

Guidance | Criteria | Corporates | General:

Methodology And Assumptions: Liquidity Descriptors For Global Corporate Issuers

December 4, 2019

OVERVIEW AND SCOPE

1. Here S&P Global Ratings provides additional information and guidance relating to the application of its criteria "Methodology And Assumptions: Liquidity Descriptors For Global Corporate Issuers," published Dec. 16, 2014. This guidance document is intended to be read in conjunction with that criteria. For a further explanation of guidance documents, please see the description at the end of this article.

GUIDANCE

Key Quantitative Measures

2. The key indicators of a company's liquidity cushion are:
 - A/B: Liquidity sources (A) divided by uses (B)
 - A-B: Liquidity sources (A) minus uses (B)
3. When assessing both estimates, we evaluate monetary flows within sources and uses based on amounts generated or used over the timeframes identified by each of the liquidity descriptors. We evaluate monetary flows over a two-year period when calculating A/B and A-B for exceptional and strong liquidity, and a one-year period for adequate, less than adequate, and weak. When evaluating adequate liquidity, we could use a six-month period under certain situations, as outlined in paragraph 39 of the criteria.

ANALYTICAL CONTACTS

Michael P Altberg
New York
(1) 212-438-3950
michael.altberg
@spglobal.com

Jeanne L Shoesmith, CFA
Chicago
(1) 312-233-7026
jeanne.shoesmith
@spglobal.com

Alex P Herbert
London
(44) 20-7176-3616
alex.herbert
@spglobal.com

METHODOLOGY CONTACTS

Marta Castelli
Buenos Aires
(54) 114-891-2128
marta.castelli
@spglobal.com

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

Key Publication Information

- This article is related to "Methodology And Assumptions: Liquidity Descriptors For Global Corporate Issuers," published on Dec. 16, 2014.
- We may revise this guidance from time to time when market dynamics warrant reevaluating the variables we generally use in our analysis.

4. For companies in more volatile sectors, we assess the resiliency of liquidity through a cycle. If we do not believe the resulting descriptor reflects sustainable liquidity characteristics, we could adjust our liquidity assessment downward. For example, we could lower our liquidity assessment on a volatile company to strong from exceptional if we believe key quantitative measures typical of exceptional liquidity are not sustainable over the forecast period. This could especially be true if we believe there is a higher prospect of ratios weakening from the peak of an economic cycle.

Liquidity sources

5. **Cash and liquid investments.** When determining the cash to be included under sources (A), we use cash that will be available to cover monetary outflows. As a result, we may make haircuts to account for cash trapped overseas (for example, haircut for taxes payable upon repatriation of cash held abroad), apply a discount to lower-quality marketable securities, and exclude restricted cash held for specific purposes.
6. If we believe a company would use cash trapped at a foreign subsidiary to meet debt maturities or other liquidity uses at that foreign subsidiary, we would include this cash as a source of liquidity up to the amount of the corresponding use. We generally haircut the cash to be included under sources when a material proportion of a group's cash is held in a different part of the structure than where the debt is located, and we believe the cash may not be fully fungible within the group (due to the presence of minority shareholders, for example).
7. We do not exclude cash that the company needs to maintain to run the business and meet potential working capital requirements. Since working capital outflows are included under uses (B) of liquidity, system-related cash needed to run the business should be included in sources, along with items such as customer advances.
8. Investments should be able to be quickly liquidated without requiring deep discounts to their carrying value. This does not preclude long-term investments from being included. It does, however, exclude large stakes in non-liquid equity investments.
9. **Funds from operations (FFO).** We derive projected FFO from forecasted cash flow from operations before change in working capital and after lease payments, when assessing a company's liquidity. This differs from the FFO definition in our "Corporate Methodology: Ratios And Adjustments," used in our base-case forecasts, where adjusted FFO is reduced by the lease-depreciation component. This is because our quantitative liquidity analysis focuses on the monetary flows--the sources and uses of cash--that are the key indicators of a company's liquidity cushion. At the same time, we do not include lease repayments in debt maturities under uses of liquidity.
10. **Committed credit facilities.** When calculating sources of liquidity, we only include the undrawn, available portion of committed bank lines maturing beyond the specified time horizon for each liquidity descriptor. For example, when assessing liquidity as adequate, we only include a committed revolving credit facility as a source if it matured beyond the next 12 months. Similarly, given that our liquidity assessment looks out over two years when assessing liquidity as strong or exceptional, we only include a facility maturing beyond 24 months as a source of liquidity.
11. If, for example, a facility matured in 18 months, we could include the borrowing availability as a source of liquidity in year one, but exclude the amount in year two under the exceptional and strong descriptors (as well as include any drawn portions as debt maturities under uses of liquidity). This is because we do not assume an extension of bank lines--regardless of the company's perceived credit strength or issuer credit rating. For instance, whether the issuer credit

rating on the company is speculative grade or investment grade, we do not assume bank lines will be extended beyond the current stated maturity.

