

Criteria | Corporates | Industrials:

Key Credit Factors For The Oil Refining And Marketing Industry

March 27, 2014

(Editor's Note: This article is no longer current after the publication of "Sector-Specific Corporate Methodology," April 4, 2024, except in jurisdictions that require local registration of those criteria.)

1. These criteria present S&P Global Ratings' methodology and assumptions for its key credit factors for the oil refining and marketing industry.
2. This paragraph has been deleted.

SCOPE OF THE CRITERIA

3. For the purpose of this article "oil refining" means companies that derive a majority of their operating cash flow from the process of refining crude oil into various oil-related refined products such as gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel. By "marketing," we mean companies that are wholesale suppliers of refined products, such as gasoline and diesel, to retail outlets (gas stations). For oil refining and marketing companies that own retail operations and convenience stores that sell refined products, we apply the guidance for the retail and restaurant industry outlined in "Guidance: Corporate Methodology." Operating cash flow is our preferred method of determining which companies are subject to these criteria, but we will use revenues if operating cash flow data are not available.
4. These criteria are also applicable in assessing the business risk of refining and marketing (also known as "downstream") operations of integrated oil and gas companies that generally derive the majority of their earnings from oil and gas exploration and production ("upstream") businesses and that also typically have "midstream" businesses, which include the transportation, storage, wholesale marketing, and trading of oil, natural gas, and refined products. To the extent that separate revenue or segment-level operating cash flow information to distinguish these business lines is not available (as is sometimes the case with multinational, integrated oil and gas companies), we will use other available operating data such as refinery capacity, refinery utilization, and refined product sales.

SUMMARY OF THE CRITERIA

5. These criteria describe S&P Global Ratings' methodology for analyzing oil refining and marketing companies by applying "Corporate Methodology."
6. When we assess an industry's various risks, we apply our criteria for assessing industry risk (see

ANALYTICAL CONTACTS

Michael V Grande
New York
+ 1 (212) 438 2242
michael.grande
@spglobal.com

Per Karlsson
Stockholm
(46) 8-440-5927
per.karlsson
@spglobal.com

METHODOLOGY CONTACTS

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

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

"Methodology: Industry Risk"). In assessing an oil refining and marketing company's competitive position, we put particular emphasis on the following factors:

- Ability to source cost-advantaged feedstocks,
 - The refinery's complexity (i.e., its ability to process less-expensive crude oil feedstocks into value-added refined products),
 - Cost position, and
 - Operating flexibility and efficiency.
7. In our assessment of the financial risk profile, we consider industry- or company-specific working capital characteristics (including seasonality and outflows/inflows over the business cycle) and their effect on core ratios such as debt to EBITDA and on supplemental ratios including cash flow coverage (EBITDA to interest) and/or free operating cash flow (FOCF) to total debt.
 8. This paragraph has been deleted.
 9. This paragraph has been deleted.

METHODOLOGY

Part I--Business Risk Analysis

Industry risk

10. The industry risk is assessed by applying S&P Global Ratings' criteria for assessing industry risk (see "Methodology: Industry Risk"). For the most recent assessments for the oil refining and marketing industry, see "Industry Risk Assessments Update," which is updated from time to time.
11. This paragraph has been deleted.
12. This paragraph has been deleted.
13. This paragraph has been deleted.
14. This paragraph has been deleted.
15. This paragraph has been deleted.
16. This paragraph has been deleted.
17. This paragraph has been deleted.
18. This paragraph has been deleted.
19. This paragraph has been deleted.
20. This paragraph has been deleted.
21. This paragraph has been deleted.
22. This paragraph has been deleted.
23. This paragraph has been deleted.
24. This paragraph has been deleted.
25. This paragraph has been deleted.
26. This paragraph has been deleted.

