

# RatingsDirect®

---

## RFC Process Summary:

# Fund Credit Quality Ratings Methodology And Fund Volatility Ratings Methodology

### **Analytical contacts:**

Wendy T Immerman, San Francisco (1) 212-438-5052; [wendy.immerman@spglobal.com](mailto:wendy.immerman@spglobal.com)

Francoise Nichols, Paris (33) 1-4420-7345; [francoise.nichols@spglobal.com](mailto:francoise.nichols@spglobal.com)

Peter G Gargiulo, New York (1) 212-438-5423; [peter.gargiulo@spglobal.com](mailto:peter.gargiulo@spglobal.com)

Joseph Giarratano, New York (212) 438-8942; [joseph.giarratano@spglobal.com](mailto:joseph.giarratano@spglobal.com)

Peter L Rizzo, New York (1) 212-438-5059; [peter.rizzo@spglobal.com](mailto:peter.rizzo@spglobal.com)

### **Criteria contacts:**

Nik Khakee, New York (1) 212-438-2473; [nik.khakee@spglobal.com](mailto:nik.khakee@spglobal.com)

Mark Puccia, New York (1) 212-438-7233; [mark.puccia@spglobal.com](mailto:mark.puccia@spglobal.com)

## Table Of Contents

---

Feedback Summary

Points Of Clarification

Related Criteria

## RFC Process Summary:

# Fund Credit Quality Ratings Methodology And Fund Volatility Ratings Methodology

On Sept. 26, 2016, S&P Global Ratings published its request for comments (RFCs) on our proposed fund credit quality (FCQR) and fund volatility (FVR) ratings methodologies. In the RFCs, we encouraged interested market participants to submit their written comments to us.

We'd like to thank the market participants who provided feedback. After careful consideration, we finalized and published the final criteria articles, "Fund Credit Quality Ratings Methodology" and "Fund Volatility Ratings Methodology," on June 26, 2017. This RFC Process Summary provides an overview of the changes, if any, between the RFCs and the final criteria, and the rationale behind those changes.

## Feedback Summary

Because the FCQR and FVR RFCs share similarities and are tangentially related rating products, we believe it is beneficial to provide a singular RFC Process Summary rather than separate ones. Our RFCs included several specific questions on which we asked for feedback:

- Do you have alternative views on the proposed updates to the criteria, and if so, why? In particular, do you have views on the application and effect of the rating sensitivity tests?
- In your opinion, do the proposed criteria contain any significant redundancies or omissions? Are any factors significantly over- or underweighted, and if so, why? For example, do you have alternatives to how we have differentiated the treatment of hedging and speculative credit derivatives?
- Do you have alternate views on how we capture repo and reverse repo activity?
- Do you have alternate views on the composition and content of our management assessment?
- Do you have alternate views on the composition and content of our portfolio risk assessment?
- Do you have alternative views on the updates to the statistical analysis of fund return volatility?
- Do you believe we are appropriately capturing portfolio risk and agree with the indicators we propose to assess this risk? If not, what alternatives would you propose?
- Do you believe we are appropriately capturing management risk? Do you agree with the components and categories we propose to assess this risk? If not, what alternatives would you propose?

Respondents addressed these and other issues, with the bulk of the feedback centered on the following areas:

- The factors developed may be too punitive (both for rated and unrated assets)
- Clarity on the comparable rating analysis portion of the FCQR RFC and potential for portfolio ratings fluctuations more broadly
- Alignment of principal stability fund ratings (PSFR) criteria and the FCQR criteria
- The qualitative elements of the RFCs seemingly favored large fund sponsors over smaller

There were minimal comments directed toward the FVR RFC, and minimal changes were made outside of the management assessment, described below in "Refinement of scoring of Management Assessment categories for FCQR

and FVR."