12. Additionally, we exclude revolver borrowing availability that we believe would be inaccessible due to covenant constraints. For revolving credit facilities with extension options, we include the extension period(s) under sources of liquidity only if the option is at the discretion of the borrower. If lenders have the option to terminate commitments at each extension point, we only include the borrowing availability under the facility up to the first extension date.
13. **Commercial paper and factoring programs.** While the existence of a commercial paper (CP) program can provide companies with alternative sources of short-term funding, such a program would not be considered a committed source of liquidity. Additionally, we do not require the presence of a committed facility to back up the full size of the CP program. For liquidity to be at least adequate, an issuer would need sources of liquidity (for example, committed facility and/or cash balances) to cover at least 100% of expected intra-year debt maturities, including CP, over the next 12 months.
14. Given that it can be difficult to identify outstanding CP at any point in time, when considering coverage, we may include our expectations for peak outstanding CP during the year as opposed to CP balances as of the last filing date, especially if we believe reported balances are not reflective of typical borrowing patterns.
15. Likewise, we do not consider factoring programs under sources of liquidity. Unlike asset-based lending (ABL) facilities, factoring is more of a sales transaction and not a loan. In addition, these transactions tend to be very short term. For this reason, we would not consider them a committed source of future liquidity over a 12-month period.
16. **Planned or potential future debt issuance.** We do not include potential future debt issuances as a source of liquidity because of the uncertainty of a company's ability to access debt markets in times of financial stress, even for investment-grade issuers. For instance, in the case of a proposed financing, with the intended use of proceeds to repay existing debt, we will assess a company's liquidity excluding the proposed financing until it's obtained or fully underwritten.
17. In this scenario, we would still include the existing debt maturity as a use of liquidity in our A/B and A-B calculations, if the debt matures within the corresponding liquidity horizon. The rationale is that our liquidity assessment is essentially a stress test against a sudden and severe loss of capital markets access availability. For companies with an anchor of at least 'bbb-' that meet certain characteristics, as outlined in paragraphs 38 and 39 of the criteria, we may use a shorter three- to six-month time horizon when assessing upcoming maturities.
18. For new issuers, while our ratings are prospective, we will not include proposed financing as a source in our liquidity calculations until the financing has been obtained or is fully underwritten. Similarly, we would not include rights issues as a source of liquidity for a company, unless the rights issue is irrevocably guaranteed (for example, an underwriter agrees to buy any securities not taken up by existing holders).
19. Given that we exclude proposed "best efforts" or potential financings as a source of liquidity, we also exclude from uses of liquidity acquisitions and other discretionary spending that are contingent on the successful issuance of new financing to support the proposed transaction.
20. **Shared facilities with captive finance entities.** When an issuer has a shared revolving credit facility with a captive finance entity, for purposes of calculating the issuer's liquidity sources, we net outstanding commercial paper at the captive from the revolver's borrowing availability. In these cases, we generally use an estimate of peak CP borrowings at the captive to avoid potentially overstating sources available to the issuer over a 12- to 24-month period.

21. **Asset divestitures.** We do not include asset sales as a source of liquidity unless they are contracted and proceeds will be received in the time period being measured under the liquidity descriptor (even when the disposed assets are reported under discontinued operations in a company's financial statements).

Liquidity uses

22. **Capital spending.** When assessing whether liquidity is at least adequate, capital expenditures should include:
- Maintenance capital spending (for example, expenses to maintain asset base),
 - Contracted expenditures, and
 - Expansionary projects with long lead times that cannot be easily stopped or that we believe management is committed to pursuing regardless of the liquidity position.
23. In these cases, the level of capital expenditures will be lower than estimates in our base-case forecast to determine an issuer's financial risk profile, particularly for companies that are pursuing discrete growth projects that have not been committed or can be easily curtailed in case of a need to preserve cash.
24. When assessing strong or exceptional liquidity, we include all forecasted capital expenditures over the next 24 months, including discretionary growth capital spending.
25. **Dividends and share repurchases.** Our liquidity uses include dividends and share repurchases that we expect under a stress scenario. Unlike other potential uses of liquidity, such as debt maturities or maintenance capital spending, we view dividends and share repurchases as more discretionary, although more so for the latter. For this reason, when evaluating a company's liquidity position, we may use a lower estimate of dividends and shareholder repurchases than in our base-case forecast based on our views of management and the company's track record in terms of shareholder returns and maintaining a certain minimum level of liquidity.
26. More specifically, we exercise judgment on the extent to which management would likely curtail dividends and share repurchases in a challenging economy. Companies' behavior in past recessions may be a useful indicator.
27. **Debt maturities and put options.** When evaluating uses of liquidity, we include all debt maturities over the liquidity horizon that are either recourse to the company, or nonrecourse that we believe the company will support even in times of stress. In cases where the debt includes a put option held by debtholders, we will consider the date of the put option the effective debt maturity--i.e., we will assume the debt will need to be repaid/refinanced on the day the put can be first exercised.
28. Under debt maturities, we also include outstanding CP maturities. Given that it can be difficult to identify outstanding CP at any point in time, we may include our estimates for peak outstanding CP during the year, as opposed to CP balances as of the last filing date.
29. We do not assume future debt refinancing or the rolling over of CP, regardless of the company's perceived credit strength or issuer credit rating. For instance, even for investment-grade issuers, we do not assume future debt maturities are refinanced with potential uncommitted capital raises. We could, however, consider a shorter time horizon (such as three to six months) when including debt maturities for stronger issuers, as outlined in paragraphs 38 and 39 of the criteria.
30. We do not treat repayments of leases as debt maturities (even if International Financial Reporting