Country risk

27. Country risk plays a critical role in determining all ratings on companies in a given country. Country-related risk factors can have a substantial effect on company creditworthiness, directly and indirectly. In assessing country risk for a refining and marketing company, we use the same methodology that we use for other corporate issuers (see "Corporate Methodology"). The country risk assessment is a key factor in our business risk analysis for corporate issuers and covers the broad range of economic, institutional, financial market, and legal risks that arise from doing business in a specific country.
28. Beyond the risks captured in our country risk assessment, some factors can lead to major credit variations among refining industries in different countries and in some cases, among regional markets within countries. These factors include:
- The extent to which the market is served by domestic refining capacity, and the nature of domestic refiners' access to various types or grades of crude oil;
 - The nature of the refined product transportation and wholesale and retail distribution systems, including control of retail sales outlets;
 - The government's role in local environmental regulations;
 - The nature of end-use demand, such as the size and growth rate of the passenger- and commercial-vehicle stock in operation, the intensity of vehicle usage, and the composition of the local industrial fuel oil user base;
 - The extent to which the market is open to refined product imports, given the state of transportation infrastructure (e.g., import terminals, pipelines) and trade barriers; and
 - The maturity of the national or regional economy, prospects for GDP growth, prospects for growth in the key energy-consuming sectors of the economy, and the extent to which the economy is subject to cycles and shocks.
29. We capture the effect of these country- or region-specific industry risks in our assessment of a company's competitive position.
30. We generally determine exposure to country risk using revenues, as this information is consistently available. However, if country exposure by EBITDA or assets is available and indicative of a materially different country exposure profile, we may use EBITDA or assets instead. For example, if profit margins are materially higher in one region because government policies insulate the refiners from foreign competition, EBITDA would be more appropriate. In certain cases, we apply a "weak-link" approach to refining companies that have exposure to more than one country (see "Corporate Methodology").

Competitive position (including profitability)

31. Under our global corporate criteria, we assess a company's competitive position as (1) "excellent," (2) "strong," (3) "satisfactory," (4) "fair," (5) "weak," or (6) "vulnerable." In assessing the competitive position for oil refining and marketing companies, we review the following components:
- Competitive advantage;
 - Scale, scope, and diversity;
 - Operating efficiency; and

- Profitability.
32. We assess each of the first three components as (1) "strong," (2) "strong/adequate," (3) "adequate," (4) "adequate/weak," or (5) "weak." We assess profitability separately by analyzing two subcomponents: the level of profitability, and the volatility of profitability.
 33. After evaluating the first three components, we determine the preliminary competitive position assessment by ascribing a specific weight to each component. The applicable weightings will depend on the company's Competitive Position Group Profile (CPGP).
 34. The CPGP assigned to oil refining and marketing companies we rate is "Commodity Focus/Scale Driven," as they have little product differentiation, if any, and compete primarily on cost of feedstock and price of finished products. We weight the first three components of the competitive position as follows: competitive advantage (10%); scale, scope, and diversity (55%); and operating efficiency (35%).
 35. **Competitive advantage.** Competitive advantage is generally of limited importance in our analysis of oil refiners and marketing companies. Refiners buy and sell commodities that have little, if any, competitive edge or profitability difference due to product differentiation or brand name. We generally assess this factor as "adequate," but it may be stronger or weaker in limited circumstances.
 36. An oil refining and marketing company that we believe has a "strong" or "strong/adequate" competitive advantage is typically integrated with other business lines (e.g., midstream or retail) that extend its basic refining operations and enable the company to demonstrate higher or less volatile profitability over its entire operations than would otherwise be the case.
 37. A company that we believe has a "weak" or "adequate/weak" competitive advantage typically has limited integration with other business lines and competes mainly against larger, diversified entities, particularly if it is in countries where refining operations are subsidized, placing independent refiners at a disadvantage.
 38. **Scale, scope, and diversity.** In assessing the scale, scope, and diversity of an oil refining and marketing company, we consider:
 - Total refining capacity;
 - Number of refineries and degree of reliance on a single refinery to generate earnings;
 - Geographic footprint (for instance feedstock supply diversity, specifically from a logistics standpoint), and access to attractive demand markets;
 - Complexity and product mix; and
 - Degree of midstream/downstream integration and extent of marketing operations.
 39. Scale (as an indicator of market position) is an important aspect of a refining and marketing company's competitive position. For example, a company with a large total capacity base, which we define as at least 500,000 barrels per day (bpd), can achieve economies of scale or synergies by spreading their overhead costs over more production volume than can companies with a smaller capacity base. Also, large refining companies are sometimes able to negotiate more competitive purchase contracts for crude oil and other raw materials than smaller companies can. Ultimately, larger scale should contribute to lower unit production costs. And the relative attractiveness of the markets in which the refining company competes (for example, in terms of demand for high-value-added products and the extent of competition with other producers), the diversity of those markets, and the refining company's market position with respect to product mix are key determinants of its profit potential and exposure to downside risks.