## Points Of Clarification

### Factors

**Changes adopted or considered.** Feedback suggested that the fund credit quality asset factors proposed in the FCQR RFC were overly conservative, inasmuch as changes in bank and other criteria resulted in the underlying ratings on fund asset holdings to have already been adjusted downward. We also received comments on how pricing of securities and differently rated securities did not match the factor distinctions. After carefully considering these comments, we determined no change would be made based on this feedback. The development of the updated factors was informed by our studies of historical defaults and include the data from the period between 2007-2015.

### Alignment with principal stability fund ratings credit quality criteria

**Changes adopted or considered.** Feedback received indicated there was a misalignment between S&P Global Ratings' approach to credit quality between the published PSFR criteria and the proposed criteria for FCQR. As the short-term categories and cutoffs were proposed in the FCQR RFC, it was possible that a fund, just on the basis of maturity and credit quality of assets (irrespective of other factors), could qualify for a 'AAAm' PSFR but would only qualify for a 'AAf' FCQR. The market saw this as a misalignment on how fund ratings across fixed income mutual funds are viewed.

We also received comments stating that 'AAAf' and 'AAAm' rated funds often invest in assets with short-term ratings of 'A-1', which maps to long-term ratings of 'A+' or 'A'. Some asset managers also noted that the FCQR RFC insufficiently recognized the differences in the likelihood of asset default as maturity shortens, and that the asset factors proposed for extremely short-term paper did not recognize the lower likelihood of default of assets at maturities even shorter than three months.

Commenters further expressed concern that our proposed thresholds were based upon two instead of four ratings levels, which, when considered with the comments above, increased the disparity in approaches, particularly as a 'AAAm' rated fund cannot only invest in 'A-1+' ('AAA', 'AA+', 'AA', 'AA-'), but also 'A-1' ('A+', 'A') rated assets.

We agreed with commenters that the disparity between the RFC proposal and the PSFR criteria had become more distinct, which was not our intent. As a result, we introduced further gradation into the maturity buckets by breaking down the less than or equal to 90 day maturities into two buckets: less than or equal to 31 days, and greater than 31 and less than or equal to 92 days. At the same time, we revised the fund rating thresholds applied to the rating categories and refined the definition of maturity buckets to meet market convention.

**Rationale.** The greater granularity in maturity buckets was an approach we considered early in our criteria development but decided the market would deem a fourth asset maturity bucket burdensome and unnecessarily complex. The feedback indicated otherwise.

In the RFC, the rating thresholds for each category were based on an assumed mix of assets. The threshold represented 60% of the higher one-year rating factor and 40% of the lower rating factor. For example, the 'AAA' factor is 10 and the 'AA+' factor is 25. The 'AAAf' rating threshold was proposed as  $(10 \times 0.6) + (25 \times 0.4)$ , which equals 16. After carefully considering the feedback received, we revised the fund rating thresholds based on an asset breakdown of 60% of the current category, and 25%/10%/5% of the next three rating notches lower.

Comments received also prompted us to look at more portfolios where we observed 'AAAF' rated asset portfolios distributed across four long-term ratings ('AAA' to 'AA-') as opposed to only 'AAA' and 'AA+'. This reflects the four long-term ratings that map to the short-term rating 'A-1+'. In fact, we also observed portfolios whose asset portfolios were distributed across six long-term ratings, including 'A+' and 'A'.

In determining the revised thresholds, we evaluated how they would appear in relationship to the raw default rate for each rating level, and we limited the threshold to a number less than the factor of the next lowest rating level. For example, the new fund rating threshold for 'AAf' rated funds is 58. We made sure this threshold was lower than the factor for the greater than 365 bucket for the 'AA-' asset credit factor, which has a factor of 70.

We believe these adjustments better address concerns regarding the nature and extent of differences in approaches between criteria, and better capture our analytical intent.