Standard 16 shows them as such in the cash flow statement) because we already have reduced FFO by such lease cash outflow.

31. **Working capital outflows.** To assess forecasted working capital outflows for companies with material intra-year working capital requirements (for example, companies in seasonal businesses), we use forecasted peak working capital outflows, per paragraph 32 of the liquidity criteria. For seasonal businesses, in many cases the annual projection might indicate a working capital inflow or neutral working capital, even though there could be material intra-quarter or inter-quarter outflows throughout the year.
32. For example, if a company incurred a large working capital inflow in the fourth quarter, which more than offset working capital outflows during the first three quarters, we would use the peak working capital outflows within our A/B and A-B calculation. However, we avoid double-counting when the working capital outflow is already captured through our assumption of peak CP amount.
33. For companies that engage in reverse factoring--where accounts payable (AP) days are extended beyond the term customary for the industry and supply chain--we assess the likelihood and potential impact on liquidity of these arrangements ceasing to exist. In such a scenario, a company could be subject to material working capital outflows if AP days with its suppliers revert back to industry norms. Accordingly, we exclude these arrangements from sources of liquidity.
34. However, given that these arrangements are typically conducted through proprietary relationships with multiple banks, an immediate unwinding of these arrangements in a stress scenario would be unlikely. Accordingly, if we are unable to quantify the risks of unwinding over a specified time period, we may account for these risks under qualitative liquidity factors, such as a company's ability to withstand high-impact, low probability events and within its general risk management. This would be in addition to any debt adjustments we make for reverse factoring, as outlined in paragraph 11 of "Corporate Methodology: Ratios And Adjustments."
35. **Credit puts.** If a company has a credit put that causes debt acceleration or collateral posting due to a downgrade of three notches or less, we would include these requirements under uses of liquidity, per paragraph 30 of the liquidity criteria. For example, if a 'BBB' rated company had a credit put that was triggered with a downgrade to speculative grade, we would include the corresponding cash requirement under uses of liquidity. This is because the criteria evaluate a company's liquidity position during times of stress, when potential downgrades are more likely.
36. **Hybrid capital instruments.** Regardless of the equity content applied to a given hybrid security, for the purposes of our liquidity analysis, we attempt to capture any potential calls on cash under uses of liquidity. Such uses might include preferred dividends, maturities, or potential puts of the instrument back to the issuer.
37. When evaluating these potential uses, we include payments that are due and payable in cash. Where such uses can be met through the issuance of equity, we use judgment based on our view of management, our assessment of the factors involved, and the likelihood that the company will meet these obligations through equity issuance.
38. If the security is mandatorily convertible to equity, we would not include this under uses of liquidity. In addition, if payments have deferability features, we use judgment on whether we believe these obligations would be deferred, particularly in a stress scenario.
39. **Acquisitions.** We include contracted acquisitions as a use of liquidity, as outlined in paragraph 30 of the criteria. We exclude acquisitions that are not contracted or fully committed, but we could consider the impact of any break-up fees or other costs that will have to be funded regardless of whether the financing and acquisition closes. These costs would still be included under uses of

liquidity and, if large enough, could hurt a liquidity assessment.

40. **Collateral calls.** Analyzing potential liquidity requirements due to derivative contract positions is a complex topic. Potential liquidity calls depend on how far out-of-the-money the derivative contracts become and can be further exacerbated if a company is downgraded below a certain threshold. With the exception of commodity trading operations, we do not include such contingent cash calls in our liquidity assessment, given the uncertainty about whether any liability will occur.

Material deficit

41. For liquidity to be weak, an entity would display a material deficit in either A/B or A-B over the next 12 months. Generally, we view a material deficit as A/B well below 1x or A-B well below zero (relative to the company's size), but we also consider other qualitative factors when distinguishing between less than adequate and weak liquidity. As an example, this may be a result of insufficient sources to cover an upcoming debt maturity or an inability to meet fixed charges (interest and capital spending) over the next year.

