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1. Introduction

This methodology lays out the update for our approach to assigning credit ratings to non-financial corporates. The update, which follows the call for comments released on 26 February, has no implications for existing corporate ratings assigned by Scope.

This document provides the methodological basis for our analysis of a corporate issuer, encompassing assessments of general business risks and financial risks. Sector-specific corporate methodologies, which are published separately, expand on our business risk profile assessment and in some case sector-specific rating thresholds related to credit metrics; this methodology defines credit metrics for determining financial risk irrespective of the sector, except for several sectors with exceptional characteristics (page 10).

Key changes to the methodology

Scope used this methodology update to:

- Extend the financial guidance table with more granularity for ratio outcomes in the 'A' and 'AA and above’ categories
- Extend the financial guidance table with more granularity for financial risk credit metrics in the 'CCC' category
- Provide clearer guidance on the use of the industry matrix used for Scope's Industry Risk Profile
- Provide examples of environmental and social factors that Scope would consider in its analysis and which, if material, could impact our assessment of an issuer’s credit quality
- Clarify/specify some wording

2. Corporate rating framework

Our corporate rating methodology details the key principles and criteria we apply when assigning ratings to non-financial corporate issuers and their debt instruments.

2.1. Corporate issuer ratings

The corporate issuer rating is our long-term credit rating for corporate issuers. It indicates the issuer’s relative credit quality, i.e. its ability relative to peers to meet contractual, financial debt obligations as a going concern, on time and in full. It does not consider the ranking and priority of debt payments upon a hypothetical default of the issuer.

When determining an issuer's rating, we perform a forward-looking analysis using qualitative and quantitative information. Alongside past financial data, the analysis considers the potential impact of likely future events on an issuer’s credit risk profile (forecasts).

Issuer ratings are assigned to legal entities only. Depending on the legal and operational structure of a group, we can assign an issuer rating either to a holding company of a group on a consolidated basis or to individual entities within that group. For the latter, we look at legal ties, intercompany guarantees and interdependent operations (such as centralised group financing or cash-pooling) to determine the entity level at which we apply the issuer rating. Issuer ratings are not assigned to bankruptcy-remote vehicles.

2.2. Corporate debt ratings

Our corporate debt ratings reflect our credit opinion on the relative credit quality of the corporate debt instrument. Corporate debt ratings can be issued on both short-term and long-term debt.

Long-term debt ratings are assigned to long-term debt instruments, taking into account the likely recovery of the debt instrument in a hypothetical default scenario.

Short-term debt ratings express an opinion on debt instruments with a maximum term of 365 days, e.g. commercial paper. Short-term ratings correlate with the issuer’s rating and liquidity position. Also see Rating Definitions - Credit Ratings and Ancillary Services Scope Ratings, published April 2021.
3. Corporate rating approach

Figure 1: Scope’s corporate rating approach
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Issuer Rating
3.1. Corporate issuer rating
We assess an issuer's credit risk profile by analysing its business risk and financial risk profiles using a transparent, fundamental and forward-looking approach. This results in a rating that is objective and reproducible.

The rating committee decides on the relative importance of each rating driver. In general, business risk and financial risk profiles are weighted equally for BB/BBB rated companies. The analysis of investment grade companies (rated BBB- and above) focuses more on the business risk profile. B (and below) ratings are assigned with a stronger focus on the financial risk profile. The weighting between the business risk and financial risk profiles may be adjusted for specific business models and markets.

We combine factual business and financial risk factors with supplementary rating drivers (see page 11/12) that cover:

- Financial policy
- Parent/government support
- Peer context
- Governance and structure

We customise the rating process to incorporate features specific to both the sector and the issuer, evaluated in a local context. Our analysis is based on historical and forecast data, typically for the next two to three years. We also derive forecasts for our rating analysis, which take into account an issuer's strategy and planning for the future. Our forecasts may deviate significantly from those of the issuer.

We ensure that our issuer ratings are applied consistently and transparently within and across sectors. Our analysis incorporates a peer comparison, i.e. an issuer's credit profile is compared with those of its rating peers. When considering peer context as part of the supplementary rating driver assessment, we consider the predictability and volatility/sustainability of a company's operational environment. Aspects such as emerging market risk or execution risk related to the transformation of a company's business model can result in considerable uncertainty and low transparency which we also consider in our supplementary rating analysis.

3.1.1. Business risk profile assessment
We adopt a forward-looking approach when analysing an issuer's business risk profile, taking into account the issuer's market and sector dynamics, as well as business drivers. The business risk profile is divided into an analysis of the industry and of the company in question (competitive positioning).

Industry-related drivers aim to capture the general drivers for the underlying industry and consist of three sub-categories:

- Cyclicality: risk of volatility in revenues and operating profits for the foreseeable future compared with past industry performance
- Entry barriers: level of protection for a company operating in an industry. These comprise high capital requirement, regulation, technological requirements, customer relationships, R&D requirements or distribution channels.
- Substitution risks: the risk and vulnerability of an industry to technological obsolescence/maturity. Here, we consider megatrends or transition risks (i.e. technological, ecological, or demographic) as well as structural shifts that can influence the industry's trajectory, and weigh on its risk and vulnerability.

