

RFC Process Summary:

# Global Equipment ABS Methodology And Assumptions

May 31, 2019

On March 12, 2019, S&P Global Ratings published a request for comment (RFC) article on its proposed revisions to its criteria for rating global equipment asset backed securities (ABS), titled "Request For Comment: Global Equipment ABS Methodology And Assumptions."

Following feedback from the market, we finalized our criteria and published them on May 31, 2019, in an article titled "Global Equipment ABS Methodology And Assumptions." On the same day, we also published the related guidance article "Guidance: Global Equipment ABS Methodology And Assumptions," to provide further details on how we apply these criteria.

We would like to thank the market participants who provided feedback. This RFC process summary provides an overview of the changes between the RFC and the final criteria as well as the rationale behind those changes. In addition, this document outlines feedback from various market participants that was considered but didn't result in any changes to the final criteria. We made other changes that are purely stylistic and intended to clarify our methodology.

## I) Summary Of Changes And Clarifications

### Minimum credit enhancement

**Feedback:** One market participant asked if minimum credit enhancement as outlined in Table 5 of the RFC could be interpolated for each rating level (that is, including the +/- modifiers).

**Response:** We have updated the final criteria to allow for interpolation for minimum credit enhancement at each rating level (which includes the +/- modifiers).

### Criteria scope

**Feedback:** One market participant asked for clarification on whether the equipment ABS criteria would be applicable to mixed automotive-backed pools of 'commercial' and 'consumer' contracts.

**Response:** We have further clarified the scope to indicate that the global equipment ABS criteria is applicable to (i) mixed asset pools that may include a combination of vehicles and equipment, if the pool is exposed to concentration risk or (ii) pools that are predominantly composed of vehicle fleets. Please refer to the final criteria for the description of the full scope.

### ANALYTICAL CONTACTS

**Volker Laeger**  
Frankfurt  
(49) 69-33-999-302  
volker.laeger  
@spglobal.com

**Joanne K Desimone**  
Dallas  
(1) 212-438-2444  
joanne.desimone  
@spglobal.com

**John A Detweiler, CFA**  
New York  
(1) 212-438-7319  
john.detweiler  
@spglobal.com

**Yuji Hashimoto**  
Tokyo  
(81) 3-4550-8275  
yuji.hashimoto  
@spglobal.com

**Elizabeth A Steenson**  
Melbourne  
(61) 3-9631-2162  
elizabeth.steenson  
@spglobal.com

**Antonio Zellek, CFA**  
Mexico City  
+52 (55) 5081-4484  
antonio.zellek  
@spglobal.com

See complete contact list at end of article.

## RFC Process Summary: Global Equipment ABS Methodology And Assumptions

For example, we'll determine whether a pool consisting of financing arrangements for self-employed borrowers or small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) falls within the scope of the global equipment ABS criteria by considering the collateral type and the obligor concentrations. If, for example, the underlying collateral for such a pool is predominantly vehicles (but not vehicle fleets) and the pool doesn't have significant obligor concentrations, it would not fall within the scope of the global equipment ABS criteria and may continue to be analyzed using other relevant criteria.

Alternatively, if that same pool's obligor concentrations are significant, then the pool would fall within the scope of global equipment ABS criteria.

### Residual stress

**Feedback:** One market participant asked to clarify the last bullet point in Paragraph 55 of the RFC, specifically what is meant by "obligor default, to avoid application to both credit stress and residual stress on the same asset."

**Response:** In the final criteria, we have clarified that if residuals are included in the pool balance, we will apply our residual stress to the portion of the pool representing residuals of non-defaulted obligors, to avoid application of both credit stress and residual stress on the same asset.

## II) Summary Of Other Market Feedback

### Minimum credit enhancement

**Feedback:** One market participant asked whether credit could be given to fast-growing hard credit enhancement that accumulates after closing in relation to minimum credit enhancement (Table 5 of the RFC) at the time of transaction closing.

**Response:** The minimum hard credit enhancement has to be available at the time of transaction closing, and we would not consider fast-growing hard enhancement that accumulates after closing as part of the minimum because the growth is dependent on future performance.