40. The number of refineries a company operates and the overall size of the capacity base are significant factors in a refinery's scale, scope, and diversity assessment. Having operations spread over at least three different facilities minimizes the potential downside of operating hazards. Operating multiple refineries also indicates geographic or market diversity. In addition, refining companies with high production diversity should over time be able to benefit from higher operating rates than less diversified refiners.
41. Market conditions may vary considerably across regions and countries. We consider the diversity of the geographic markets in which a company competes, including the location and regional concentration of its refining and marketing assets. If assets are concentrated in one region, offsetting factors to this could be the relative attractiveness of supply/demand characteristics, crude feedstock options, and access to markets with strong demand for refined products. A small-scale refinery may be highly profitable if it has an entrenched or niche position (as reflected in pricing power) in a market that is insulated from competition. In addition, being able to switch between serving domestic and export markets as demand and pricing conditions fluctuate can be a distinct advantage.
42. Crude oil typically accounts for well over 80% of a refinery's cash costs, and the mix of crude oil sourced by a refining company is a key aspect of its competitive profile. Related to this, "complexity"--the refinery's ability to process less-expensive crude oil feedstocks (heavier and higher-sulfur-content crude oils) into value-added products--is an important consideration. Light, sweet crudes are generally more expensive than heavy, sour crudes because the former require less treatment and produce a slate of products with a greater percentage of high-priced refined products (such as gasoline, kerosene, and jet fuel) than heavy, refined products (asphalt and residual fuel oil). Therefore, the more complex the refinery and more flexible the feedstock slate, the better-positioned the refinery generally is to take advantage of the differential between heavy sour and light sweet crude prices. (Less complex refineries generally consist of simple distillation and desulfurization capacities.)
43. In making comparisons among facilities and companies, we use indices compiled by third-party sources, including the Nelson Complexity Index. Complexity does not provide absolute protection against adverse market conditions. The financial performance of more complex facilities depends on the price differential between low-quality and high-quality crude oil, which can change depending on global production. On balance, though, we consider complexity to be a competitive advantage, and we expect companies with highly complex refineries to have better and more stable profitability than others over time.
44. Refining and marketing companies that have midstream and downstream operations typically have greater flexibility in sourcing different types of crude oil, which minimizes feedstock costs and enables the refinery to more readily bring its finished products to market. Downstream integration and diversification may include participation in oil and gas common-carrier pipelines with regulated tariffs, ownership of logistics networks, and integration into high-value-added petrochemicals. Logistics networks could be extensive, supported by a fuel marketing business that may encompass transportation, distribution, and retail operations (such as a chain of branded gas stations).
45. An oil refining and marketing company with a "strong" or "strong/adequate" scale, scope, and diversity assessment typically is characterized by a combination of:
 - Large scale (usually at least 500,000 bpd), based on total refining capacity;
 - Having at least three different refineries, and the company is not overly reliant on any one asset to generate cash flow;
 - A geographically diversified asset base, or if assets are concentrated regionally, they are in

markets with attractive supply/demand characteristics marked by advantageous crude feedstock options and access to demand for premium refined products;

- A high degree of complexity and value-added product mix; and
- Downstream integration from an established midstream or retail network.

46. Typically, a company we assess as "strong" would meet all or all but one of the above characteristics; for "strong/adequate," it would meet at least three.
47. A company with a "weak" or "adequate/weak" scale, scope, and diversity assessment typically is characterized by a combination of:
- Small scale (usually less than 500,000 bpd), based on total refining capacity;
 - Few (or fewer than three) refineries;
 - One market or closely correlated markets served by several competitors, and no market advantage in terms of low-cost feedstock or refined product premiums;
 - Low complexity and low-value finished products; and
 - Limited or no midstream or downstream integration.
48. Typically, a company we assess as "weak" would meet all or most of the above characteristics; for "adequate/weak," it would meet at least three.
49. **Operating efficiency.** In assessing operating efficiency for an oil refining and marketing company, we consider:
- Operating and processing costs, including age of the refinery, retrofitting or upgrades to equipment, and fuel costs, which can vary by region;
 - Utilization rates;
 - Operating flexibility relative to that of its peers;
 - Unplanned outages; and
 - Ability to source feedstock and market product.
50. Among the operating and processing costs we consider (excluding raw material costs), energy is the dominant component. Companies with access to low-cost natural gas (as in the U.S. presently) may have a significant cost advantage over companies that must use fuel oil. In considering processing costs, we calculate cash operating expenses per barrel of throughput. Processing costs vary considerably depending on complexity, so it is most meaningful to compare peer companies with similar costs in this regard.
51. In assessing cost position, we consider the age of a company's refineries, as new refineries are generally more efficient and reliable than old ones. However, some well-maintained old facilities have undergone such extensive retrofitting that their age is not an appreciable disadvantage. Thus, ongoing operating results in these circumstances are a better gauge of cost-competitiveness than age.
52. The size of a company's individual refineries is also important in the cost position. Large-scale refineries (which we view as having at least 150,000 bpd of capacity) are typically the most efficient. Usually, such large-scale refiners benefit from economies of scale and often have investments in hydrocrackers and cokers to improve the yield of high-value-added products.
53. The high-fixed-cost nature of the refining business means refining companies must generally

