2021). Risk, resilience, and rebalancing in banking. McKinsey & Company. Retrieved December 1, 2024, from <https://www.mckinsey.com>
- Molnar, C. (2022). Interpretable machine learning (2nd ed.). Leanpub. <https://christophm.github.io/interpretable-ml-book/>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). Artificial intelligence, machine learning and big data in finance. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/7c4f1f85-en>
- Petropoulos, A., Siakoulis, V., Stavroulakis, E., & Vlachogiannakis, N. (2020). Predicting bank distress with machine learning techniques. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 36(3), 1092–1111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2019.11.005>
- Rudin, C., Chen, C., Chen, Z., Huang, H., Semenova, L., & Zhong, C. (2022). Interpretable machine learning: Fundamental principles and challenges. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 110(8), 1150–1169. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2022.3148829>
- S&P Global Market Intelligence. (2021). Model risk management in banks. S&P Global. Retrieved December 1, 2024, from <https://www.spglobal.com>
- Serrano-Cinca, C., Gutiérrez-Nieto, B., & López-Palacios, L. (2020). Determinants of default in P2P lending. *Decision Support Systems*, 133, 113321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2020.113321>
- Sun, J., Li, H., Huang, Q. H., & He, K. Y. (2020). Predicting financial distress and corporate failure: A review of state-of-the-art definitions, modeling, sampling,

- and featuring approaches. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 57, 41–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2013.12.006>
- Thompson, S., & King, T. (2021). Model risk management under Basel frameworks. *Journal of Banking Regulation*, 22(3), 220–236.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41261-021-00148-9>
- World Bank. (2022). Global financial development report: Finance for an equitable recovery. World Bank Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1768-7>
- World Economic Forum. (2020). The global risks report 2020. World Economic Forum. Retrieved October 20, 2024, from <https://www.weforum.org>
- Zhang, D., Louzada, F., Zhou, Z., & Tovar, E. (2021). Credit scoring using machine learning: A survey. *IEEE Access*, 9, 124681–124701.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3114374>
- Zhang, Y., & Härdle, W. K. (2021). Machine learning for financial risk management. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 14(8), 370.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm14080370>
- Zhou, L., Chen, K., & Wang, H. (2022). Machine learning–based credit risk assessment: Regulatory challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance*, 30(4), 475–492. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFRC-09-2021-0071>
- Zopounidis, C., Galariotis, E., Doumpos, M., Sarri, S., & Andriosopoulos, K. (2020). Multiple criteria decision aiding for finance. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 282(2), 397–410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2019.08.039>