### Considerations related to down-payments and lessee guarantees

**Feedback:** One market participant commented that there seems to be no mention of certain features typical in equipment finance, such as down-payments and lessee guarantees. Is this covered somewhere, the commenter asked, or could it perhaps be specified in the section on performance risks?

**Response:** Down-payments and lessee guarantees are qualitative considerations in our assessment of defaults and recoveries.

### Obligor concentration

**Feedback:** One market participant asked if the typical number of largest obligors assumed to default applies only when an obligor's exposure accounts for over 1.5% of the pool, and does it explicitly take into account the obligor creditworthiness? They also asked how the 1.5% typical threshold was determined given individual obligor concentration risk for Australian equipment ABS has historically been deemed relevant at exposure levels closer to 2.0% of the pool.

**Response:** The largest obligor default test is generally applicable when an obligor concentration is higher than approximately 1.5%. Please note that Paragraph 36 of the RFC also outlines additional considerations.

Furthermore, the large obligor default assumption does explicitly account for the obligor creditworthiness as outlined in the RFC by including only those obligors with a creditworthiness lower than the liability rating level and with a concentration of higher than approximately 1.5%.

We have not seen any largest obligor concentrations exceeding 1% in Australian equipment transactions we've rated over the past 10 years. We consider the threshold of approximately 1.5% to be appropriate globally.

### Balloon loans

**Feedback:** One market participant asked whether providing quantitative guidance could be considered on what constitutes a significant portion of the total pool that may result in additional risk from balloon loans (in reference to Paragraph 23 of the RFC).

**Response:** This is not intended to be prescriptive; rather, it's determined based on the specific characteristics of the originator, the underwriting and historical performance data, and the composition of the pool. We may also take into account regional differences.

### Supplemental test

**Feedback:** One market participant asked to clarify whether the liability ratings in Table 3 refer to issue ratings on the global scale. They also asked if a certain credit quality would be assumed depending on the product and/or collateral type backing the loan or lease.

**Response:** The liability ratings in Table 3 are on a global scale. Paragraph 40 of the RFC states that for each unrated obligor, we typically assume that the obligor's creditworthiness falls within the 'B+' to 'CCC-' buckets unless we have an assessment of its creditworthiness (based on, for example, a credit estimate or a guarantee that qualifies for ratings substitution, if applicable).

This report does not constitute a rating action.

## Contact List

### ANALYTICAL CONTACTS

**Volker Laeger**  
Frankfurt  
(49) 69-33-999-302  
volker.laeger@spglobal.com

### ANALYTICAL CONTACTS

**Joanne K Desimone**  
Dallas  
(1) 212-438-2444  
joanne.desimone@spglobal.com

### ANALYTICAL CONTACTS

**John A Detweiler, CFA**  
New York  
(1) 212-438-7319  
john.detweiler@spglobal.com

### ANALYTICAL CONTACTS

**Yuji Hashimoto**  
Tokyo  
(81) 3-4550-8275  
yuji.hashimoto@spglobal.com

### ANALYTICAL CONTACTS

**Elizabeth A Steenson**  
Melbourne  
(61) 3-9631-2162  
elizabeth.steenon@spglobal.com

### ANALYTICAL CONTACTS

**Antonio Zellek, CFA**  
Mexico City  
+52 (55) 5081-4484  
antonio.zellek@spglobal.com

### ANALYTICAL CONTACTS

**Giuseppina Martelli**  
Milan  
(39) 02-72111-274  
giuseppina.martelli@spglobal.com

### METHODOLOGY CONTACTS

**Kapil Jain, CFA**  
New York  
(1) 212-438-2340  
kapil.jain@spglobal.com

### METHODOLOGY CONTACTS

**Mauricio Tello**  
New York  
(52) 55-5081-4446  
mauricio.tello@spglobal.com

### METHODOLOGY CONTACTS

**Eric Gretch**  
London  
(1) 212-438-6791  
eric.gretch@spglobal.com

### METHODOLOGY CONTACTS

**Katrien Van Acoleyen**  
London  
(44) 20-7176-3860  
katrien.vanacoleyen@spglobal.com

Copyright © 2024 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.spglobal.com/ratings](http://www.spglobal.com/ratings) (free of charge), and [www.ratingsdirect.com](http://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.spglobal.com/usratingsfees](http://www.spglobal.com/usratingsfees).

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