Covenant headroom

42. Our liquidity assessment on all companies is forward-looking. As a result, the analysis emphasizes future covenant headroom, as opposed to headroom as of the latest quarter results. If we believe headroom will drop below 15% (see "Sector-Specific Considerations" for exceptions) over the next 12 months, then the company would fail to meet this characteristic normally associated with adequate liquidity.
43. However, failure to meet required covenant headroom does not necessarily translate into less than adequate liquidity. In paragraph 37, the criteria state that to have adequate liquidity, an entity must meet the ratio test for A/B and demonstrate at least four of the other six supportive characteristics. Therefore, we use analytical judgment to determine whether the decreased covenant headroom warrants a less than adequate assessment, or if a company has enough financial flexibility to offset this factor, such as a track record of waivers or strong interest coverage.
44. While the criteria address EBITDA-based maintenance covenants, we may include non-EBITDA-based covenants as part of our analysis using a similar framework. We may also factor in negative covenants, such as incurrence tests and distribution restrictions, to the extent that we believe these covenants could affect sources and uses. For example, if we believe a debt incurrence test would limit revolver availability in a stress scenario, we could haircut available revolver balances under sources of liquidity.

Qualitative Liquidity Factors

High-impact, low-probability events

45. In our qualitative analysis, we look at how high-impact, low probability events could affect a company's liquidity. Examples of such events include adverse litigation rulings, realistic disaster scenarios (natural or man-made catastrophic events), regulatory changes, cyber threats, loss of confidence in confidence-sensitive sectors, unwinding of reverse factoring arrangements, and extreme pricing variations in commodity sectors and sovereign risk. We consider events that are reasonable in context and size relative to the issuer.

46. Factors that could benefit a company's ability to withstand such events without or with only limited need for refinancing include the presence of excess liquidity, strong asset coverage, and strong discretionary cash flow generation. To achieve exceptional or strong liquidity, an issuer would need to absorb such events without refinancing, which would imply the ability to meet all debt maturities over the specified time horizon with internally generated cash flow and/or cash and revolver availability, even under a stress scenario.
47. Conversely, companies that have high debt leverage, low ratios of free operating cash flow (FOCF) to debt, tight financial covenants, and steep debt maturity walls could have difficulty absorbing high-impact, low-probability events without external capital.

Banking relationships

48. The nature of banking relationships is generally evidence-based. Under exceptional and strong liquidity, we characterize banking relationships as well established and solid, while the criteria cite sound relationships when characterizing adequate liquidity. We distinguish between these descriptors based on analytical judgment and consider the length and nature of relationships, as well as the turnover in the lender group.
49. Generally, a solid business relationship is key to determining whether a bank will stand by its client. The concentration of lenders and the dollar amount of participation can also be revealing. Dependence on just one or a few banks or less financially sound lenders heightens risks in times of economic stress.
50. Concentration of banking facilities also tends to increase the amount of an individual bank's participation. As the amount of the exposure increases, the bank may be more reluctant to meet its commitment. On the other hand, a company will not benefit if it spreads its banking business so thinly that it lacks a substantial relationship with any of its banks. Generally, we expect investment-grade issuers to have well-established and solid relationships with their banks, absent contrary evidence.
51. For speculative-grade entities, we might also consider the history of the banking relationship through periods of credit stress. Key inputs might include a company's historical ability to receive waivers or negotiate credit amendments on relatively favorable terms, though this does not ensure companies will be able to obtain future waivers, especially if they are repeatedly violating covenants. At the opposite end of the spectrum, any history of litigation between the issuer and lenders, or difficulty obtaining waivers and amendments, could be evidence of a strained banking relationship.

Standing in credit markets

52. To assess an issuer's standing in the credit markets, we may look at factors such as equity, debt, and credit default swaps (CDS) trading levels, where available, relative to peers and market averages. For example, lower-than-average debt trading levels or widening rating-adjusted spreads relative to market averages may indicate decreasing market confidence about a company's prospects and ability to meet its debt maturities. As a result, the company could have increased difficulty accessing the capital markets.
53. Other factors we consider include a company's frequency of debt issuance and market access, especially during times of company-specific stress or credit market turbulence.
54. For exceptional and strong liquidity assessments, we characterize standing in the credit markets as generally high, and for adequate liquidity, we view standing in the credit markets as satisfactory. We distinguish between these descriptors based on analytical judgment and mainly

consider the diversity of funding sources available to an entity.