All three industry drivers are classified as either high, medium or low risk, according to the following:

- Cyclicality (five-year compound annual growth rate of revenues and peak-to-trough dimension)
  - High risk: growth highly correlated with GDP or other macroeconomic indicators; high amplitude of change
  - Medium risk: growth closely linked with GDP or other macroeconomic indicators
  - Low risk: no negative change over time and higher average growth than GDP or other macroeconomic indicators
- Entry barriers
  - Opinion-based: e.g. based on the number of players
- Substitution risks
  - Opinion-based: from observations, technological developments, product features, impact on strategic decisions, budgets and product production (marketing, R&D, technology, innovation) affecting an entire sector. Specific substitution risks affecting a rated entity in a given industry are captured in the assessment of competitive positioning.
The industry matrix below (Figure 2) shows how we derive the industry risk rating from our combined assessment of cyclical, entry barriers and substitution risk. The combination of cyclical, entry barriers and substitution risk yields an initial outcome, which is divided into two values e.g. BB/BBB (see below). The value on the left is taken when substitution risk is high; the value on the right when it is medium or low. For example, medium entry barriers and medium cyclical, entry barriers would yield an initial outcome of BB/BBB, and incorporating a high substitution risk would result in a final industry risk rating of BB.

**Figure 2: Scope’s industry matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cyclicality</th>
<th>Barriers to entry</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>CCC/B</td>
<td>B/BB</td>
<td>BB/BBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>B/BB</td>
<td>BB/BBB</td>
<td>BBB/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>BB/BBB</td>
<td>BBB/A</td>
<td>AA/AAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of competitive positioning aims to capture the individual drivers for the rated company. For each company, we analyse:

- Market shares (historical and projected trends)
- Diversification of products, geographies, customers, suppliers, assets and sales channels
- Operating profitability
- Sector/company-specific factors

The individual sector/company-specific drivers are detailed in the separate sector methodologies as these drivers are difficult to generalise. For instance, the drivers in an innovation-driven industry might be R&D-to-sales or the number of patents correlating to sales growth; in a retail environment, a driver could be sales productivity. For diversified companies (which are more common in Europe), we give adequate weight to all key business units and the potential benefit that diversification may bring to a company’s overall structure.

Competitive positioning factors therefore represent the benchmarks for the rated company in its underlying industry. For example, we consider the industry margin to be the achievable operating margin for a rated company.

Crucially, industry and competitive positioning are assessed independently. For example, a very strong market leader in a low-rated industry can still achieve an investment grade business risk profile.

Corporate strategy or management quality are not explicit rating drivers as these are: i) difficult to measure objectively; and ii) reflected indirectly in the company’s competitive positioning and ultimately in its financial risk profile. We expect a very good company strategy to be reflected in higher margins and stronger competitive advantages. We do not look at these explicitly or in isolation, but as embedded qualitative factors that influence the aforementioned company-specific drivers.

Our corporate rating approach particularly aims to identify and capture rating drivers for diversified companies, often reflected in the family ownership structures that are a significant part of Europe’s corporate landscape. The approach encompasses business and financial risks. For a company’s business risk profile, we examine its entire structure by assessing industry risk and competitive positioning for each key division, and then applying a weighted average blend of underlying risks and ratings. This enables our business risk assessment to reflect a company’s true drivers, rather than concentrating on the core division and then providing an uplift for diversification at a later stage.

**3.1.2. Financial risk profile assessment**

As part of our forward-looking analysis of the financial risk profile, we assess the issuer’s financial leverage, cash flow generation, and ability to cover interest and principal payments (debt service).

We focus on cash-flow-based ratios such as leverage ratios, interest coverage and cash flow coverage. These are good indicators of credit risk as they tend to be less distorted by accounting policy than ratios based on P&L or balance sheet items. Liquidity considerations supplement our assessment of the financial risk profile.
Scope-adjusted debt (SaD)

We analyse the amount, structure and maturity of debt obligations using a forward-looking approach. Our definition of debt – Scope-adjusted debt or SaD – includes all of a company’s capital market and bank debt, as well as adjustments that qualify analytically for full or partial debt treatment, including off-balance sheet debt. This commonly includes unfunded pension obligations and operating leases, but can also extend to guarantees/contingencies, hybrid bonds or other debt-like instruments, industrial provisions, and factoring.

Our adjustments include:

- **Pensions:** we believe that investment grade-rated companies, as well as some BB rated corporate credits, qualify for only a partial consideration of their ‘pension gap’, which is the unfunded part of pension obligations expressed as the difference between the projected pension obligations and the fair value of pension plan assets. The pension gap qualifies for partial consideration if a company’s pension assets are able to cover pension contributions for several years of zero free cash flow in times of economic stress.

  This is motivated by our view that unfunded pension obligations should not always receive the same (i.e. full) debt treatment as bank or capital markets debt. This reflects pension obligations’ fundamentally different and typically very long-term repayment structure compared to financial debt, which is typically due at a defined date. If this information is disclosed and the below conditions are met, pension obligations will only be included partially in Scope-adjusted debt.

  The pension gap is partially considered as debt if an issuer keeps a sustainably sufficient amount of defined pension assets. In other words, if defined assets are at least three times the amount of annual pension payments, we adjust for two-thirds of the unfunded pensions; if defined assets are at least six times the amount of annual payments, half the pension gap is adjusted for.

- **Operating leases** (applicable for issuers not reporting under IFRS16): we use the net present value of operating lease payments for our debt adjustments, with a proxy calculated in the absence of nominal or net present value. We generally discount future operating lease payments by 5% and reclassify operating lease expenses. Interest expense is increased by 5% of the present value of lease commitments for the respective period. The remaining amount is reclassified as depreciation expense.

- **Classification of hybrid securities:** hybrid securities are instruments that have both debt and equity characteristics. They are generally complex and highly structured. A hybrid is the broad term used to describe an instrument that typically ranks behind senior (unsecured) debt but ahead of equity and in some cases can be converted into ordinary equity. However, it can incorporate numerous features that comprise either debt-like or equity-like characteristics.