maintain high utilization rates to keep unit fixed costs low and achieve satisfactory profitability. In assessing operating efficiency, we compare peer companies based on their disclosed operating rates to understand how these rates are defined and circumstances surrounding major unplanned outages.

54. Apart from its relevance to market position, location can be another key determinant of a refining company's cost-competitiveness and operating flexibility. The closer a refinery is to its crude supply and end users, the lower its all-in feedstock and transport costs. Landlocked refineries may benefit from their insulation from waterborne imports but have the disadvantage of limited access to other end markets and few options in sourcing crude oil feedstocks. On the other hand, coastal refineries may have much greater flexibility in sourcing relatively low-cost, waterborne feedstocks and in exploiting sales opportunities in export markets but may also face more competition from waterborne imports in their home territories.
55. Some refining and marketing companies maintain extensive proprietary crude oil and refined product pipelines, giving them a significant and defensible advantage over regional peers in feedstock sourcing and marketing. For example, a refining company that owns its own pipeline can direct products to the market that offers the greatest return.
56. Given the potential for significant operating hazards, refining companies commonly maintain extensive third-party property and casualty insurance coverage, including business interruption protection. We believe standard insurance provides incomplete protection against operating hazards. For example, coverage for hurricane damage is usually limited, and coverage for terrorism risks typically contains very broad exclusions. As a result of market conditions, premiums and deductibles for certain insurance products could escalate over time, becoming uneconomical.
57. An oil refining and marketing company with a "strong" or "strong/adequate" operating efficiency assessment typically is characterized by a combination of:
 - Above-average complexity yielding a relatively high-value-added product mix compared with that of its industry peers;
 - Lower-than-average operating or processing costs;
 - Consistently high utilization rates;
 - Minimal unplanned downtime or outages;
 - An extensive network of proprietary crude oil and refined product pipelines; and
 - Insurance coverage at least in line with industry standards.
58. An oil refining and marketing company with a "weak" or "adequate/weak" operating efficiency assessment typically is characterized by a combination of:
 - Below-average complexity yielding relatively low-value-added product mix compared with that of its industry peers;
 - Higher-than-average operating or processing costs;
 - Inconsistent utilization rates;
 - Inconsistent operating performance characterized by a high occurrence of unplanned downtime or outages;
 - Sole reliance on third-party logistics assets to source feedstock and market products; and
 - Limited insurance coverage.

59. **Profitability.** The profitability assessment can confirm or modify the preliminary competitive position assessment. The profitability assessment consists of two components: the level of profitability, and the volatility of profitability. The two components are combined into the final profitability assessment using a matrix (see "Corporate Methodology").
60. We assess the level of profitability on a three-point scale: "above average," "average," and "below average."
61. For refiners, the key general profitability measure is ROC. Operating margins or EBITDA to revenues tend not to be useful as a general measure of profitability for refining companies, given the "pass-through" nature of the business, where a refiner's margin can fluctuate with the price of crude oil, to a large degree, and where the absolute size of the refiner's EBITDA is thus a better indication of profitability than as expressed in terms of a profit margin.
62. Because profitability can vary so widely from year to year depending on industry conditions, we generally forecast ROC using near-term market conditions (typically for the current year and for the following year) based on current trends, but we use normalized, or "mid-cycle," expectations for later years.
63. We define "mid-cycle" conditions as a long-term average that typically encompasses the last 10 years, provided that the period contains both strong and weak market conditions (see table for threshold guidelines).

