

General Criteria:

Criteria For Assigning 'CCC+', 'CCC', 'CCC-', And 'CC' Ratings

October 1, 2012

(Editor's Note: On Jan. 17, 2023, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes related to the archival of the associated guidance. See the "Revisions And Updates" section for details.)

1. This paragraph has been deleted.

SUMMARY OF THE CRITERIA

2. The article presents our criteria for assigning 'CCC+', 'CCC', 'CCC-', and 'CC' ratings. We associate each rating level with a distinct scenario or set of scenarios. The criteria supersede the article "How Standard & Poor's Uses Its 'CCC' Rating," published Dec. 12, 2008.

SCOPE OF THE CRITERIA

3. This methodology applies to issuer credit ratings and issue ratings. However, corporate and government issue ratings may be notched up or down from the issuer credit rating based on post-default recovery considerations, or relative position in the event of bankruptcy, and such notching adjustments are outside the scope of this criteria. Please refer to the following criteria: "Hybrid Capital: Methodology And Assumptions," published March 2, 2022, "Recovery Rating Criteria For Speculative-Grade Corporate Issuers," published Dec. 7, 2016, and "Reflecting Subordination Risk In Corporate Issue Ratings," published March 28, 2018.
4. This paragraph has been deleted.
5. This paragraph has been deleted.

METHODOLOGY

6. The criteria are designed to provide clarity for assigning 'CCC+', 'CCC', 'CCC-', and 'CC' ratings. In order to provide additional clarity for assigning these ratings, we associate each rating level with a distinct scenario or set of scenarios (see "S&P Global Ratings Definitions"). These criteria have priority over other sector specific criteria when assigning these ratings to issues and issuers.

ANALYTICAL CONTACTS

Chiza B Vitta

Dallas
+ 1 (214) 765 5864
chiza.vitta
@spglobal.com

Luciano D Gremone

Buenos Aires
(54) 114-891-2143
luciano.gremone
@spglobal.com

METHODOLOGY CONTACTS

Takamasa Yamaoka

Tokyo
(81) 3-4550-8719
takamasa.yamaoka
@spglobal.com

Peter Kernan

London
(44) 20-7176-3618
peter.kernan
@spglobal.com

Lapo Guadagnuolo

London
+ 44 20 7176 3507
lapo.guadagnuolo
@spglobal.com

Andrew M Bowyer, CFA

London
+ 44 20 7176 3761
andrew.bowyer
@spglobal.com

Criteria For 'CCC' Category Ratings

7. S&P Global Ratings defines the 'CCC' issue credit rating as follows: "An obligation rated 'CCC' is currently vulnerable to nonpayment, and is dependent upon favorable business, financial, and economic conditions for the obligor to meet its financial commitment on the obligation. In the event of adverse business, financial, or economic conditions, the obligor is not likely to have the capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation."
8. As a general rule, issuers and issues that face at least a one-in-two likelihood of default will be rated in the 'CCC' category. The 'CCC' category may also be appropriate--even at a lower likelihood of default threshold of approximately one-in-three--if we expect a default within the next 12 months.

Criteria For 'CC' Category Ratings

9. S&P Global Ratings defines the 'CC' issue credit rating as follows: "An obligation rated 'CC' is currently highly vulnerable to nonpayment."
10. We rate an issuer or issue 'CC' when we expect default to be a virtual certainty, regardless of the time to default. We use the 'CC' rating when, for example:
 - An entity has announced that it will miss its next interest or principal payment, but is still current on these payments.
 - An entity has announced its intention to file a bankruptcy petition or take similar action and payments on an obligation are jeopardized, but the entity has not yet entered into receivership protection.
 - An entity has announced its intention to undertake an exchange offer or similar restructuring that we classify as distressed, but has not yet completed the transaction.
 - We expect the default of an issue to be a virtual certainty based on either: the specific default scenarios that are envisioned over the next 12 months, or the expectation of default even under the most optimistic collateral performance scenario over a longer period of time.
11. In addition, we assign a 'cc' SACP (stand-alone credit profile) to an issuer when we expect default to be a virtual certainty, unless it receives extraordinary support from a parent or government.