  Typically, hybrid instruments have a more complex structure than most fixed-income instruments and generally contain embedded options. These options typically allow the issuer to either redeem the security before its specified maturity, avoiding a step-up of coupon payments, or to convert the security into ordinary shares. Instruments that include a mandatory conversion at maturity are not grouped under hybrid securities.

- **Industrial provisions such as contingent liabilities, unfunded obligations, decommissioning assets, and site remediation (net of associated assets)**

- **Factoring**

- **Netting of cash:** generally only applicable to ratings in the BB category or higher, and only if the cash is permanent and accessible. We often apply ‘haircuts’ to reported cash and marketable securities, reflecting restrictions imposed by offshore assets, joint-venture holdings, cash trapped in captive-insurance contracts, or technical requirements (cash needs in the cash desks of retailers).
Hybrid instrument features: a hybrid instrument must meet the criteria shown in Figure 4 to be granted an equity credit. If more requirements are met under a specific percentage category (i.e. 100% or 50%), we apply that percentage as the equity credit. If we see no reason to assign an equity credit, the instrument is treated as financial debt. We may also deviate from the scale based on analytical judgement.

Figure 4: Equity credit criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Convertibility</td>
<td>Conversion of hybrid bond into equity for the rated entity is mandatory</td>
<td>Issuer has the right to convert the hybrid bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Replacement</td>
<td>Replacement with a similar debt instrument with equal maturity and rank (subordination) is mandatory</td>
<td>Replacement with a similar debt instrument with equal maturity and rank (subordination) is mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coupon deferral and accumulation of payments</td>
<td>Includes coupon deferral Non-accumulation of payments (issuer not required to pay missed obligations in a later period)</td>
<td>Includes coupon deferral Accumulation of payments (issuer pays missed obligations in later periods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Contractual subordination</td>
<td>Yes – all other current and future instruments rank before hybrid bond issue; hybrid bond ranks before equity</td>
<td>Yes – all other current and future instruments rank before hybrid bond issue; hybrid bond ranks before equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Remaining maturity</td>
<td>More than 50 years or perpetual</td>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notching criteria: contractually subordinated debt instruments are rated one to two notches below the respective issuer rating. We define subordinated debt as interest-bearing liabilities ranked below senior unsecured debt in the debt waterfall. When contractually subordinated debt excludes features like deep subordination or deferability, or any equity-like feature, we treat the instrument as subordinated debt and rate it one notch below its issuer’s rating. However, if hybrid debt includes at least one of these features, the hybrid bond will be rated two notches below its respective issuer rating.

Hybrid securities: we establish the degree of equity involved based on the five criteria in Figure 4. If the hybrid qualifies as 100% equity, nothing would be added to Scope-adjusted debt as the debt portion is 0%. If it meets no requirements under either 100% or 50% equity, the instrument is fully treated as debt. We also adjust interest paid on the hybrid bond in proportion to the equity credit given.

The credit rating committee may deviate from this general approach if not all five criteria in Figure 4 are fulfilled.
Leverage

When analysing an issuer’s debt protection, we assess its ability to service debt from ongoing cash flow. We evaluate the level, timeframe, certainty and volatility of expected internal cash flows relative to upcoming debt obligations.

Our analysis includes the issuer’s historical financial performance as reflected in the audited financial accounts, as well as forecasts for at least two years.

We use cash flow items when calculating funds from operations (FFO), reflecting our cash-oriented approach to calculating debt protection. Scope-adjusted debt to Scope-adjusted EBITDA is our second credit ratio for evaluating leverage.

Interest cover

Interest cover reflects an issuer’s operating profitability (EBITDA), degree of indebtedness (absolute value), prevailing interest rate environment, and risk spreads paid by an issuer. Interest cover ratios can deviate substantially from leverage and cash flow cover ratios if indebtedness and interest expense are both low in absolute terms (low interest expense could be due to the interest rate environment and low risk spreads payable). Therefore, when interest cover is better than the other two measures in the financial guidance table shown in Figure 5 (leverage and cash flow cover), it does not necessarily mean that we consider this building block of the financial risk profile to be better than the other building blocks.

Cash flow cover

We also assess the issuer’s ability to generate cash flow, including coverage ratios relating to free operating cash flow (FOCF).

Our analysis includes other industry-specific measures where appropriate.

Short-term, intra-annual changes in financial performance measures – quarterly, semi-annually or annually – only trigger rating changes if they are significant, expected to last for at least two years, and not already factored into the ratings. This is often the case when changes in industry dynamics lead to a structural deterioration in credit fundamentals, such as a change in pricing regulations that affects an issuer’s cash flow.

We examine audited annual statements, which we supplement with more recent information such as interim reports, pro-forma data and issuer forecasts (when available). We determine whether unaudited data are reliable and plausible. Our forecasts may deviate significantly from those of the issuer.

Credit metrics calculated in line with the financial guidance table are neither weighted equally nor are they assigned a mathematical weight to derive the overall assessment of the credit metrics. Considerations may include industry-related drivers, interest rate risk, issuer-specific maturity schedules, visibility of future cash flows, and a track record of generating cash flows.