55. Larger, investment-grade issuers that have access to both public and private debt markets have greater flexibility than companies that depend solely on private bank loans. In addition, we consider whether a company can borrow on an unsecured basis, has access to the commercial paper markets, and issues debt in multiple geographies. It is more costly to raise debt in the public bond markets and often requires a company to establish a track record among investors. These costs and information asymmetry issues sometimes make it impractical for smaller, speculative-grade issuers to raise small amounts of debt in public markets.
56. In addition, a speculative-grade company's access to the credit markets during times of stress, such as the financial crisis, is often a function of the capital market's appetite for risk. Accordingly, it would be rare that we would characterize a speculative-grade company as having a generally high standing in the credit markets, and even low-investment-grade companies may not have access to a diversity of funding sources required for this assessment.

Risk management assessment

57. In determining how prudent a company's risk management is, we look for evidence that management has historically anticipated potential company-specific or market-related setbacks and has taken necessary actions to ensure sufficient liquidity.
58. Under times of stress, such actions could include dividend cuts, suspension of share repurchases, or maintenance of minimum cash balances. This is particularly relevant for exceptional and strong assessments, where issuers are required to carry higher levels of excess liquidity even during times of stress. For example, when assessing liquidity, we would generally expect companies to be able to cover the full amount of dividends and share repurchases included in our base-case forecast, while still maintaining excess liquidity and achieving the required A/B and A-B measures under a stress case.
59. Our view of a company's financial policy is an important input when assessing its current and future liquidity position. For instance, we assess whether a company has historically had a higher risk appetite and an aggressive acquisition strategy that has strained its liquidity position, or whether it has taken actions to preserve liquidity in past downturns.
60. While we only include contractual acquisitions when calculating A/B and A-B, when evaluating qualitative factors, we focus more on a company's track record and our expectation for financial management. In this respect, the quantitative and qualitative factors under the liquidity criteria are meant to complement each other and produce a more comprehensive view of a company's future liquidity position.

Size and issuer credit strength

61. The various qualitative factors in the criteria help to identify strengths and weaknesses within a company's future liquidity position that numerical ratios might not fully capture. While there is no size bias in our liquidity assessment, generally, lower-rated entities might meet the quantitative requirements for strong or exceptional liquidity but fail to meet corresponding qualitative factors.
62. For example, smaller, speculative-grade companies with lower amounts of excess cash, and less access to the debt markets or alternative sources of liquidity, might not be able to withstand high-impact, low probability events or have a high standing in the credit markets. As a result, these issuers might be subject to more volatility among their sources of liquidity, including funds from operations, which is not fully captured in A/B and A-B ratios. Additionally, a well-established, solid relationship with banks can often be influenced by the size of the bank's commitment and

amount of business it does with the company.

63. For these reasons, although the criteria establish no rating threshold for liquidity, we typically expect:
- Instances of 'B+' and below rated issuers achieving liquidity descriptors higher than adequate to be rare.
 - Few companies to qualify for the exceptional category, and these entities to typically have issuer credit ratings of 'BBB-' or above.
64. Generally, when deciding between exceptional and strong liquidity, we use our analytical judgement to distinguish between many of the qualitative factors.

Sector-Specific Considerations

65. In our assessment of a company's liquidity, we also consider the impact of unique industry characteristics.

Agribusiness and commodity foods

66. Given the earnings volatility grain processors, meat processors, and produce companies experience, we have specified for these issuers a more stringent decline in EBITDA percentage for each liquidity category to the extent our cash flow forecasts are not already assuming a downside scenario.
67. The EBITDA declines companies would have to withstand and still have defined sources cover defined uses are as follows for each liquidity descriptor:
- Exceptional: Positive liquidity sources minus uses (A-B), even if forecasted EBITDA declines by 60%.
 - Strong: Positive A-B, even if forecasted EBITDA declines by 50%.
 - Adequate: Positive A-B, even if forecasted EBITDA declines by 30%.
 - Less than adequate: A-B of about zero or below if forecasted EBITDA declines by about 15%.
 - Weak: A/B or A-B reflecting a material deficit over the next 12 months.
68. For calculating the liquidity uses for companies with significant commodity trading activities (more than 10% of expected normalized EBIT, EBITDA, or gross margin), we apply the same adjustments for ARMI (adjusted readily marketable inventories) as we do for commodities traders (see paragraphs 86 and 87 of "Commodities Trading Industry Methodology," published on Jan. 19, 2017).

Agricultural cooperatives

69. To calculate liquidity uses for cooperatives with significant commodity trading activities (more than 10% of expected normalized EBIT, EBITDA, or gross margin), we apply the same adjustments for ARMI as we do for commodities traders (see paragraphs 86 and 87 of "Commodities Trading Industry Methodology").

Health care equipment

70. Health care equipment companies generally have more stable revenues and profitability than most other corporate issuers. Therefore, we may assess a covenant cushion of 10% as the minimum for adequate liquidity, rather than our standard 15%, provided other aspects of the company's liquidity meet our criteria for adequate liquidity.