Primary Differentiating Factor--Likelihood Of Default

12. In our view, likelihood of default is the centerpiece of creditworthiness. That means likelihood of default--encompassing both capacity and willingness to pay--is the single most important factor in our assessment of the creditworthiness of an issuer or an obligation. Therefore, consistent with our goal of achieving a rank ordering of creditworthiness, higher ratings on issuers and obligations reflect our expectation that the rated issuer or obligation should default less frequently than issuers and obligations with lower ratings, all other things being equal.
13. More specifically, the degree of financial stress on the issuer or issue and the time frame for anticipated default are primary factors in our assessment of the likelihood of default for issuers and issues rated in the 'CCC' and 'CC' categories.
14. For corporate and government issuers, the time frame to anticipated default is generally the dominant factor when assigning a plus (+) or minus (-) sign modifier to show relative standing

General Criteria: Criteria For Assigning 'CCC+', 'CCC', 'CCC-', And 'CC' Ratings

within the 'CCC' rating category. This is because, as a corporate and government issuer approaches an anticipated default date the likelihood of a favorable change in business, financial, or economic conditions that would be sufficient to avoid a default generally declines and the level of certainty that the issuer will default generally increases. In order to provide greater clarity about the usage of ratings ranging from 'CCC+' to 'CCC-' (and from 'ccc+' to 'ccc-' SACP's for issuers, unless they receive extraordinary support from a parent or government), the following are scenarios that would generally be associated with each rating level:

- 'CCC+': The issuer is currently vulnerable and is dependent upon favorable business, financial, and economic conditions to meet its financial commitments. The issuer's financial commitments appear to be unsustainable in the long term, although the issuer may not face a near term (within 12 months) credit or payment crisis.
- 'CCC': It is likely that the issuer will default without an unforeseen positive development. In contrast to the 'CCC+' rating, specific default scenarios are envisioned over the next 12 months. These scenarios include, but are not limited to, a near-term liquidity crisis, violation of financial covenants, or an issuer is likely to consider a distressed exchange offer or redemption in the next 12 months.
- 'CCC-': A default, distressed exchange, or redemption appears to be inevitable within six months, absent unanticipated significantly favorable changes in the issuer's circumstances.

15. Similarly, for structured finance issues, the 'CCC' category is used if the payment of principal or interest when due is dependent upon favorable business, financial, or economic conditions. The degree of financial stress is generally the dominant factor and the time frame for anticipated default is generally a secondary consideration when assigning a plus (+) or minus (-) sign modifier to the 'CCC' rating. Expected collateral performance and the level of available enhancement (credit and/or cash flow) are generally the primary factors in our assessment of the degree of financial stress and likelihood of default. Time frame for anticipated default is generally a secondary consideration because structured finance issuers are typically special purpose entities, which by definition have limited ability to raise additional capital or pursue strategic alternatives that could improve their business or financial conditions—irrespective of the time horizon.

Frequently Asked Questions

Q1: What scenarios are associated with corporate issuers for 'CCC+' and 'CCC' ratings?

16. A: Corporate issuers rated 'CCC+' typically have a combination of "vulnerable" business risk and a "highly leveraged" financial profile, but a specific default scenario is not yet envisioned. However, in some cases very high leverage could place an issuer with a "weak" business profile in this rating (as our criteria define the terms). The issuer's leverage is "unsustainable". (For example, debt is a very high multiple of EBITDA and a successful refinancing is unlikely, absent financial improvement.)
17. When specific default scenarios are envisioned over the next 12 months, the corporate issuer is rated 'CCC'. (For example: the issuer has breached covenants, unless we have reason to think creditors will waive their remedies or the related facilities are of limited size; the issuer's operating cash is dwindling; or a large maturity or other liquidity crisis for the issuer looms.)