Figure 5: Financial guidance table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope-adjusted debt</th>
<th>Leverage</th>
<th>Interest cover</th>
<th>Cash flow cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(SaD)/EBITDA (x)</td>
<td>FFO/SaD</td>
<td>EBITDA/interest cover</td>
<td>FOCF/SaD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA and above</td>
<td>&lt;1x</td>
<td>&gt;60%</td>
<td>&gt;10x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1x-2x</td>
<td>45%-60%</td>
<td>7x-10x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>2x-3x</td>
<td>30%-45%</td>
<td>4x-7x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>3x-4x</td>
<td>15%-30%</td>
<td>2x-4x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4x-6x</td>
<td>0%-15%</td>
<td>1x-2x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC and below</td>
<td>&gt;6x</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>&lt;1x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The importance of leverage (SaD/EBITDA) and cash flow cover (FOCF/SaD) in the assessment may depend on the issuer's business context. This includes, but is not limited to, leveraged buyouts undertaken, exposures to the sectors listed below, parent company links, and the inherent cyclicality and vulnerability of the issuer's industries and business model.

The table above can be applied to all industrial sectors that we cover except for the following (largely covered by sector methodologies):

- Real estate
- Airports
- Investment holdings
- Utilities (including renewable energy)

This is because we consider the financial drivers of the above sectors to be different to those of most production-focused industries, necessitating a different analytical approach. This can involve the use of different metrics (loan to value), or the assignment of rating implications to existing metrics (such as SaD/EBITDA) that differ to the implications defined under this methodology. Therefore, the sector methodologies for these industries (available on www.scoperatings.com) have their own financial guidance tables.

**Liquidity**

We assess liquidity separately from credit metrics, reflecting its different nature. We classify liquidity as either adequate or inadequate. Its implication for the ratings is ultimately subject to the rating committee's decision, as we believe liquidity can only be partially expressed by coverage ratios (see below).

**Definition:** liquidity consists of cash and near-cash assets (internal and external sources), plus committed bank and factoring lines with a tenor of over one year that are available for repaying short-term financial debt. Our liquidity assessment can influence the financial risk profile positively or negatively and can affect the final rating. Our analysis examines the following sources of cash that result from a company’s central cash pooling at group level:

- Balance sheet cash (end of preceding year)
- Balance sheet marketable securities (end of preceding year)
- Committed bank lines (tenor exceeding one year)
- Committed factoring lines (tenor exceeding one year)
- Expected free operating cash flow (FOCF)
- Liquid inventory (mainly for agricultural or trading companies).

All of the above, except for bank lines or factoring lines, may be subject to haircuts reflecting the assessment of restricted cash or cash equivalents. While expected FOCF may not be subject to a specific analytical haircut, the analytical forecast of FOCF may include additional conservative assumptions, in particular for issuers whose liquidity we judge to be low or vulnerable to unexpected impacts. In addition to the before, we might consider other factors, i.e. the use of reverse factoring lines to better seize liquidity risk especially for companies with a non-investment grade financial risk profile. This follows our view that the access to reverse factoring can weaken liquidity at a time of stress, with termination of existing reverse factoring lines potentially leading to sudden and significant working capital outflow over a matter of weeks or months.

As a general rule, available cash should be sufficient to cover all debt that will mature within one year. Coverage of below 110% could have a negative impact on the rating result based on credit metrics (Figure 5), but is not capped by this, by up to four notches in most cases. The magnitude of down-notching for liquidity classified as inadequate is subject to the time horizon over which liquidity risks could crystallise. If an issuer depends on external funding or asset disposals to cover operating expenses, capital expenditures, interest payments, and negative fluctuations in working capital for a prolonged period, we could classify liquidity as inadequate even if a point-in-time calculation suggests coverage of above 110%. If coverage is sustained above 200%, as demonstrated by the company’s track record, this could result in a rating upside of up to two notches. This upside is captured in the financial risk profile assessment. Investment grade financial risk profiles are highly unlikely to result in a notch-up for liquidity, as such rating levels already assume adequate liquidity.
For our SaD calculation, centrally available cash, as defined above, can be netted against debt. There is no netting of cash for B category ratings, as cash in those situations is not deemed permanent. In addition, a company's liquidity needs to be seen in a regional context and non-mechanistically. For example, in certain European countries the provision of committed lines is not customary – even for investment grade-rated issuers – as fees are deemed too high. A too-narrow, numbers-based approach would assess liquidity as weak in this instance. Therefore, we also examine 'soft' factors such as the company's reputation as well as support provided by its banking group, particularly in adverse conditions. Liquidity is also assessed by looking at debt covenants, which allows us to gauge the response to potential short-term calls on liquidity.

**Family ownership**

Our financial risk profile assessment examines whether cash on the balance sheet reflects a cautious financial policy – a common feature of family-owned businesses. Liquidity may also have positive implications in times of economic stress as excess cash can act as a cushion.

**3.1.3 Supplementary rating drivers**

Supplementary rating drivers complement our analysis of the factors and drivers of business and financial risks.

Our supplementary analytical aspects cover:

- Financial policy: this captures: i) management's 'risk appetite' for discretionary spending (such as for acquisitions, dividends and share buybacks) and the extent to which these are funded by debt; and ii) the management's ratings commitment, both credit positive and negative. For example, when a debt-funded acquisition causes short-term deviations from stated financial policies, we believe management commitment to maintain the rating level is usually stronger among family-owned companies than non-owner managed companies. We reflect this in our financial policy assessment based on a company’s track record and level of commitment.

- Parent/government support: when assessing the credit quality of an entity that may benefit from parent/governmental support, we incorporate the owner's capacity and willingness to support the entity when under financial distress. We aim to capture potential support or even a 'malus' from the ultimate owners, which may have both credit-positive and credit-negative implications. In terms of the rating impact, all options are possible, from the full equalisation of the subsidiary's ratings with the parent's (name equality, debt guarantees or other supportive factors in the case of high strategic importance) to no notching from the parent's rating. An ownership malus could be incurred if a parent is unable to provide financial support to its subsidiary and instead is extracting significant cash from its subsidiary through intercompany loans or dividends to shore up its own credit position or that of other group companies. We assess the subsidiary's strategic importance to the parent as either significant or less significant. We also consider the extent of a parent's support to its subsidiary, including explicit guarantees or letters of credit. More implicit forms of parent commitment could be provided by name equality, the use of the same banks, or common treasury operations. When assessing parent or government support, we apply our 'Rating Methodology: Government Related Entities'.