Homebuilder and real estate developers

71. One supplementary metric we consider useful in assessing homebuilders' liquidity is cash plus inventory/unadjusted debt. In our experience, this metric has been important for lenders and other constituents, and where lenders have viewed this measure as relatively high, it has enhanced a homebuilder's ability to raise capital.
72. We believe that when a company is viewed as being on the cusp between two liquidity descriptors and has higher-than-average cash plus inventory/unadjusted debt compared with similarly constituted peers, that helps support the better liquidity assessment. However, in the case of a nonresidential developer, given that its inventory is typically less liquid (and the greater potential for inventory to suffer value erosion in a downturn), we do not consider this measure as pertinent.
73. In considering the liquidity of a non-residential real estate developer, we generally assume that investment related to properties under construction or under contract with its third-party builders will not be deferred or curtailed.
74. Also, given the high capital requirements related to development projects, a key qualitative factor is the extent to which a company has well-established, solid relationships with construction lenders and a high standing in the credit markets. As part of this assessment, we consider the terms and conditions of existing construction loans, including guarantees and recourse provisions, the circumstances under which loans could be called, and how potential cost overruns and completion delays are provided for.
75. Some homebuilders and developers operate in seasonal markets, which can lead to substantial intra-year working capital requirements. For these companies, we treat forecasted intra-year peak working capital outflows as a use of cash, in accordance with our global corporate criteria.
76. In some jurisdictions, homebuilders and developers must provide letters of credit and/or surety bonds for certain performance-related obligations (for example, to municipalities, government agencies, and utilities related to the construction of roads, sewers, and other infrastructure). If unable to obtain letters of credit and surety bonds from third parties, the company must provide cash collateral, reducing cash available for other liquidity uses. If we expect that a company will have to post cash collateral, we treat this as a use of cash in our liquidity assessment.
77. Our liquidity criteria specify certain tests for defining each liquidity category. Because we view the homebuilder/developer industry as volatile, we apply standards that are tougher than those we utilize for most other industries in determining the following liquidity assessments:
 - Exceptional. Our corporate liquidity criteria indicate positive A-B, even if forecasted EBITDA were to decline by 50%. We have raised this to 70% for homebuilders/developers. Also, in our corporate liquidity framework, covenant leeway must be sufficient to sustain at least a 50% decline in EBITDA. We have raised this to 70% for homebuilders/developers.
 - Strong: Our corporate liquidity framework indicate positive A-B, even if forecasted EBITDA were to decline by 30%. We have raised this to 50% for homebuilders/developers. Also, in our corporate liquidity framework, covenant leeway must be sufficient to sustain at least a 30%

decline in EBITDA. We have raised this to 50% for homebuilders/developers.

- Adequate: Our corporate liquidity criteria indicate positive A-B, even if forecasted EBITDA were to decline by 15%. We have raised this to 30% for homebuilders/developers. Also, in our corporate liquidity framework, covenant leeway must be sufficient to sustain at least a 15% decline in EBITDA. We have raised this to 30% for homebuilders/developers.
- Less than adequate. In the case of homebuilders/developers, for liquidity to be assessed as less than adequate, there must be positive A-B, even if forecasted EBITDA were to decline by 20%, and there must be covenant leeway sufficient to sustain at least a 20% decline in EBITDA.

78. These EBITDA leeway standards are most relevant in the midpoint to peak of a real estate cycle as sales growth trajectories (up or down) are moderate and internally generated cash can fund most inventory replenishment. EBITDA can be negligible at the bottom of a cycle, so further stressing this metric is typically not meaningful.
79. In jurisdictions (such as China, for example) where homebuilders and developers operate a presale model that involves a significant timing mismatch between non-escrowed, unrestricted cash receipts (cash flow) and revenue recognition (income), we adapt our liquidity analysis in two ways:
 - We calculate cash flow from operations (CFO) using the direct cash flow method (rather than calculating FFO by adjusting EBITDA).
 - We run the stress scenarios provided for in paragraph 15 of the criteria based on cash EBITDA, as explained below.
80. For homebuilders and developers in these jurisdictions, we forecast CFO by summing cash receipts from sales, rental income, and other cash-based operating inflows, and deducting construction costs; selling, general, and administrative expenses; tax; interest expenses; and other cash-based operating outflows. We also include committed land expenditure as a use of liquidity.
81. This method allows us to reflect more accurately actual operating conditions since, in these jurisdictions, the accounting practices of revenue recognition at the delivery of completed property can cause distortions because FFO derived from EBITDA would lag by a number of years. As per the criteria, FFO and working capital variations are either sources or uses of funds, and calculating CFO using the direct method is the same as calculating FFO using our usual method and adding or subtracting working capital variations.
82. Likewise, in these jurisdictions, to apply the stress test described above, we calculate cash EBITDA by starting from the calculated CFO and adding back working capital variation, interest, and taxes.