Q2: What are the most common factors that lead to upgrades out of the 'CCC' category for issuers?

18. A: Generally, 'CCC' rated companies often default without a material positive development, such as a change to their capital structure or business model, as the definition of this category suggests. But we have observed that many struggling companies can and do endeavor to make such positive developments materialize. If this occurs, some may subsequently be upgraded to reflect the improved situation--but a good percentage of these slip back into distress and ultimately default. Upgrades out of the 'CCC' category can be due to the following reasons:
- Improved business, financial, or economic conditions;
 - Purchase by a stronger entity;
 - Refinancing;
 - Debt repayment;
 - Waiver and amendment of covenants;
 - Market factors, e.g., higher commodity prices; and
 - Asset sales.
19. This paragraph has been deleted.
20. This paragraph has been deleted.

APPENDIX: CRITERIA APPLICATION TO STRUCTURED FINANCE RATINGS

This appendix provides additional transparency to the market about how we apply the criteria in this article to our ratings analysis and how we exercise analytical judgment as called for in the criteria (hereafter referred to as the "'CCC' criteria").

When rating structured finance issues in the low speculative-grade categories of 'CCC' or below, our analysis recognizes both the increased likelihood and more imminent proximity of a default of the rated issue. Because of that, it can be easier to foresee a specific default scenario and develop transaction-specific default patterns to determine whether a securitization can be rated at a certain level. Our 'CCC' criteria is therefore generally more principles-based so that we can analyze the unique facts and circumstances underlying the increased likelihood of default of an issue and its most probable default pattern.

This appendix also provides concrete examples to illustrate the transaction-specific features that we take into account when assessing the default risk that drives our ratings analysis. We also address the interplay between sector-specific and the 'CCC' criteria, providing additional clarity about the qualitative and quantitative factors we consider when applying the 'CCC' criteria.

Our 'CCC' Criteria And Sector-Specific Structured Finance Criteria

Structured finance sector-specific criteria generally outline the methodology and assumptions for assigning ratings from 'AAA' to 'B'. For ratings lower than 'B', the analysis would be supplemented by the methodology outlined in the 'CCC' criteria.

For most asset classes in structured finance, ratings are typically differentiated based on the level

General Criteria: Criteria For Assigning 'CCC+', 'CCC', 'CCC-', And 'CC' Ratings

of credit enhancement, that is, the issuer's ability to withstand rating-specific stress scenarios without defaulting or the extent to which an issuer may be dependent on favorable conditions to meet its financial commitments. Table 1 shows the rating-specific scenarios we expect a security to be able to withstand. We expect securities rated from 'B' to 'AAA' to withstand scenarios from mild to extreme stress, respectively. 'CCC' and lower rated securities that have not defaulted are assumed to not be able to withstand any stress scenario and in our view would be dependent on favorable conditions in order not to default. These securities have such low creditworthiness that any level of stress is much more likely to lead to further deterioration and ultimately to default than for any other rating category.

Table 1							
Typical Rating-Specific Stress Scenarios							
Rating category	AAA	AA	A	BBB	BB	B	CCC
Stress scenario	Extreme	Severe	Substantial	Moderate	Modest	Mild	Favorable
	<div><div>←</div><div>Assumed collateral performance</div><div>→</div></div> <div><div>Weakening</div><div></div><div>Improving</div></div>						
Copyright © 2017 by Standard & Poor’s Financial Services LLC. All rights reserved.							

Under our ratings definitions, a security would generally be rated 'B-' if we believe the obligor has the capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation under the current conditions. (For our ratings definitions, see "S&P Global Ratings Definitions.") However, to be assigned a rating above 'B-', a security must have sufficient credit enhancement to withstand scenarios that are more stressful than the current conditions.

For example, to achieve a rating of 'B', the securities must be able to withstand a mild level of stress. To achieve a rating of 'B-', the securities must have sufficient credit enhancement to withstand a steady-state scenario where the current level of stress shows little to no increase and collateral performance remains steady (that is, performance does not deteriorate or improve).