- Peer context: this reflects additional considerations in a peer group context and aims at ensuring consistency across the rating spectrum, with both credit-positive and credit-negative implications.

- Governance and structure: corporate governance guidelines lay out rules for corporate behaviour and how companies monitor the enforcement of these rules. Corporate governance is a 'soft' rating factor reflecting a company’s due diligence in meeting governance guidelines. To avoid double counting, our corporate governance assessment excludes factors covered elsewhere in our rating assessment. Our opinion of corporate governance will have either a neutral or negative rating impact. Although a company’s governance structure cannot drive up the rating, it is nevertheless important when determining a credit rating. For example, adequate corporate governance is the minimum standard for rated issuers, while weak corporate governance is likely to put downward pressure on a rating.

We review corporate governance guidelines and document any concerns regarding the structure, execution and enforcement of corporate governance as well as any lacunae. Concerns are included in our publications and comparisons are made with established standards. If we identify significant issues that would affect our ability to reach clear conclusions and form a measured opinion on corporate governance, we will decline to rate the issuer.

We review three key governance areas during the rating process:
1) External governance (company control): this covers, but is not limited to, the quality of public governance, transparency of local financial markets and financing sources, accounting frameworks, property law, bondholder rights, as well as any past, pending or upcoming issues with regulatory authorities and tax offices or other legal issues. We only review company behaviour relative to the appropriate regulatory and legal frameworks.

2) Internal governance (clarity and transparency): this covers, but is not limited to, the makeup and functions of the board of directors, the existence of committees tasked with governance, the effectiveness of management and the corporate culture, as well as the quality of both internal financial reporting and internal control mechanisms.

3) Transparency of ownership and control (corporate structure): this covers, but is not limited to, ownership structure and transparency, independence from and transactions with related parties, the relationship with independent auditors, and mechanisms in place to address issues, if any.

3.1.4 Corporate issuer rating

The final corporate issuer rating is based on a combination of the business and financial risk analyses on the one hand, and the potential effects of supplementary rating drivers on the other.

We use the following key ratios in our fundamental quantitative analysis to assess an issuer’s financial risk profile. Other financial ratios, in addition to those based on cash flow, are also used in the analysis if appropriate. This could include the loan-to-value ratio (x) for issuers in the real estate industry and debt-to-regulated asset value ratio (x) for issuers in the utilities industry.

More information on definitions of key financial items is provided in Figure 6 below.
**Figure 6: Our key value and metrics definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Scope-adjusted EBITDA</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reported earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortisation, plus rental payments for the year adjusted for material one-off items (cash and non-cash), subject to analytical judgment.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Cash flow measure**    | **Reported EBITDA**  
|                          | ± Rental payments  
|                          | ± One-off items  
|                          | = Scope-adjusted EBITDA |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Funds from operations (FFO)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Funds from operations represent operating cash flows before changes in working capital and after dividends received, interest paid (including accrued interest on positions that we treat as debt-like such as pensions, asset retirement obligations, and lease obligations) and long-term operating lease charges and other non-recurring income or expenses, adjusted by the depreciation component of operating leases.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Cash flow measure**           | **Scope-adjusted EBITDA**  
|                                 | - Interest paid (net)  
|                                 | - Tax paid  
|                                 | + Associate dividends received  
|                                 | ± Other non-operating charges before FFO  
|                                 | = FFO |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Free operating cash flow (FOCF)</strong></th>
<th><strong>An issuer’s free operating cash flow represents its operating cash flow after changes in working capital and non-operating cash flow and reported capital expenditures (netted with fixed-asset divestitures). Acquisitions are not capex. For issuers with substantial lease obligations, we likewise deduct the amortisation element of lease obligations. FOCF represents the cash flow available for discretionary spending such as for dividends, acquisitions, share buybacks, or the reduction of financial debt.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Cash flow measure**               | **FFO**  
|                                     | ± Working capital changes  
|                                     | ± Non-operating cash flow  
|                                     | - Capex (net)  
|                                     | - Lease amortisation (if applicable)  
|                                     | = FOCF |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Discretionary cash flow</strong></th>
<th><strong>This measures FOCF after dividends that is available for discretionary spending such as for acquisitions, share buybacks, or the reduction of financial debt.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Cash flow measure**              | **FOCF**  
|                                    | - Dividends paid  
|                                    | = Discretionary cash flow |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Scope-adjusted debt (SaD)</strong></th>
<th><strong>SaD is a key determinant for many credit metrics. We apply adjustments based on a company’s annual reports (reported financial debt), which typically consist of bank loans, leases and capital market debt such as bonds. The main adjustments relate to unfunded pension obligations, operating lease obligations and guarantees given. For specific industries (such as utilities) debt-like provisions are included if material, for example, for the decommissioning of power plants.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Debt measure**                  | **Reported financial debt**  
|                                   | + Adjustments such as operating leases (if applicable), unfunded pensions, guarantees, provisions (if applicable), hybrid bonds (equity credit), off-balance sheet debt  
|                                   | - Available cash and cash equivalents  
|                                   | = SaD |

---

1 For companies reporting under IFRS, no adjustments will be required for operating leases regarding the calculation of i) Scope-adjusted EBITDA; ii) funds from operations (FFO); iii) Scope-adjusted debt (SaD); and iv) Scope-adjusted interest. 
### FFO/SaD (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This measure compares an entity’s cash flow with its debt. It uses a lease-adjusted debt equivalent and deducts equity credit resulting from hybrid debt securities that display equity-like features. The long-term operating lease charge is capitalised as a multiple of rents.