Midstream energy

83. In the more stable subsectors of midstream energy, such as interstate pipelines and highly contracted storage assets, we allow for more lenient ratios relative to the general guidelines. Specifically, to meet our definition of adequate liquidity, we consider a sources-to-uses ratio of 1.1x, instead of the standard 1.2x. We also consider covenant cushions of 10% instead of the standard 15%.
84. For subsectors with more meaningful volume and price risks, such as the larger diversified midstream energy companies and the gathering, processing, and fractionation sector, we use the benchmarks outlined in our general liquidity criteria.

Oil refining and marketing

85. Working capital constitutes a significant use of liquidity for many refiners, and needs can change within a year and even within a month. But supply and offtake intermediation agreements may partially offset such swings.
86. Because we view refining and marketing companies' earnings and cash flows as relatively volatile, we generally apply more stringent standards. Specifically:
 - To have adequate liquidity, refining companies' liquidity sources must exceed uses even if forecasted EBITDA declines by 30%.
 - To have strong liquidity, sources must exceed uses even if forecasted EBITDA declines by 50%.
 - To have exceptional liquidity, sources must exceed uses even if forecasted EBITDA declines by 67%.
87. However, if we project trough-like market conditions for the following year, we do not apply this harsher standard, but rather the standards in the general liquidity criteria.

Real estate

88. Because we view real estate companies as exceptionally stable, we use the following guidelines for the EBITDA declines companies would have to withstand for each of the liquidity descriptors:
 - Exceptional: 30%
 - Strong: 15%
 - Adequate: 10%
 - Less than adequate: 5%
 - Weak: --
89. In applying the global corporate liquidity criteria to real estate companies, we generally treat real estate investment trusts' (REITs') common dividends as a use of cash, given the relative inflexibility of REITs' dividend payout policies. We generally do not include maturities related to nonrecourse property-level secured debt--such as minority-owned joint ventures and properties included in commercial mortgage-backed securitizations--as a use of cash unless we have a specific expectation that the company will support this debt.
90. In the real estate sector, companies regularly walk away from the debt of underperforming properties, without incurring the market stigma such an action might create in other sectors. However, we will only exclude the debt of ailing affiliates from our liquidity calculations if we believe the failure to support the affiliate will not limit the issuer's access to capital markets.
91. While our cash flow and leverage ratio calculations incorporate all debt (including nonrecourse, property-level debt), we exclude nonrecourse property-level debt from our calculation of uses of liquidity for the real estate sector. This is based on our expectation that performing properties will refinance their nonrecourse debt, or that the REIT can dispose of or walk away from underperforming properties and it will not have to support associated nonrecourse debt.
92. In the real estate industry, companies may have substantial unencumbered assets, which can be a critical source of financial flexibility, given the very large and liquid market for property-specific mortgages. If we view a company as being on the cusp between two liquidity descriptors, the

amount of unencumbered assets compared with potential liquidity uses can be a deciding factor.

Regulated utilities

93. The relative certainty of financial performance by utilities operating under relatively predictable regulatory monopoly frameworks makes these utilities more attractive to investors, even in times of economic stress and market turbulence, than conventional industrials. Also, recognizing the cash flow stability of regulated utilities, we allow more discretion when calculating covenant headroom. When determining whether utilities with business risk profiles of at least satisfactory meet our definition of adequate liquidity, we use slightly lower thresholds:
- A ratio of sources to uses higher than 1.1x (compared with the standard 1.2x);
 - Positive sources over uses even if forecast EBITDA declines by 10% (compared with a 15% decline for corporate issuers); and
 - No covenant breach even if forecast EBITDA declines by 10% (compared with a 15% decline for corporate issuers).

Transportation cyclical

94. Since we view cyclical transportation companies' earnings and cash flows as relatively volatile, we generally apply more stringent standards when assessing liquidity:
- Adequate liquidity: Cyclical transportation companies must be able to sustain an EBITDA decline of more than 30% (rather than the standard 15%), with liquidity sources still exceeding liquidity uses.
 - Strong liquidity: Cyclical transportation companies must be able to sustain an EBITDA decline of more than 50% (rather than the standard 30%), with liquidity sources still exceeding liquidity uses.
 - Exceptional liquidity: Cyclical transportation companies must be able to sustain an EBITDA decline of more than 75% (rather than the standard 50%).
95. However, if we project trough-like market conditions over the next year, we do not apply these harsher standards, but rather the standards in the general liquidity criteria. Also, we do not apply these harsher standards for companies that are consistently and materially less cyclical than other companies in this industry--either because of the subsegments they operate in or because of their specific characteristics. Examples include:
- Shipping companies in the U.S. domestic market whose regulations do not permit competition from non-U.S. companies and that have long-term contracts with their customers;
 - Other shipping companies that generate a high proportion of their revenues from long-term contracts with minimum volume commitments and fixed pricing, such as certain companies that operate natural gas tankers serving utilities;
 - Bus companies that operate under government-granted franchises that greatly limit competitive entry; and
 - Other bus companies that have a strong market position, significant scale, and largely flexible operating costs.