When, in our view, the security does not have the capacity to withstand a steady-state scenario where the current level of stress shows little to no increase and collateral performance remains steady (that is, a default is likely to occur if collateral performance does not improve), the rating assigned is typically in the 'CCC' category, in accordance with our 'CCC' criteria. We evaluate existing credit enhancement and prospective cash flows available to service the debt under a steady-state scenario. For instance, when we believe that credit enhancement is not sufficient to prevent a default on the notes in a steady-state scenario, we would rate the issue in the 'CCC' (or below) category, reflecting the existence of conditions outlined in 'CCC' criteria. Ratings in the 'CCC' category may be modified by the addition of a plus (+) or minus (-) sign to show relative ranking.

General Criteria: Criteria For Assigning 'CCC+', 'CCC', 'CCC-', And 'CC' Ratings

For example, our global criteria for residential mortgage-backed securities (RMBS) and our European criteria for commercial mortgage-backed securities (CMBS) outline the methodology and assumptions applied for assigning ratings down to 'B' (referred to as the expected case). To achieve a rating of 'B', the securities must have sufficient credit enhancement to withstand a scenario of mild stress. Our criteria for RMBS across Europe assume that an archetypal pool will endure defaults in a "mild" stress typically varying from a minimum of 0.5% to 4.0%. The differences reflect country-specific considerations of credit risk, which are reflected in our mortgage market assessment. Similarly, these criteria assume that the residential property market will suffer a 15% fixed market value decline (as defined in the RMBS criteria) in a "mild" stress. Our European CMBS criteria on the other hand consider the long-term sustainable value of a commercial property to correspond to the definition of a "mild" or 'B' stress. This long-term sustainable value as defined under our criteria provides a calculated commercial property value that we view as more stable through a property cycle, consistent with a 'B' creditworthiness.

If we conclude after applying these RMBS or CMBS criteria that sufficient credit enhancement does not exist to withstand a mild stress, the rating assigned will be either 'B-' or in the 'CCC' or 'CC' categories.

To make this determination, the 'CCC' criteria are taken into account. According to the 'CCC' criteria, a 'CCC' rating should be assigned if the securities are currently vulnerable to nonpayment and the issuer is dependent upon favorable conditions to meet its financial commitment on such obligation. However, if the securities can withstand a steady-state scenario without favorable conditions, a 'B-' rating can be assigned.

Application Of 'CCC' Criteria For Structured Finance

The degree of financial stress is generally the dominant factor and the time frame for anticipated default is generally a secondary consideration when assigning a plus (+) or minus (-) sign modifier to the 'CCC' rating. Expected collateral performance and the level of available enhancement (credit or cash flow, or both) are the driving risk factors in our assessment of the degree of financial stress and likelihood of default. The time frame for anticipated default is generally a secondary consideration because structured finance issuers are typically special-purpose entities, which by definition have limited ability to raise additional capital or pursue strategic alternatives that could improve their business or financial conditions--irrespective of the time horizon.

Therefore, structured finance securities rated in the 'CCC' category could be expected to continue to pay timely interest and not realize a default for multiple years under a steady-state unstressed scenario, while ultimately being at risk of a principal default at legal final maturity.

The starting point of the analysis is to apply the assumptions, data, and modeling techniques as outlined in the sector-specific criteria to determine if the transaction can withstand a mild level of stress. If the transaction can't, the 'CCC' criteria are applied by making a qualitative assessment of the need to rely on favorable conditions to make timely payments. This assessment is supported by the initial sector-specific analysis, transaction-specific features, and actual data from servicer reports on the driving risk factors and key variables as outlined in table 2. Judgment is used to combine the driving factors and key variables to determine their respective weight. At the lowest rating levels, the securities will be experiencing specific stress characteristics. As this stress manifests itself differently in each situation in how the various credit factors come together, a qualitative assessment is key in the analysis of these credit factors, as outlined in the criteria. It is the transaction-specific analysis of all relevant factors that will help explain their relative importance in each individual situation.