### SaD/Scope-adjusted EBITDA (x)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SaD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope-adjusted EBITDA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This ratio compares an issuer’s debt payment obligations with its ordinary, unleveraged, untaxed cash flow before operating rent payments (EBITDA(R)). The measure uses a long-term operating, lease-adjusted debt equivalent and deducts equity credit resulting from hybrid debt securities that qualify as equity-like. Long-term operating lease charges are capitalised as a multiple of rents. This multiple is typically 8 but may vary depending on the specific industry the entity operates in and the location of the leased assets.

### FOCF/SaD (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This ratio compares an entity’s cash flow generation with debt levels.

### Scope-adjusted EBITDA interest cover (x)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope-adjusted EBITDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash interest paid plus the interest element of operating leases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This ratio compares ordinary, unleveraged, untaxed cash flow generation with its cost of financing. The ratio illustrates an entity’s ability to cover its cost of adjusted debt. It is predominantly applied to non-investment grade cases. The ratio is defined as EBITDA/Net cash interest cover and often modified for the lower range of the non-investment grade segment. It illustrates a company’s ability to pay its cash interest expenses.

### Liquidity (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liquidity measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free operating cash flow (t) + unrestricted cash and marketable securities (t-1) + unused committed bank facilities (t-1) + committed unused factoring lines (t-1) + liquid inventory (t-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term debt (t-1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This ratio indicates a company’s ability to pay its short-term debt using free operating cash flow, unrestricted cash and marketable security positions, unused committed bank facilities, unused committed factoring lines, and liquid inventory.

### 3.2. Specific considerations for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)

We apply the same analytical approach to SMEs as to large corporates, i.e. by focusing on cash flow and liquidity.

While the corporate rating methodology applies to all corporates, we recognise that SMEs have specific characteristics, which we incorporate into our rating analysis. These characteristics can be observed in their market position, management quality and corporate governance.

For SMEs, cash flow can be more volatile than for larger peers due to their smaller scale, making them more vulnerable to adverse market effects. We account for this by focusing more on liquidity when rating SMEs.
However, despite their size, SMEs may benefit from strong positions in their key markets, which can provide some cash flow stability. Therefore, we examine an SME’s positioning in their core markets in addition to their size.

Management quality and governance are particularly important when rating SMEs. Contrary to large entities, which are often listed and highly scrutinised by shareholders, an SME’s management quality and governance are generally less tightly controlled. Therefore, a specific rating driver we apply for SMEs is a record of solid strategy and management quality, as such factors can stabilise cash flow.

Although governance structure cannot drive the ratings upward, it is important when determining an SME issuer’s ratings. Adequate corporate governance is the minimum standard for rated entities; weak corporate governance, on the other hand, is likely to put downward pressure on the rating. We conduct an explicit corporate governance assessment for all corporate ratings (page 11).

4. Corporate debt rating

4.1. Long-term debt rating

Long-term debt instrument ratings reflect our opinion on an issuer’s creditworthiness with respect to its long-term debt instruments. These ratings are linked to the issuer rating and are determined through an upward or downward adjustment relative to the issuer rating.

Our rating approach depends on whether the issuer rating is i) BBB- or above (investment grade); or ii) below BBB- (non-investment grade).

4.2. Debt instrument ratings for investment grade issuers

For the ratings of guaranteed debt instruments, we take into account unconditional and irrevocable guarantees and the capacity of guarantors to accommodate the guaranteed debt instrument on a timely basis.\(^2\)

The ratings on senior unsecured debt and its investment grade issuer typically correspond, with recovery rates on the debt averaging 30% to 50%. This reflects the tendency among investment grade issuers to rank senior unsecured debt below material secured debt.

Instrument ratings for investment grade issuers depend on their debt structure and jurisdiction. In general:

- senior secured debt: one notch higher than the issuer rating
- senior unsecured debt: equal to the issuer rating
- subordinated debt: one to two notches lower than the issuer rating, and two notches lower for hybrid securities

The above are only guidelines, and we may deviate from them if: i) the issuer’s characteristics support the assumption that the enterprise value upon default could be materially different from historical levels; or ii) the issuer’s debt structure is atypical and we judge that the debt instrument rating requires a different approach.

4.3. Debt instrument ratings for non-investment grade issuers

We perform a customised recovery analysis when rating the long-term debt instruments of non-investment grade issuers and assume a hypothetical default situation.

This analysis establishes the recovery rates of debt instruments by taking into account the estimated value of claims available for creditors at the point of default (VCD), as well as the size and ranking of claims in the debt waterfall.

4.3.1 Estimated value of claims at default (VCD)

In order to determine the VCD, we first take the higher value of: i) the estimated enterprise value at default, assuming operations are a going concern after the default; and ii) the estimated enterprise value at default in a liquidation scenario (estimated liquidation value) with post-default operations that are not a going concern. This assumes that the preferred scenario is the one creating the most value for bondholders.