### **Comparable rating analysis and fund ratings fluctuations**

*Changes adopted or considered.* Comments suggested that readers were unclear on the comparable rating analysis portion of the FCQR RFC and what would warrant raising fund ratings. Others suggested that strong management scoring should lead to FCQRs that were higher than the preliminary FCQR or matrix score, or that the proposal could result in portfolio ratings that continually fluctuate.

After carefully considering these comments, we determined no change would be made based on this feedback.

*Rationale.* When assessing funds, the final step in our analysis is holistic, wherein we look at all the elements of the analysis completed up to that point in relation to other funds. In doing this holistic analysis, we look at the fund portfolio's credit quality and characteristics relative to its peers with similar portfolio strategies, composition, and management. We may raise or lower the intermediate FCQR by up to one notch where we believe the combination of all factors on balance demonstrates strengths or weaknesses not otherwise captured by the various steps in the analysis.

### **Refining the scoring of management assessment categories for FCQRs and FVRs**

*Changes adopted or considered.* We received feedback indicating a belief that the criteria do not seem to recognize that proactive management can reduce credit risk and enhance a fund's credit, and therefore do not recognize the potential for ratings uplift. Further, comments indicated a belief that subjective elements within the analysis favor larger firms, although the comments also indicated the qualitative analysis appropriately captured portfolio risk.

These criteria incorporate the potential for uplift, based on the assessment of management within the context of the comparable ratings analysis. Where one or more management assessment categories are assessed as "strong," and none are "weak," a fund's management strength may factor into the final step, the comparable ratings analysis. A positive comparable ratings assessment, supported by a strong management assessment, would lead to a rating one notch higher, whereas a negative assessment leads to a rating that is one notch lower, and a neutral assessment results in no change to the intermediate FCQR. In considering management and its capabilities, we focus on management's capabilities rather than on the size of the firm, which is not an element in our assessment.

We revisited the methodology by which we assess management. Rather than assessing management through separate and distinct components, we determined to simplify the assessment of management by assessing each category holistically.

**Rationale.** We determined that scoring of subcomponents was unnecessarily prescriptive, whereas a more holistic assessment better captured our analytical intent. Otherwise, we believe the criteria achieve an appropriate balance between the quantitative and qualitative elements of our analyses.

### Other points of clarification

**Changes adopted or considered.** We received a number of other comments that were largely application-type comments or requests for clarification, that is, comments as to how the criteria would be applied rather than comments specific to the proposal itself. We considered the extent of clarification needed to address these items, and incorporated these into the final criteria. Also, we incorporated editorial clarifications throughout to aid in readability and clarity of the intent of the criteria.

## Related Criteria

- Methodology For Linking Long-Term And Short-Term Ratings, April 7, 2017
- Guarantee Criteria, Oct. 21, 2016
- Request For Comment: Fund Credit Quality Ratings Methodology, Sept. 26, 2016
- Request For Comment: Fund Volatility Ratings Methodology, Sept. 26, 2016
- Principal Stability Fund Rating Methodology, June 23, 2016
- Global Methodologies And Assumptions For Corporate Cash Flow And Synthetic CDOs, Aug. 8, 2016
- Mapping A Third Party's Internal Credit Scoring System To Standard & Poor's Global Rating Scale, May 8, 2014
- Group Rating Methodology, Nov. 19, 2013
- Assessing Bank Branch Creditworthiness, Oct. 14, 2013
- Counterparty Risk Framework Methodology And Assumptions, June 25, 2013
- Methodology: Updated Fund Credit Quality Ratings Criteria For Counterparty Transactions, July 22, 2011

Only a rating committee may determine a rating action and this report does not constitute a rating action.

Copyright © 2017 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.

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 acknowledgement 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 nonpublic 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](http://www.standardandpoors.com) (free of charge), and [www.ratingsdirect.com](http://www.ratingsdirect.com) and [www.globalcreditportal.com](http://www.globalcreditportal.com) (subscription) and [www.spcapitaliq.com](http://www.spcapitaliq.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](http://www.standardandpoors.com/usratingsfees).

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