Table 2

Risk Factors And Key Variables In The Application Of The CCC Criteria

Driving risk factors	Key variables
European RMBS	
Collateral performance	Shortfalls (including provisional shortfalls), existing pool losses, cumulative asset default level, delinquency levels
Available credit enhancement	Reserve funds available to cover credit losses; excess spread available to cover credit losses
Market and sector outlook	Structural changes in the mortgage market including underwriting; prevailing macroeconomic conditions and forecasts
Transaction-specific features	Triggers; waterfall features
European CMBS	
Collateral performance	Estimated losses under current market conditions
Available credit enhancement	Credit and liquidity enhancement
Market and sector outlook	Specific risks, for example, natural disasters; macroeconomic conditions; prevailing commercial loan performance
Transaction-specific features	Loan-to-value ratios

CMBS--Commercial mortgage-backed securities.

When reviewing a transaction structure, analytical judgment is used to determine the importance of each of the driving risk factors and key variables listed above, in order to determine their relative weight in the overall creditworthiness of the issue being analyzed. This analysis also considers the individual circumstances of the issue. A predetermined statement of their relative importance (or weighting) cannot be given, because it depends on individual circumstances that will vary over time and across transactions, portfolios, and different market conditions.

Therefore, the driving risk factors and key variables analyzed to assess a transaction typically reflect the specific features of an individual structure, as well as how a portfolio has reacted to an already stressed environment.

The source for the key variables is available performance data (for instance, from transaction-specific servicer reports). No specific modeling techniques are used when analyzing securities under our 'CCC' criteria.

Below, we address a number of real-life examples from our portfolio of rated European RMBS and CMBS. They show how deal-specific data inform the key variables we use for assessing credit risk. They serve to illustrate the analysis of each credit factor, as discussed above, and their relative importance at that point in time in assessing the creditworthiness of an issue, and ultimately, in assigning its rating.

Application Examples For Structured Finance

Disclaimer: The information and analysis presented are as of the date of the rating action or rating analysis that is being shown as an example.

RMBS

1. 'B-' rating affirmed for class B2 notes in Eurohome UK Mortgages 2007-2 PLC. Eurohome UK Mortgages 2007-2 PLC is a U.K. nonconforming RMBS transaction that is backed by first-ranking mortgages originated by DB UK Bank Ltd. The transaction closed in August 2007.

On April 6, 2017, we affirmed our 'B-' rating on the class B2 notes because payment of principal and interest on the notes is not dependent upon favorable business, financial, or economic conditions. These notes are the most junior class in the structure and our ratings on this class of notes address timely receipt of interest and ultimate repayment of principal.

We applied our then-applicable European residential loans criteria (see "Methodology And Assumptions: Assessing Pools Of European Residential Loans," published on Dec. 23, 2016) including our credit and cash flow analysis. The weighted-average foreclosure frequency and weighted-average loss severity at 'B' was 19.63% and 13.60%, respectively, resulting in an expected loss of 2.67%. This expected loss of 2.67% does not include the negative carry resulting from interest due on the notes during the foreclosure period, which we accounted for in our cash flow analysis. In our cash flow analysis, the class B2 notes did not pass our 'B' rating level cash flow stresses in a number of our cash flow scenarios, in particular when we modelled high prepayment stresses of 30% and a recession at the end of year three.

Therefore, we used the 'CCC' criteria to assess if either a rating of 'B-' or in the 'CCC' category would be appropriate. The 'CCC' criteria specify the need to assess whether there is reliance on favorable conditions to continue in an unstressed scenario.