Return On Capital (ROC) Under Mid-Cycle Conditions

	Below average	Average	Above average
ROC	< 10%	10%-20%	> 20%

64. We assess volatility of profitability on a six-point scale, from '1' (least volatile) to '6' (most volatile). In accordance with our global corporate criteria, we generally use the standard error of regression (SER), subject to having at least seven years of historical annual data, and we generally use ROC to determine the SER for refining and marketing companies, although we may also use nominal EBITDA when comparing companies with similar fixed asset bases. We also may--subject to certain conditions being met--adjust the SER assessment by up to two categories better (less volatile) or worse (more volatile). If we do not have sufficient historical information to determine the SER, we follow the global corporate criteria guidelines to assess the volatility of profitability.

Part II--Financial Risk Analysis

Accounting and analytical adjustments

65. In assessing the accounting characteristics of refining and marketing companies, we use the same methodology that we use for other corporate issuers. Our analysis of a company's financial statements begins with determining whether the statements accurately measure the company's performance and financial position relative to those of its peers and the universe of corporate entities. To allow for globally consistent and comparable financial analyses, we may include quantitative adjustments to a company's reported results. These adjustments enable better alignment of a company's reported figures with our view of underlying economic conditions and allow for a more accurate portrayal of a company's ongoing business. Adjustments that pertain broadly to all corporate industries, including this one, are discussed in "Corporate Methodology: Ratios And Adjustments." The other relevant adjustment in the refining and marketing industry

relates to financial derivatives (see "Corporate Methodology: Ratios And Adjustments").

Cash flow/leverage analysis

66. In assessing the cash flow and leverage of a refining and marketing issuer, we use the same methodology that we use for other corporate issuers (see "Corporate Methodology"). We assess cash flow and leverage on a six-point scale, ranging from '1' (minimal) to '6' (highly leveraged), by aggregating the assessments of a range of credit ratios, predominantly cash flow-based, that complement each other by focusing on a company's cash flow in relation to its obligations.

Core ratios

67. For each company, we calculate two core debt payback ratios, funds from operations (FFO) to debt and debt to EBITDA, in accordance with our ratios and adjustment criteria (see "Corporate Methodology: Ratios And Adjustments").
68. Given the significant cyclicity in refining, these core ratios can vary widely over the course of an industry cycle and even from year to year. When forecasting cash flow, we generally forecast near-term market conditions (typically for the current year and the following year) based on current trends, but we use normalized, or "mid-cycle," expectations (see paragraph 63) for the later years.

Supplemental ratios

69. We also consider supplemental ratios to develop a fuller understanding of a company's credit risk profile and to refine our cash flow analysis in accordance with our global corporate criteria. For refining and marketing companies, we generally use:
- FOCF to debt, the preferred supplemental ratio, which could confirm or adjust the preliminary cash flow and leverage assessment indicated by the core financial ratios. In calculating FOCF, we generally include only maintenance-related capital spending that is required to maintain the integrity of the refinery (including environmental, safety, and other regulatory spending needed to continue operations), as opposed to large growth-based expenditures that can skew the ratio.
 - We may alternatively use debt service coverage ratios (FFO + interest to cash interest, or EBITDA to interest), when the cash flow and leverage assessment indicated by the core ratios is "significant" or weaker.

Volatility adjustment

70. In accordance with our global corporate criteria, we may adjust the cash flow and leverage assessment to account for expected volatility (see "Corporate Methodology," paragraph 124, subsection 5). When market conditions are strong, i.e., when we believe refining margins are at or near the peak of the commodity cycle, we typically consider refiners' cash flow ratios to be "highly volatile" because of the tendency for ratios to drop by two categories when industry conditions reach the trough.
71. When market conditions reflect our mid-cycle assumptions, we typically adjust the cash flow and leverage assessment to one category weaker to account for volatility.
72. When recent history reflects trough-like market conditions or we apply trough-like assumptions in

our forecasts, we typically do not use any volatility adjustment because this forecast already assumes stressed market conditions. We also may not apply any volatility adjustment if the refinery has or is expected to maintain minimal debt, provided we believe that leverage and cash flow ratios will not move out of the "minimal" category, even during times of severe market stress.

Part III--Rating Modifiers

Diversification/Portfolio effect

73. In assessing a refining and marketing company's diversification/portfolio effect, we use the same methodology that we use for other corporate issuers (see "Corporate Methodology").

Capital structure

74. In assessing a refining and marketing company's capital structure, we use the same methodology that we use for other corporate issuers (see "Corporate Methodology").