The value for the first scenario (going concern) is estimated by multiplying the likely EBITDA at default with the EBITDA multiple considered realistic at default. This multiplier is based on our assessment of the company’s competitive positioning and the industry

\(^{2}\) A guarantee will not change the seniority of a debt instrument. A senior unsecured obligation that benefits from a guarantee will retain its classification and not become a (senior) secured instrument.
in which it operates. The adequacy of an estimated proxy at a simulated hypothetical point in the future is therefore closely linked with the business risk profile assessment. The adequacy of the multiplier is likewise subject to the hypothesized prevailing multiples for issuers assumed to be defaulted in the future as well as investor appetite for distressed assets at the point of emergence from a default-driven situation such as through restructuring.

The value for the second scenario (liquidation) is estimated by aggregating asset values and assuming asset haircuts reflecting the liquidation status, thus assuming a similar asset structure to the one at default. Our calculation may include accounts receivables, inventory, and property, plant and equipment. Haircuts are based on, but not limited to, the issuer’s industry, the ability to convert certain assets to cash and counterparty credit quality. Haircuts also reflect analytical judgment on the marketability of assets.

A haircut is then applied to the higher of the two values, reflecting the estimated costs related to the administration of the default. This discounted value is the VCD.

### 4.3.2 Allocation of VCD to the waterfall of debt obligations

We determine the likely recovery rate for a defaulted debt instrument by allocating VCD to the debt instruments according to the waterfall of claims at the time of the rating.

Recovery rates are categorised from 0% to 100% as follows:

- **Excellent:** a recovery of 90%-100%
- **Superior:** 70%-90%
- **Above average:** 50%-70%
- **Average:** 30%-50%
- **Low:** 10%-30%
- **Very low:** 0%-10%

The instrument ratings are determined by adjusting the issuer rating upwards or downwards based on these recovery rates. This is applied as follows:

- **Excellent (90%-100%):** up to three notches above the issuer rating
- **Superior (70%-90%):** up to two notches above the issuer rating
- **Above average (50%-70%):** up to one notch above the issuer rating
- **Average (30%-50%):** instrument rating corresponds to the issuer rating
- **Low (10%-30%):** up to one notch below the issuer rating
- **Very low (0%-10%):** up to three notches below the issuer rating

The above guidelines apply to the large majority of non-investment grade issuers. However, the rating committee may deviate from these based on the issuer’s circumstances, the debt issue, or bankruptcy proceedings in the issuer’s jurisdictions. We also cap the rating at BBB for senior secured debt of non-investment grade issuers and BBB- for senior unsecured debt of non-investment grade issuers.

### 4.4. Short-term debt rating

#### 4.4.1 Framework for short-term debt instrument ratings

Short-term ratings usually apply to commercial paper or Billets de Trésorerie and to unsecured debt instruments maturing within 365 days in the European commercial paper market or 270 days in the US commercial paper market. Many large European non-financial corporates issue commercial papers in both markets.

Among the drivers of the short-term rating are the issuer’s fundamental long-term credit quality as reflected by its corporate issuer rating, the issuer rating’s stability (see section 4.4.3), and the issuer’s liquidity (see section 4.4.4).

#### 4.4.2 Short-term rating symbols and definitions

Our short-term ratings reflect our credit opinion on debt instruments with a maximum term of 365 days. Unlike our long-term issue ratings, short-term debt ratings do not incorporate the likely recovery of the debt instruments in a hypothetical default scenario.
Short-term ratings are assigned one of five levels: S-1+, S-1, S-2, S-3 and S-4.

4.4.3 General relationship between short-term and long-term rating scales
The issuer rating not only indicates the issuer’s relative credit quality but is also a long-term measure of its fundamental credit quality. As such it only implicitly reflects short-term credit quality, i.e. within the longer-term assessment of the issuer’s fundamental credit quality.

Although an issuer’s short-term rating correlates with its issuer rating, the relation between the two are not fixed. Low credit quality in the short term generally reduces long-term credit quality, whereas high short-term credit quality does not necessarily increase the issuer’s long-term credit quality.

When assigning short-term ratings, we assess the issuer’s fundamental long-term credit quality (as reflected in the issuer rating), the issuer’s liquidity position, and the stability of the long-term rating as reflected in the rating Outlook. The latter is particularly important for issues rated borderline between S-2, S-3 or S-4.

Downgrades from S-2 or S-3 might significantly worsen or even preclude access to capital markets (short-term funding). This makes issuers of these short-term debt instruments more reliant on liquidity. For further details, see Rating Definitions - Credit Ratings and Ancillary Services Scope Ratings.

4.4.4 Liquidity
In addition to the issuer rating and its stability, the short-term rating is also driven by the issuer’s liquidity, which indicates its ability to refinance commercial paper from both internal and external sources. It consists of the following:

1. The internally provided liquidity cover (%): coverage of short-term debt by the sum of internally generated cash flow, available unrestricted cash and marketable securities, and predictable proceeds from asset disposals, (see below);
2. The issuer's externally and internally provided liquidity cover (%): coverage of short-term debt by internally provided liquidity and contractually committed credit lines (page 18); and
3. The issuer's banking relationships and standing in the capital markets (page 18).

An issuer’s liquidity indicates its resilience to refinancing or liquidity risk. Most commercial paper investors hold the securities until maturity and then roll over with new issues by the same issuer. Therefore, maturing commercial paper is often refinanced by new issues.

Liquidity risk arises if investors are no longer willing to refinance maturing commercial paper. This situation could be unrelated to the issuer such as a general market contraction or market disruption; or be specific to the issuer, such as negative publicity, a deterioration of its credit quality, a deterioration of confidence in the issuer, expected downgrades, or lawsuits. If an issuer cannot refinance maturing commercial paper with new issues, it has to seek other ways to fulfill short-term debt obligations.

When assigning a short-term rating, we aim to minimise short-term rating fluctuations. We therefore focus on an issuer’s sustainable liquidity position, for example, by excluding one-off effects such as cash proceeds from unusual asset disposals. This analysis also incorporates an issuer’s financial policy and how well this has been implemented.

While we consider ‘externally and internally provided liquidity cover’ as the most important driver in our assessment of the liquidity position, there is no fixed weighting applied for the three key analytical elements listed above:

We assess an issuer’s liquidity position as:

- adequate, i.e. neutral in the overall assessment of short-term credit quality;
- better than adequate, i.e. a positive rating driver for short-term ratings considered borderline between two short-term ratings (crossover credits); or
- worse than adequate, i.e. a negative rating driver for crossover credits.

4.4.5 Internally provided liquidity cover
This measure indicates an issuer’s ability to repay its short-term debt (defined as debt maturing within 12 months, including commercial paper). The calculation includes: internally provided liquidity, i.e. free operating cash flow and the issuer’s unrestricted cash and marketable securities. We consider internally provided liquidity cover of 40% to 50% to be adequate, cover below 40%
as worse than adequate, and above 50% as better than adequate. In general, a short-term debt issuer is rated S-2 or better if we expect that a significant share of short-term debt will be covered by internal proceeds rather than external bank lines.

**Figure 8: Internally provided liquidity cover (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internally provided liquidity cover (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOCF (t) + unrestricted cash/cash equivalents (t-1) + marketable securities (t-1) + liquid inventories (t-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term debt (t-1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.6 **Externally and internally provided liquidity cover**

This measure indicates an issuer's ability to repay short-term debt using liquidity from both internal and external sources. This includes contractually committed bank lines specific to the commercial paper, or other bank lines for general business purposes.

The existence of external bank lines does not, however, guarantee that drawings can be made. For example, covenants could limit drawings in the event of a material adverse change. We therefore analyse the covenants for the committed credit lines and regularly monitor 'covenant headroom'. We also consider an issuer’s short-term financial policy as well as its track record in implementing this. We only include bank lines in our calculation if these are available to cover short-term debt.

Externally and internally provided liquidity cover of about 100% is considered adequate for the overall assessment of liquidity; below 100% is a negative driver; above 100% is seen as positive.

**Figure 9: Externally and internally provided liquidity cover (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Externally and internally provided liquidity cover (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOCF (t) + unrestricted cash and cash equivalents (t-1) + marketable securities (t-1) + unused committed bank facilities (t-1) + committed unused factoring lines (t-1) + liquid inventories (t-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term debt (t-1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We may apply discounts to the book or market value of such sources of liquidity depending on the asset type.

4.4.7 **Banking relationships and standing in the capital markets**

In terms of refinancing, issuers with well-established banking relationships are better placed than those with no such relationships. In addition, issuers with a high standing in the capital markets are more able to re-issue commercial paper, even upon a contraction of a specific market. Indicators of a company’s standing in the capital markets could be credit-default swap spreads or share price movements. Signs of good market access – and thus a high standing in the capital markets – include a historically high frequency and volume of debt issuances, and the diversity of market access. Our assessment of the liquidity position is outlined in Figure 10.
Figure 10: Components of an issuer’s liquidity position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liquidity position</th>
<th>Better than adequate (positive analytical driver)</th>
<th>Adequate (neutral analytical driver)</th>
<th>Worse than adequate (negative analytical driver)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internally provided liquidity cover</td>
<td>Above 50%</td>
<td>About 40% to 50%</td>
<td>Below 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally and externally provided liquidity cover</td>
<td>Above 100%</td>
<td>About 100%</td>
<td>Below 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking relationships and standing in the capital markets</td>
<td>More than five well-established bank relationships with highly reputable banks of strong credit quality; strong standing in the capital markets</td>
<td>Four to five well-established bank relationships with highly reputable banks of strong credit quality; medium standing in the capital markets</td>
<td>Fewer than four well-established bank relationships with highly reputable banks of strong credit quality; weak standing in the capital markets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Rating Outlook

A rating is accompanied by an Outlook which can be Stable, Positive or Negative. This indicates the most likely direction of the rating if it were to change in the next 12 to 18 months. A rating change is not automatic, however.

A rating change may occur if the issuer's business risk and financial risk profiles fall above or below our expectations. For example, if the issuer's financial profile is better than anticipated and we expect the improvement to be sustainable.

A Positive Outlook indicates that if a rating were to change, it would entail an upgrade; a Negative Outlook indicates a potential downgrade; and a Stable Outlook implies that we do not anticipate the rating to change over the next 12 to 18 months.

Outlooks apply to all long-term issuer and debt-instrument ratings. These are not explicitly provided with an instrument rating unless they differ from the Outlook on the issuer rating. There are no Outlooks on short-term issuer and instrument ratings.

6. Environmental, social and governance assessment

We implicitly capture general environmental, social and governance factors during the corporate rating process with the sole criteria of their material impact on credit quality. We conduct an explicit corporate governance assessment during the corporate rating process (see 3.1.3). For environmental factors we review factors such as resource management, product innovation, physical risks or efficiencies in production processes and would highlight any such factors if they have a material influence over the credit assessment.

We highlight social factors if they could have a material impact on the credit quality of an issuer. For social factors, we review factors such as labour management, safety, supply chains, and regulatory/reputational risks.

Sector-specific methodologies may define sector-specific ESG drivers if they are applicable to most issuers in a given sector.

Although our credit analysis incorporates ESG factors, they are often not an important risk driver of the actual rating. Therefore, in cases where ESG considerations are a significant driver of the rating assigned, we would only disclose the relevant risk and how our analysis accounted for it. An absence of such disclosures indicates that ESG considerations were not relevant to credit risk.