Credit enhancement for this class of notes was 3.81% and was trending upward, which compares favorably to our expected loss of 2.67%. The reserve fund was fully funded and the transaction had a fully funded liquidity facility provided by Deutsche Bank AG that provides support to pay interest on the notes. In addition, all losses were covered by excess spread in the transaction. Annualized excess spread was 1.68%. Total delinquencies in the transaction were below 20% and had fallen steadily since 2012 when total delinquencies were over 30%. At the time of our review, quarterly prepayments were 6.34%, so below our modelled level of 30%. Therefore, the transaction had so far experienced less negative carry due to prepayments than assumed by our cash flow analysis.

Our outlook for the U.K. residential mortgage market was benign, with historically low unemployment at 4.6%, low mortgage interest rates, and falling delinquencies across the sector.

Taking these factors into account, reflected in improving collateral and transaction performance, we considered that payment of principal and interest on the class B2 notes was not dependent upon favorable business, financial, or economic conditions. Therefore, we affirmed our 'B-' rating on the class B2 notes.

2. 'CCC' rating for class 'B' notes in Bancaja 10, Fondo de Titulizacion de Activos. Bancaja 10, Fondo de Titulizacion de Activos is a Spanish RMBS transaction that closed in January 2007. The originator of the loans was Bancaja (now Bankia). The assets are first-ranking mortgages over residential properties in Spain.

On Dec. 1, 2015, we lowered our rating on the class B notes to 'CCC' from 'B-' because we considered this class of notes to be currently vulnerable and dependent upon favorable business, financial, and economic conditions to pay timely interest and ultimate principal.

The transaction was structured with a mechanism where interest can defer on any class of notes

General Criteria: Criteria For Assigning 'CCC+', 'CCC', 'CCC-', And 'CC' Ratings

junior to the class A notes based on class level-defined cumulative default triggers.

As the rating was already 'B-', the 'CCC' criteria were applied to determine whether there was reliance on favorable conditions to continue in an unstressed scenario.

In October 2015, the level of cumulative defaults was 9.76% and the interest deferral trigger for the class B notes was 10.9%.

Credit enhancement for the class B notes was 5.37% and had continued to increase. In addition, total delinquencies were below 5% and also below the Spanish RMBS index (about 8%). However, severe delinquencies continued to roll into default (based on the 18-month definition of default under the transaction documentation).

Based on the evolution of cumulative defaults in the transaction, it was our expectation that they would increase to above the 10.9% trigger level within 12 months, which would cause interest to be deferred on the class B notes. Although economic conditions suggested that the Spanish economy was improving, with falling unemployment and increasing GDP, the structural features and the transaction's performance trends were key factors in the rating decision.

The stabilization of cumulative defaults in the transaction necessary to prevent a trigger-based deferral on class B note interest depended on favorable business, financial, and economic conditions for severely delinquent borrowers not to roll into default. At the point where defaults increased to above 10.9%, the issuer would not be able to meet its financial obligations to pay the class B note interest. Therefore, in this instance, a 'CCC' rating was assigned.

CMBS

DECO 11 - UK Conduit 3 PLC. On April 22, 2016, we assigned ratings of 'CCC+', 'CCC', 'CCC-', and 'CCC-' to Deco 11 – Conduit 3 PLC's class A-2, B, C, and D notes, respectively.

A qualitative assessment of key variables, together with analysis of performance and market data, was performed.

We considered repayment of these classes to be dependent upon favorable business, financial, and economic conditions, and vulnerable to default. In particular, we considered the January 2016 servicer report that disclosed securitized loan-to-value (LTV) ratios of over 100% for each of the four loans remaining in the transaction based on current market valuations. Based on these valuations, we projected losses of principal for the class A2 to D notes. (The class E and F notes were already rated 'D' due to previous non-accruing interest amounts and interest shortfalls.)

The ratings on the class A2, B, C, and D notes were subsequently further lowered seven months later in November 2016 to 'CCC-', 'CCC-', 'D', and 'D', respectively. This reflected changes in current market conditions following the receipt of an issuer special notice regarding an updated valuation and a payment default on the Class C and D notes.