Financial policy

75. In assessing a refining and marketing company's financial policy, we use the same methodology that we use for other corporate issuers (see "Corporate Methodology").

Liquidity

76. In assessing a refining and marketing company's liquidity, we use the same methodology that we use for other corporate issuers (see "Corporate Methodology").
77. This paragraph has been deleted.
78. This paragraph has been deleted.

Management and governance

79. In assessing a refining and marketing company's management and governance, we use the same methodology that we use for other corporate issuers (see "Corporate Methodology").

Comparable ratings analysis

80. In assessing a refining and marketing company's comparable ratings analysis, we use the same methodology that we use for other corporate issuers (see "Corporate Methodology").

REVISIONS AND UPDATES

This article was originally published on March 27, 2014. These criteria became effective on March 27, 2014.

This article was published to help market participants better understand the key credit factors in this industry. This article is related to our global corporate criteria (see "Corporate Methodology," published Nov. 19, 2013) and to our criteria article "Principles Of Credit Ratings," which we

published on Feb. 16, 2011.

Changes introduced after original publication:

- Following our periodic review completed on March 4, 2016, we updated the contact information and criteria references and deleted paragraphs 2, 8, and 9, which were related to the initial publication of the criteria and no longer relevant.
- Following our periodic review completed on March 2, 2017, we updated the contact information and criteria references.
- Following our periodic review completed on Feb. 28, 2018, we updated the contact information and outdated criteria references in paragraph 65. We also renamed the section "Appendix: Summary Of Historic Changes To This Article" to "Revisions And Updates" and deleted the "Effective Date And Transition" subsection, which was related to the initial publication of the criteria.
- On April 1, 2019, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes. We modified paragraph 65 because it was superseded by "Corporate Methodology: Ratios And Adjustments," published on April 1, 2019 (Ratios and Adjustments). The sector-specific accounting and analytical adjustments previously included in this paragraph are now included in the Guidance supporting the Ratios and Adjustments criteria. We also updated criteria references.
- On April 11, 2019, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes to update the contact information and criteria references.
- On Dec. 4, 2019, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes. We deleted paragraphs 77 and 78 because they were superseded by "Methodology And Assumptions: Liquidity Descriptors For Global Corporate Issuers" (liquidity criteria), published Dec. 16, 2014. The sector-specific liquidity adjustments previously included in those paragraphs are now included in the guidance supporting the liquidity criteria. We also updated criteria references.
- On April 22, 2020, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes. We updated a number of criteria references in the article body and the "Related Criteria" section.
- On April 5, 2021, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes. We replaced the content of the "Industry risk" section (paragraphs 10-26) with a reference to the most recent "Industry Risk Assessments Update." In addition, we updated paragraph 6, referring readers to "Methodology: Industry Risk." We made these changes to refer to the most updated industry risk assessments. Lastly, we updated the "Related Research" section.
- On Nov. 22, 2022, we republished this criteria article to make nonmaterial changes to update guidance references.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Superseded Criteria

- Key Credit Factors: Criteria For Rating The Global Oil Refining Industry, Nov. 28, 2011

Related Criteria

- Corporate Methodology: Ratios And Adjustments, April 1, 2019
- Methodology And Assumptions: Liquidity Descriptors For Global Corporate Issuers, Dec. 16, 2014
- Corporate Methodology, Nov. 19, 2013
- Country Risk Assessment Methodology And Assumptions, Nov. 19, 2013
- Methodology: Industry Risk, Nov. 19, 2013
- Methodology: Management And Governance Credit Factors For Corporate Entities, Nov. 13, 2012
- Principles Of Credit Ratings, Feb. 16, 2011

Related Research

- Industry Risk Assessments Update, Jan. 27, 2021
- FAQ: How S&P Global Ratings Formulates, Uses, And Reviews Commodity Price Assumptions, Sept. 28, 2018

Related Guidance

- Guidance: Corporate Methodology, July 1, 2019
- Guidance: Corporate Methodology: Ratios And Adjustments, April 1, 2019

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

Copyright © 2024 by Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC. All rights reserved.

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

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

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

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

S&P may receive compensation for its ratings and certain analyses, normally from issuers or underwriters of securities or from obligors. S&P reserves the right to disseminate its opinions and analyses. S&P's public ratings and analyses are made available on its Web sites, www.spglobal.com/ratings (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.spglobal.com/usratingsfees.

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