Financial market infrastructures

96. Within the financial market infrastructures (FMI) sector, international central securities depositories (ICSDs) typically have large varying amounts of deposits that appear on their balance sheets but are dedicated to client settlement activity and are invested in highly liquid, highly creditworthy instruments, rather than being available to support the corporate activity of the ICSD. Similarly, clearinghouse (CCP) balance sheets substantially consist of client-related assets and liabilities, such as initial margins and the replacement value of some types of unsettled trades.
97. Consistent with our leverage analysis, for ICSDs, CCPs, and groups that own CCPs or ICSDs, we do not include clearing or settlement assets or obligations, or client deposits and related investments (for ICSDs) as sources or uses in our liquidity assessment. Instead, we assess the adequacy of stressed liquidity resources for clearing and settlement purposes in our analysis of clearing and settlement risk.
98. "Clearing obligations" typically refer to clearing liabilities that are usually non-debt and may include initial or variation margin postings. "Settlement obligations" typically refer to member deposits lodged at ICSDs. Similarly, we tend to exclude the movement in these assets and liabilities from our cash flow analysis.

Companies that borrow from Brazil's Banco Nacional de Desenvolvimento Economico e Social (BNDES)

99. For all rated entities in Brazil that have any group members that borrow from BNDES, such borrowings can expose the group to risk related to cross-default clauses. That is because all BNDES loans contain cross-default clauses by virtue of the BNDES rules, or general terms and conditions. In case an entity defaults on a BNDES obligation, BNDES may immediately accelerate the debt it has lent to entities that are members of the same economic group as the defaulting entity. For entities related to a government, BNDES may accelerate debt at the related entities, though not debt contracted directly by a government.
100. The BNDES cross-default clause creates potential liquidity risk, particularly for groups where weaker subsidiaries borrow from BNDES. In case of financial stress at a subsidiary that has borrowed from BNDES, the group has the choice of:
 - Supporting the subsidiary sufficient to avoid default,
 - Supporting the subsidiary to avoid default on only BNDES debt, or
 - If it does not support the subsidiary, it has the risk of acceleration on all group BNDES debt--essentially, BNDES holds a contingent put option on all group BNDES debt, with a trigger equivalent to the default risk of the weakest BNDES borrower in the group.
101. When assessing a group's liquidity, we take into account the BNDES financings within the group that may need to be supported by the group/parent and treat such financing as an immediate use of liquidity. Such financings would be those of the entities that we consider weak links of the group with respect to the BNDES cross-default clause. In particular, these entities are not core or highly strategic to the group, their debt is material to the group, and:
 - Their SACPs are 'bb+' or lower and are lower than the GCP (prior to considering the impact of such iteration on the GCP),
 - Their ICRs are 'BB+' or lower and are lower than the GCP, or

- Their ICRs are 'BBB-' and are lower than the GCP, on a judgmental basis.

¹⁰². For example, we may add a special liquidity stress for 'BBB-' rated subsidiaries that are entities not otherwise included in the standard GCP liquidity analysis for sources and uses due to being off-balance-sheet and/or due to higher transition risk (such as bank subsidiaries, which rely on confidence-sensitive funding). If the SACP or ICR of a group member cannot be determined, for instance due to insufficient information about that group member, the BNDES debt of such entity should also be included in the group's liquidity analysis.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Related Criteria

- Methodology And Assumptions: Liquidity Descriptors For Global Corporate Issuers, Dec. 16, 2014

Related Research

- Criteria And Guidance: Understanding The Difference, Dec. 15, 2017

This report does not constitute a rating action.

This article is a guidance document for Criteria (Guidance Document). Guidance Documents are not Criteria, as they do not establish a methodological framework for determining Credit Ratings. Guidance Documents provide guidance on various matters, including: articulating how we may apply specific aspects of Criteria; describing variables or considerations related to Criteria that may change over time; providing additional information on non-fundamental factors that our analysts may consider in the application of Criteria; and/or providing additional guidance on the exercise of analytical judgment under our Criteria.

Our analysts consider Guidance Documents as they apply Criteria and exercise analytical judgment in the analysis and determination of Credit Ratings. However, in applying Criteria and the exercise of analytic judgment to a specific issuer or issue, analysts may determine that it is suitable to follow an approach that differs from one described in the Guidance Document. Where appropriate, the rating rationale will highlight that a different approach was taken.

Copyright © 2019 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.