NEMUS II (Arden) PLC. On April 29, 2016, we assigned a rating of 'CCC-' to NEMUS II (Arden) PLC's class E and F notes. We considered the repayment of these two classes to be dependent upon favorable business, financial, and economic conditions, and vulnerable to default.

In particular, we considered the reported securitized LTV ratios of the remaining loans based on current valuations. One of LTV ratios was above 100%. Therefore, based on this current market valuation, we projected losses of principal to the class E and F notes. Both classes were subsequently lowered to 'D' on March 15, 2017, following a payment default.

REVISIONS AND UPDATES

This article was originally published on Oct. 1, 2012. The criteria became effective as of the publishing date.

Changes introduced after original publication:

- On Sept. 3, 2015, we updated the contact information and criteria references for superseded criteria and deleted paragraphs 4 ("Impact On Outstanding Ratings") and 5 ("Effective Date And Transition"). Additionally, we made minor edits to improve readability.
- Following our periodic review completed on Sept. 2, 2016, we updated the contact information and deleted outdated information.
- On March 14, 2017, we updated references to related criteria. We also deleted text no longer relevant to these criteria.
- Following our periodic review completed on Sept. 1, 2017, we updated criteria references and added the "Revisions And Updates" section. Given that "Group Rating Methodology," published Nov. 19, 2013, now explains the general notching for bank holding companies and therefore supersedes paragraph 20, we deleted paragraph 20 and made corresponding refinements in paragraph 19.
- On Oct. 16, 2018, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes. We made editorial changes, including updating the contact information and criteria references.
- On July 1, 2019, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes. Specifically, we deleted paragraph 19 of the FAQ section, whose content is covered in full by "Group Rating Methodology," published on July 1, 2019.
- On Oct. 16, 2019, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes. Specifically, we updated criteria references in paragraph 3 and "Related Criteria."
- On Oct. 9, 2020, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes. Specifically, we updated article references in paragraphs 6 and 10 as well as in "Related Criteria."
- On Oct. 19, 2022, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes. Specifically, we updated the contact information, article references in paragraph 3, and "Related Publications."
- On Jan. 17, 2023, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes related to the archival of the associated guidance, adding a new appendix. As announced in "Evolution Of The Methodologies Framework: Introducing Sector And Industry Variables Reports," published Oct. 1, 2021, we are phasing out guidance documents over time. As part of that process, we archived "Guidance: Criteria For Assigning 'CCC+', 'CCC', 'CCC-', And 'CC' Ratings," published Jan. 18, 2018. We moved the guidance content to the appendix of these criteria without any substantive changes. In addition, we updated the contact information and the "Related Publications" section of this article.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Related Criteria

- Hybrid Capital: Methodology And Assumptions, March 2, 2022
- Reflecting Subordination Risk In Corporate Issue Ratings, March 28, 2018
- Recovery Rating Criteria For Speculative-Grade Corporate Issuers, Dec. 7, 2016
- Methodology: Jurisdiction Ranking Assessments, Jan. 20, 2016
- Principles Of Credit Ratings, Feb. 16, 2011

Related Guidance

- ARCHIVE: Guidance: Criteria For Assigning 'CCC+', 'CCC', 'CCC-', And 'CC' Ratings, Jan. 18, 2018

Other Related Publications

- S&P Global Ratings Definitions, updated from time to time
- Evolution Of The Methodologies Framework: Introducing Sector And Industry Variables Reports, Oct. 1, 2021

This article is a Criteria article. Criteria are the published analytic framework for determining Credit Ratings. Criteria include fundamental factors, analytical principles, methodologies, and /or key assumptions that we use in the ratings process to produce our Credit Ratings. Criteria, like our Credit Ratings, are forward-looking in nature. Criteria are intended to help users of our Credit Ratings understand how S&P Global Ratings analysts generally approach the analysis of Issuers or Issues in a given sector. Criteria include those material methodological elements identified by S&P Global Ratings as being relevant to credit analysis. However, S&P Global Ratings recognizes that there are many unique factors / facts and circumstances that may potentially apply to the analysis of a given Issuer or Issue. Accordingly, S&P Global Ratings Criteria is not designed to provide an exhaustive list of all factors applied in our rating analyses. Analysts exercise analytic judgement in the application of Criteria through the Rating Committee process to arrive at rating determinations.

