



The Deposit Mortality Index™

Methodology Overview, version 1.3 (calibrated and frozen) | Prismm Research | October 2026

The Deposit Mortality Index was created by Martha Sylla Underwood.

About this document. This overview describes what the Deposit Mortality Index measures, how the estimate is architected, and how the index is governed. It is written for executives, boards, and press. The complete technical specification, including exact regulatory field codes, component scoring formulas, the full assumptions register with direction-of-error analysis, and sensitivity runs, is published in full at getprismm.com/dmi, together with the Methodology Change Policy, the change log, and the v1.3 restatement note. Questions and input reviews: support@getprismm.com.

1. What the index measures

The DMI scores one specific, measurable exposure: deposits leaving a financial institution because account holders pass away and their heirs move the money. Scores run 0 to 100 in four tiers: Moderate (below 40), Elevated (40 to 54), High (55 to 69), and Severe (70 and above). Every federally insured US bank and credit union is scored on one scale, 8,365 institutions in the October 2026 national scoring, so scores are directly comparable across institutions, across charter types, and over time; a small number of institutions below data-coverage thresholds are classed unscored rather than estimated. Every input comes from public regulatory data; no institution submits anything. The DMI is a research estimate, not a rating of safety or soundness.

2. How the estimate is built

Account-holder age is not reported in any public filing, so the index estimates it in five steps. First, locate the deposits by geography, using branch-level deposit filings (FDIC Summary of Deposits for banks; NCUA branch records for credit unions). Second, age the footprint with Census county demographics, producing a deposit-weighted age profile. Third, convert the population profile into a dollar profile using Federal Reserve Survey of Consumer Finances figures on deposit holdings by age, because older account holders hold disproportionately larger balances; as of version 1.3 this step uses verified published SCF values, and the correction from the approximate values used through version 1.2 is a Class 2 restatement under the index's Methodology Change Policy, disclosed in a published restatement note with its full effect quantified. Fourth, apply Social Security Administration period life tables to estimate the share of dollars held by account holders statistically expected to pass away within ten years. Fifth, net the gross figure for

observed behavior: a portion of balances remains with a surviving spouse, and roughly 70 percent of balances that pass to heirs leave the institution, per published Cerulli Associates research, a parameter set conservatively against observed behavior and published with a scenario range. The result is a net ten-year runoff rate and an estimated at-risk dollar figure, scaled to the consumer share of each institution's deposits.

3. The four components and their weights

The composite is a weighted average of four components. C1, actuarial exposure (50 percent), scores the net runoff rate itself against a frozen scale. C2, composition fragility (20 percent), scores the share of balances likeliest to exit fastest at a mortality event: time deposits and uninsured balances. C3, market concentration (15 percent), scores geographic concentration crossed with footprint age, so concentration in aging markets weighs more than concentration in young ones. C4, succession capture (15 percent), scores whether the institution is structurally part of the transfer when an account holder passes, read from public capability markers; it is scored as a deficit, where 100 means the machinery is absent and 0 means it is fully in place, and it is the one component an institution can change by decision. The weights are design judgments, set before calibration and frozen with it: the actuarial component carries half the composite because it is the measured quantity itself, and the three structural components divide the remaining half because they govern how much of the exposure is realized, and how fast. Any re-weighting constitutes a new index version.

4. Calibration and governance

The scoring scale was calibrated on a twelve-institution pilot cohort and the tier thresholds were calibrated once on the full national distribution prior to first publication. Both were then frozen. Data inputs refresh on their natural cycles and institutions are re-scored against the fixed scale, so score changes over time reflect changes in the institution and its footprint, never movement in the yardstick. Every methodology change is classified and disclosed under a published Methodology Change Policy: editorial corrections, input-fidelity corrections requiring a dual-run restatement, and structural generations each carry their own disclosure obligations. The version 1.3 release carries one Class 2 input-fidelity restatement, published with its full effect quantified; institutions that purchased reports on the outgoing specification within the preceding two quarters receive restated figures at no charge. The behavioral parameters, the mortality basis, the scale anchors, and the weights are all frozen under this rule, and every change appears in the public change log.

5. What institution reports add

Institution reports present the score and its components alongside a set of analytics computed from the same pipeline that do not enter the score: national and asset-class rank, peer medians, a one-, five-, and ten-year horizon view of the at-risk dollars,

replacement-spread sensitivity, a growth ledger comparing trailing growth to the scheduled runoff with merger activity flagged from regulatory records, and replacement economics drawing on industry acquisition-cost benchmarks, the one figure family in the reports not derived from regulatory data, and labeled as such.

6. Honest limits

The index is built on public proxies and says so. Branch geography stands in for depositor residence, and the coverage of that proxy is disclosed per institution, with low-coverage institutions flagged or left unscored rather than estimated. At-risk dollars are scaled to the consumer share of deposits, an upper bound at commercial-heavy institutions. Account domicile can lag holder residence. Each limit is disclosed where it applies, and every proxy can be replaced: one anonymized count of account holders by age band, no names and no account numbers, produces a Verified score computed on the institution's actual base. Scored institutions may review the inputs applied to them, or provide corrected data, at no charge.

Access to the full specification

The complete Methodology v1.3, including exact field codes, component formulas, the assumptions register, sensitivity ranges, the Methodology Change Policy, the restatement note, and the change log, is published at getprismm.com/dmi. Scored institutions, industry analysts, academic researchers, and press with questions: support@getprismm.com.

Deposit Mortality Index, DMI, and DMI Verified are trademarks of Wunderwood Corporation d/b/a Prismm. © 2026 Wunderwood Corporation d/b/a Prismm. All rights reserved. The DMI is a research estimate derived from public data and disclosed assumptions; it is not a credit rating, examination rating, or assessment of safety and soundness.