This report does not constitute a rating action.

General Criteria: Criteria For Assigning 'CCC+', 'CCC', 'CCC-', And 'CC' Ratings

Copyright © 2023 by Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC. All rights reserved.

No content (including ratings, credit-related analyses and data, valuations, model, software or other application or output therefrom) or any part thereof (Content) may be modified, reverse engineered, reproduced or distributed in any form by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC or its affiliates (collectively, S&P). The Content shall not be used for any unlawful or unauthorized purposes. S&P and any third-party providers, as well as their directors, officers, shareholders, employees or agents (collectively S&P Parties) do not guarantee the accuracy, completeness, timeliness or availability of the Content. S&P Parties are not responsible for any errors or omissions (negligent or otherwise), regardless of the cause, for the results obtained from the use of the Content, or for the security or maintenance of any data input by the user. The Content is provided on an "as is" basis. S&P PARTIES DISCLAIM ANY AND ALL EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ANY WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE OR USE, FREEDOM FROM BUGS, SOFTWARE ERRORS OR DEFECTS, THAT THE CONTENT'S FUNCTIONING WILL BE UNINTERRUPTED OR THAT THE CONTENT WILL OPERATE WITH ANY SOFTWARE OR HARDWARE CONFIGURATION. In no event shall S&P Parties be liable to any party for any direct, indirect, incidental, exemplary, compensatory, punitive, special or consequential damages, costs, expenses, legal fees, or losses (including, without limitation, lost income or lost profits and opportunity costs or losses caused by negligence) in connection with any use of the Content even if advised of the possibility of such damages.

Credit-related and other analyses, including ratings, and statements in the Content are statements of opinion as of the date they are expressed and not statements of fact. S&P's opinions, analyses and rating acknowledgment decisions (described below) are not recommendations to purchase, hold, or sell any securities or to make any investment decisions, and do not address the suitability of any security. S&P assumes no obligation to update the Content following publication in any form or format. The Content should not be relied on and is not a substitute for the skill, judgment and experience of the user, its management, employees, advisors and/or clients when making investment and other business decisions. S&P does not act as a fiduciary or an investment advisor except where registered as such. While S&P has obtained information from sources it believes to be reliable, S&P does not perform an audit and undertakes no duty of due diligence or independent verification of any information it receives. Rating-related publications may be published for a variety of reasons that are not necessarily dependent on action by rating committees, including, but not limited to, the publication of a periodic update on a credit rating and related analyses.

To the extent that regulatory authorities allow a rating agency to acknowledge in one jurisdiction a rating issued in another jurisdiction for certain regulatory purposes, S&P reserves the right to assign, withdraw or suspend such acknowledgment at any time and in its sole discretion. S&P Parties disclaim any duty whatsoever arising out of the assignment, withdrawal or suspension of an acknowledgment as well as any liability for any damage alleged to have been suffered on account thereof.

S&P keeps certain activities of its business units separate from each other in order to preserve the independence and objectivity of their respective activities. As a result, certain business units of S&P may have information that is not available to other S&P business units. S&P has established policies and procedures to maintain the confidentiality of certain non-public information received in connection with each analytical process.

S&P may receive compensation for its ratings and certain analyses, normally from issuers or underwriters of securities or from obligors. S&P reserves the right to disseminate its opinions and analyses. S&P's public ratings and analyses are made available on its Web sites, www.standardandpoors.com (free of charge), and www.ratingsdirect.com (subscription), and may be distributed through other means, including via S&P publications and third-party redistributors. Additional information about our ratings fees is available at www.standardandpoors.com/usratingsfees.

STANDARD & POOR'S, S&P and RATINGSDIRECT are registered trademarks of Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC.