

Structured Finance Rating Criteria

Master Criteria

Key Rating Drivers

Asset Isolation: Investors in structured finance (SF) transactions rely primarily on the underlying asset pool securing the transaction for repayment of interest and principal. The effective isolation of the assets from the credit risk of the corporate originator can allow SF securities to achieve a rating higher than that of the originator itself, if the securities are adequately protected from risk of loss at the originator level.

Rating Analysis: To evaluate if investors will be fully repaid in accordance with the terms of the transaction, India Ratings and Research (Ind-Ra) focuses on five aspects fundamental to SF: legal structure; asset quality; credit enhancement; financial structure; and originator and servicer quality. All of these aspects are the principal elements that shape the credit profile of the transaction and, thereby, the determination of a rating opinion on the transaction.

Legal Structure: The distinguishing feature of a SF transaction is the isolation, or “de-linking,” of an underlying pool of assets from the corporate credit risk of the original owner, or “originator,” of those assets. The aim is that the primary credit risk of the transaction relates to that of the pool of assets themselves, rather than the idiosyncratic credit risk of the originator.

Asset Quality: Ind-Ra typically analyses the assets' credit characteristics to derive a loss expectation under a base case scenario. This assumption is stressed further in each successive rating category, such that securities rated in the high investment-grade categories (i.e. 'IND AAA(SO)' and 'IND AA(SO)') have loss expectations that are consistent with low probability, high-severity stress scenarios.

Credit Enhancement: Credit enhancement is a key component in SF as it is the mechanism that provides bondholders with protection from losses on the underlying pool. The ratings for each bond reflect whether the bonds have sufficient credit enhancement available to withstand default given the expected losses on the underlying collateral pool (determined by Ind-Ra under the rating stress scenario associated with the relevant bond rating).

Financial Structure: As part of its assessment of the financial structure, Ind-Ra will analyse any counterparty dependencies, such as provision of derivatives, bank accounts, or financial guarantees, as these represent credit exposures beyond the securitised asset pool. Generally, SF transactions which are dependent on the credit quality of an underlying entity or guarantee provider are credit-linked to those entities, absent any structural mitigants.

Originator and Servicer Quality: The originator, servicer, and CDO asset manager as transaction participants can affect the performance of the underlying assets and, ultimately, the SF transaction. Ind-Ra's operational risk team, funds and asset manager teams, or asset-specific rating analysts review the operational processes for each originator, servicer, or asset manager participating in a SF transaction rated by Ind-Ra.

Surveillance: Once Ind-Ra assigns a rating, it monitors the transaction's performance through the agency's surveillance process, until the securities have been paid in full or the rating has been withdrawn. Of the five key rating factors outlined above; asset quality, credit enhancement, and originator and servicer quality often evolve over the term of a transaction. In contrast, legal structure and financial structure are usually stable and affected only by specific events.

Analysts

Mithilendu Jha
+91 22 4000 1744
mithilendu.jha@indiaratings.co.in

Arijeet Maji
+91 22 4000 1704
arijeet.maji@indiaratings.co.in

Jatin Nanaware
+91 22 4000 1761
jatin.nanaware@indiaratings.co.in

Scope and Limitations

The principles discussed are applicable to all SF asset classes, including residential and commercial mortgage-backed securities (RMBS and CMBS, respectively), asset-backed securities (ABS), and structured credit transactions. The criteria discussed herein provide an overarching framework applicable to all SF transactions and complement any detailed asset class-specific rating criteria published by Ind-Ra. Ind-Ra will expand or explain the inapplicability of any of these principles where appropriate in asset class-specific rating criteria reports.

Specific legal structure issues, asset quality (including portfolio and data adequacy), credit enhancement, financial structure or operational risks may prevent Ind-Ra from rating a transaction, or may limit the highest achievable ratings in the agency's analysis. The core areas where such restrictions may apply are generally those detailed in the report, *Criteria for Rating Caps in Structured Finance Transactions*, available at www.indiaratings.co.in.

Ind-Ra's rating analysis is based upon the prevailing relevant legal framework and generally does not address the impact of unforeseen changes to the law (including taxation related legislation). However where the relevant legal framework is subject to a high degree of uncertainty Ind-Ra may apply a rating cap (as per the above referenced criteria). Changes to the law are analysed as credit events as outlined in the *Surveillance* section of this report. The implementation of a previously unforeseen change in the law may lead to a change to the ratings of affected notes.

Rating Process

A rating committee will determine if the rating opinion recommendations derived by the analysts reflect the risks associated with the transaction. This will include an assessment of the loss expectations derived for the underlying pool, as well as determining whether all the fundamental aspects previously described have been addressed. A rating committee may deliberate transaction-specific qualitative factors that established models and methodologies may not reflect and incorporate these into the rating opinion. A rating committee determines the appropriate final ratings to be assigned to each bond.

Legal Structure

The distinguishing feature of a SF transaction is the isolation, or "de-linking," of an underlying pool of assets from the corporate credit risk of the original owner, or "originator," of those assets. The aim is that the primary credit risk of the transaction relates to that of the pool of assets themselves rather than the idiosyncratic credit risk of the originator. This is typically achieved in SF by the sale of an identifiable and specific pool of the originator's assets, either directly or indirectly, to a special purpose vehicle (SPV) so that neither the assets nor their proceeds will be consolidated as part of the bankruptcy estate of the originator/seller in the event of its insolvency.

The SPV typically issues debt and uses proceeds of that issuance to acquire cash-generating assets. The SPV passes through cash it receives from the assets to pay interest on the debt and, in most cases, to amortise (fully or partially) the SPV's debt.

SPVs are often described as "bankruptcy remote" in that the risk of the transaction being disrupted by the bankruptcy of the SPV is rendered a remote risk through various structural features. Legal restrictions on an SPV limit the business activities it is allowed to undertake. Therefore, the transaction is protected as far as possible from credit risks posed by any ancillary activities that an SPV could otherwise undertake unrelated to the transaction. Unlike the originator of the underlying pool of assets being securitised, SPVs are not intended to be operating businesses and, therefore, should not, for example, be able to assume debt other than rated debt or subordinated debt. As their name suggests, SPVs are typically established for a specific and limited purpose, namely for issuing the SF notes, and have a separate and

- Ind-Ra will review the transaction documents. Legal opinions are expected to address the legal aspects of the transaction, including that the transaction documents are legal, valid, binding, and enforceable.

independent legal existence from their parents. Thus, the SPV provides improved predictability of outcome relative to corporate credit, as the risk factors associated with a SF transaction are confined primarily to the asset pool transferred to the SPV.

Ind-Ra is asked to consider assigning ratings to a variety of transactions using many different legal forms of SPV. The legal form of organisation will be determined and regulated by local law in the jurisdiction where the SPV was created. Typically, an SPV in a SF transaction is a limited liability company, a trust, limited liability partnership, or other form of body corporate (depending on the local law in the place of establishment).

Legal Opinion and Transaction Document Review

The SPV formation documents, the documents relating to a particular transaction, and associated legal opinions are key in assessing the extent of the separation of the assets from bankruptcy risk of the originator and the robustness of the structure of a particular transaction and, consequently, whether the transaction will operate as envisaged.

Ind-Ra analysts will review key transaction documents to determine whether they reflect the transaction and its structure as represented to Ind-Ra. Analysts may ask questions about the contents of these documents or explain the impact on the rating analysis of certain provisions in these documents. However, analysts will not make proposals or recommendations regarding the design of SF products that Ind-Ra rates or the content of transaction documents.

Ind-Ra expects to receive copies of legal opinions issued by transaction counsel covering the laws: of the jurisdiction where each relevant SPV and each other transaction party is formed/incorporated; governing the transaction documents; and governing the assets (which would cover the enforceability of the asset sale). It should be noted that any or all of the relevant laws may be different; Ind-Ra would expect legal opinions to cover all relevant laws.

Ind-Ra will review the legal opinions and expects them to address the legal aspects of the transaction. The agency would not expect to see a blanket insolvency carve-out to these opinions; to the extent that the insolvency of any person could have an impact on the opinions, Ind-Ra would expect that impact to be identified and described by transaction counsel.

Legal opinions are expected to address the nature of the various transfers in the transaction and provide assurance that the assets transferred to the SPE (i) are not subject to be recovered or “clawed back” by the seller of the assets in the event of the insolvency of the seller of such assets to the SPE, and (ii) will not be consolidated with the assets of the parent of the SPE in the event of its insolvency. Ind-Ra also receives opinions that address the perfection of transfers of assets (whether as a sale or grant of a security interest) between the transferors and transferees, including but not limited to the security interest in favor of the indenture trustee.

Ind-Ra reviews general corporate and enforceability opinions stating that the duties, obligations and agreements executed by the issuer are valid and binding, and enforceable against the issuer in accordance with their terms. Ind-Ra expects to receive tax opinions confirming that there will not be any tax leakage from the structure or, if there are taxes, quantifying that amount so that it can be factored into Ind-Ra's analysis of the cash flows. If taxation practices are under review and no conclusive opinion is received, Ind-Ra will highlight it in its rating report.

To the extent transaction counsel cannot provide a “clean” opinion on any point, Ind-Ra expects such counsel to identify and explain any residual legal risks, so that, to the extent relevant, these risks can be factored into Ind-Ra's credit analysis. Unlike operating companies, SPVs are restricted by their formation and transaction documents and do not have the ability to borrow or raise capital to remedy cash flow shortfalls or asset, security, or transaction structural problems. It could be the case that residual legal risk or risks make it impossible for Ind-Ra to rate the relevant securities.

Asset Quality

Asset Classes

SF transactions are collateralised by a broad spectrum of financial assets. Mortgage loans secured by residential and commercial properties, consumer assets such as credit card receivables and auto loans, and corporate loans and securities are the most common assets that are securitised. Ind-Ra broadly classifies SF transactions into four main sectors: RMBS, CMBS, ABS, and structured credit. Within these sectors, there is a variety of subsectors; for example, the ABS sector encompasses consumer (e.g. auto loans, credit cards, and student loans, among others) and commercial assets (aircraft leases, franchise loans, and corporate-linked future flows, among others), as well as asset-backed commercial paper (ABCP) conduits.

Default and Loss Analysis

Repayment of principal and interest on the underlying loans and collateral are used to service and repay the rated notes in SF transactions. Ind-Ra typically analyses the assets' credit characteristics to derive a loss expectation under a scenario that reflects Ind-Ra's current macroeconomic expectations. This is commonly referred to as the base case scenario. The base case scenario describes expected asset losses only, without reflecting potential loss-reducing structural features of the transaction. Ind-Ra's opinions regarding base case loss expectations are typically formed by a rating committee based on values derived by one of the approaches listed below.

Assigning a default probability and loss severity to each individual loan based on loan-level characteristics using the output of analytical models developed by Ind-Ra as a basis for committee discussion. The underlying pool's loss rate is calculated using default models. This approach is typically used in the analysis of RMBS and CMBS multiborrower transactions.

- Analysing the asset portfolio based on the originators' historical performance for a rating committee to derive an expected loss. This approach is often used in the rating of consumer ABS transactions.
- Estimating the aggregate portfolio loss rate using Monte Carlo simulation, i.e. a large number of repetitions of a stochastic process that seeks to describe the underlying portfolio credit risk behaviour. This approach is used in Ind-Ra models for correlated portfolios of corporate exposures and typically used in sectors such as CDOs and CMBS. Individual simulation models may incorporate separate adjustments or stresses. For example, the CMBS analysis often employs stressed values for rental income declines and capitalisation rates.

In addition to deriving a base case, which generally corresponds to (or is marginally below) Ind-Ra's 'IND B(SO)' rating stress scenario, loss expectations are generated under increasingly severe assumptions. The loss expectation is higher for each successive rating category above 'IND B(SO)', such that securities rated in the high investment-grade categories (i.e. 'IND AAA(SO)' and 'IND AA(SO)') have loss expectations that are consistent with low probability, high-severity stress scenarios. Ind-Ra employs a forward-looking rating philosophy that seeks to take a "through the cycle" rating approach in the higher rating scenarios and an expectations-based approach at the lower rating scenarios; that is, at the higher rating scenarios, the loss assumptions are expected to reflect a remote stress scenario that stays stable over time, while the lower rating scenarios reflect assumptions that are more closely related with expectations of collateral performance formed at that time. Ind-Ra's 'IND AAA(SO)' and 'IND AA(SO)' ratings denote the lowest or very low default risk, and repayment capacity is unlikely to be adversely affected by foreseeable events.

Loss expectations at the higher rating categories are often expressed as a multiple of base case loss estimate. For instance, an asset pool may be expected to experience 2% losses in a base case scenario, but in an 'IND AAA(SO)' scenario, the collateral pool may be expected to experience losses 4.0 times(x) greater than the base case, or 8% of the collateral pool's balance.

- Ind-Ra typically analyses credit characteristics to derive a loss expectation that reflects a highly probable outcome if conditions remain within current expectations, commonly referred to as the base case scenario.

- Certain SF transactions are not reliant on a diversified pool of assets; some may be credit-linked to underlying entities or guarantee providers, while others are backed by more concentrated pools.

While the majority of SF transactions are backed by a granular pool of assets, others are backed by more concentrated pools (for example, first-to-default baskets). Furthermore, some transactions are not fully reliant on a pool of assets for their credit quality but are credit-linked to underlying entities or guarantee providers. The asset quality of these transactions is typically derived from the rating of the underlying entity or guarantee provider. These underlying entities include single-name corporate entities, financial institutions, municipalities, sovereign entities, and financial guarantors.

Where structures are not backed by a single entity or a diversified pool of assets but have a concentrated pool with several large exposures, historical default data can become less relevant. This can also occur with formerly granular pools that become concentrated over time as they amortise approaching maturity. Ind-Ra will employ certain deterministic stresses to evaluate whether the pool is overly exposed to these large exposures' default risk. Many asset classes use concentration matrices that will default several of the large exposures within the pool. The number of defaulted exposures will depend on the rating level desired.

Data Adequacy

Ind-Ra's SF rating criteria assumptions are derived with reference to data specified in sector-specific rating criteria. The adequacy of such sector-specific data will be described in the sector-specific rating criteria, as well as whether limitations in data adequacy have led to a rating cap in that sector.

As part of the transaction analysis, Ind-Ra expects to receive originator-specific historical performance data relevant to the securitised asset pool for the longer of the following: (a) five years; and (b) a period covering all phases of at least one economic cycle. If sufficient originator-specific information is not available, significant market-wide historical performance data covering at least the same timeframe may often provide proxy information. This would be the case, in particular, for asset classes where the originator information may provide a limited contribution to the expected asset performance (for example, assets originated for the syndicated loan market).

Credit Enhancement

Credit enhancement is a key component in SF as it is the mechanism that provides bondholders with protection from losses on the underlying pool. Ind-Ra's ratings for each bond reflect whether the bonds have sufficient credit enhancement available to withstand default given losses on the underlying collateral pool that Ind-Ra expects under the rating stress scenario associated with the relevant bond rating. Credit enhancement can be sourced internally by means of subordination, excess interest, or overcollateralisation (O/C) or externally by a third-party provider in the form of a financial guarantee, the provision of a reserve fund account, external equity, or a combination of the above. Credit-linked SF transactions typically do not have additional credit enhancement; rather, the rating is dependent on the underlying entity or guarantee provider.

Subordination

In a simple two-class senior-subordinated (senior/sub) structure, the subordinated class provides credit enhancement to the senior class by having all losses on the asset pool allocated to it first until its balance is reduced to zero (assuming that the proceeds of the subordinated note were applied to purchase performing receivables). Typically, interest and principal due to the senior tranche is paid first, and whatever cash is remaining is paid to the subordinated tranche. A subordinated bond can be written down each month by an amount equal to realised losses on the underlying collateral or incur shortfalls if collections are insufficient to repay the full amount due. Senior bonds may achieve an 'IND AAA(SO)' rating if the size of the credit enhancement is consistent with Ind-Ra's loss expectation derived under its 'IND AAA(SO)' stress scenario and if the bond is able to make timely interest payments.

- Ind-Ra performs a cash flow analysis to assess the financial structure, especially where derivatives are embedded or where there is a material reliance on excess interest.

SF transactions are often “tranching” into multiple senior/sub classes with ratings ranging from 'IND AAA(SO)' through 'IND B(SO)'. Losses are usually allocated in reverse sequential order starting with the most junior and lowest rated tranche. Protection for the junior tranche is usually provided either by O/C, excess interest, an unrated class that is allocated losses first until it is reduced to zero, or a cash reserve fund fully funded at closing (or with monthly excess interest) that will be utilised first to cover losses. The rating of the junior tranche reflects the adequacy of the total credit enhancement or other forms of protection given the loss scenarios for the rating category concerned. Generally, protection available for the most senior tranches reflects the credit enhancement available to the junior tranche, as well as the subordination of the junior tranche itself.

Excess Interest

A given bond may be able to achieve a rating, even when the size and amount of the subordination available to the bond is smaller than Ind-Ra's loss expectations at the relevant stress level, if excess interest (also known as excess spread) is also available to cover losses as an additional form of credit enhancement. Excess interest is the revenue remaining after all required payments to the bonds are made at the end of each payment date and is typically the difference between the net weighted average coupon (net WAC) on the asset pool on the one hand and the weighted average note rate of the bonds plus the transaction's senior expenses on the other. The amount of excess interest generated can be very substantial and used each payment period to distribute as principal to the bondholders in an amount up to the outstanding realised losses and/or delinquent amounts for that period on the underlying pool, depending on the terms and conditions of the transaction.

The value of excess interest in providing credit enhancement varies greatly across asset classes and structures and is highly dependent on the timing of defaults, charge-offs or losses, the rate of repayment on the underlying asset pool, and changes in interest rates. It is often only available on a “use it or lose it” basis, whereby excess cash is available but released to the payee at the bottom of the waterfall because no losses were realised in a given period; in this case, the credit enhancement value of this cash is zero. Alternatively, losses may occur in a period but no excess cash may be available to distribute as principal. If unused excess cash is released each period, rather than retained, or “trapped,” in a reserve fund, default or loss timing becomes critical.

Principal repayment on the underlying asset pool is also critical in determining the credit enhancement benefit of excess interest. A fast rate of repayment can reduce the monthly amount of excess interest available to cover losses in the current and future periods. Excess interest may also decrease due to WAC compression, a decline in the amount of interest received on the collateral due to higher coupon assets repaying or defaulting at a faster pace than lower coupon collateral. Also, excess interest will decline if the bonds' note rate rises faster than the collateral's net WAC. For instance, a mismatch can occur when the note interest rate is based on a floating index while the underlying assets pay a fixed rate or as a structure de-leverages. Currency mismatches can also have an impact on the excess interest to the extent that they are not hedged.

Because these factors can directly and substantially affect the availability of excess interest, Ind-Ra performs a cash flow analysis for each SF asset class that utilises excess interest for credit enhancement. Asset class-specific, proprietary cash flow models as well as the assumptions Ind-Ra makes about the loss timing, repayment, interest rates, and other factors specific to each asset are used to analyse the availability of excess interest. The degree to which excess interest is taken into account by Ind-Ra in the rating analysis for each asset class depends on the amount of excess interest expected to be available under different stress scenarios. Published cash flow rating criteria and the assumptions made for each applicable asset type are available on Ind-Ra's Web site at www.indiaratings.co.in. Ind-Ra's published criteria for its interest rate assumptions on select countries are also available on its website.

- Transactions that do not immediately release unused excess interest or have reserve funds or O/C from closing will generally have smaller subordinated classes than those that have the release feature.

Reserve Funds and Overcollateralisation

Some structures may use reserve funds or O/C as credit enhancement instead of or in addition to other forms described. Reserve funds may be funded at closing (for example via a cash deposit or subordinated loan). Similarly, O/C may be created at closing through a greater value of assets securing the transaction than rated notes issued (i.e. via an unrated junior or subordinated class). In some structures, excess interest is not released each payment period after covering losses. Instead, the cash is used to fund (or top up) a reserve fund or pay down principal on the bonds. Remaining excess interest may be deposited in a cash reserve fund until it reaches a certain limit. Once the reserve fund reaches the targeted amount, unused excess interest is released from the deal. If the balance in the reserve fund falls below a targeted amount, excess interest is re-directed to replenish it.

Certain deals use the remaining excess interest after losses are paid to repay principal on the bonds. By using interest to repay principal, the outstanding bonds' principal balance declines more quickly than that of the underlying asset pool, creating extra collateral. The resulting O/C is available to cover losses not absorbed by excess interest. A target O/C amount, equal to a specified percentage of the pool balance, is often established, and once reached, any unused excess interest in a given period can then be released from the transaction.

Third-Party Protection

SF transactions sometimes provide for credit enhancement to be provided by an external counterparty. Counterparties that provide loss protection will pay the SF bondholders the difference between principal and interest due on the underlying collateral and the actual cash received or the amount of realised losses. These payment obligations of the counterparty are critical to ensuring that SF bondholders are paid in full. Therefore, the rating opinion for SF transactions with third-party loss protection reflects the risks associated with counterparty exposure in addition to the core credit risks related to the underlying asset pool.

The main risk associated with an external source of credit enhancement is the dependency of the SF transaction on the payment obligations of the counterparty. This reliance on an external party compromises the isolation of the SF transaction from the idiosyncratic risks associated with a corporate counterparty. However, structural provisions are usually included in the SF transaction that are intended to minimise the dependency on and exposure to the credit quality of the counterparty. Ind-Ra will analyse such structural provisions in accordance with its criteria for addressing counterparty risk in SF transactions, as detailed in its counterparty risk criteria report available at www.indiaratings.co.in.

Where structural provisions included are not sufficient to isolate the transaction from a counterparty — and the credit enhancement provided by that counterparty is material to maintaining the rating — the transaction may become credit-dependent on the counterparty, such that the transaction rating will not be isolated from that of the counterparty. One example is financial guarantors that provide a so-called “monoline wrap.” In such instances, there are no structural provisions to mitigate the financial guarantor exposure, and the transaction typically becomes credit-dependent on the counterparty.

Financial Structure

In senior/sub SF transactions, the senior classes have priority in payment of interest and principal over the subordinated class. However, the most senior class, typically the 'IND AAA(SO)' rated tranche, is often split into multiple bonds with varying maturities or payment schedules. While the amount of loss protection for a rated tranche provided by subordination, excess interest, or O/C is generally unaffected by the financial structure, the manner in which principal collected on the asset pool is distributed among bonds varies.

Ind-Ra's approach to analysing the various structures is described in asset-specific or cash flow criteria reports available on Ind-Ra's Web site at www.indiaratings.co.in. Below is a brief description of the most common types of structures found in SF transactions. Cash flow modelling will reflect the specific structure of the transaction concerned in assessing the adequacy of credit enhancement at each rating level. Cash flow criteria may include a number of stress assumptions that are applied at different rating levels. Stresses may include, but are not limited to:

- While the amount of loss protection for a rated tranche provided by subordination, excess spread, or O/C is generally unaffected by the financial structure, the manner in which principal collected on the asset pool is distributed among bonds varies.

- high and low prepayment stresses;
- asset coupon compression to stress revenue levels;
- front- or back-loaded (or other) timings for when defaults and losses occur;
- interest rate stresses to assess the materiality of unhedged exposures, as well as carrying costs associated with defaulted assets;
- basis risk stresses to assess unhedged exposures regarding different interest rate bases for assets and liabilities;
- foreign exchange stresses to assess exposures to unhedged currency risks.

The extent and nature of cash flow stresses adopted will depend on the asset class and type involved and the financial structure of the transaction concerned. For example, stresses tailored specifically to transactions may be adopted where cash flows rely heavily on the terms and conditions of embedded derivatives.

Pro Rata Pay Bonds

In a pro rata pay structure, interest and principal collections on the pool are distributed proportionately to each tranche based on its outstanding balance. To illustrate, in a 90%/10% senior/sub structure, 90% of all payments due on the collateral are distributed to the senior class and 10% to the subordinated class. Some asset sectors provide for all unscheduled principal, such as prepayments and the balance of defaulted loans plus realised losses, to be paid fully to the senior tranche while the subordinated classes are only allocated a proportion of scheduled principal collections. In these structures, the subordinated classes are "locked out" from receiving unscheduled principal collections.

By diverting all unscheduled principal to the senior tranche, its balance is reduced disproportionately faster relative to the subordinated class, which causes the subordination percentage to increase. This lockout feature, which is usually fixed for several years, is designed to protect the senior tranche from losses due to back-ended collateral defaults or adverse selection. Back-ended default may occur if the transaction enters a stressful environment in the later stages of its life. Adverse selection occurs when the strongest credit quality collateral prepays early and the seasoned pool is comprised mostly of weaker, more risky credits.

Sequential-Pay Bonds

Sequential-pay structures provide for principal amounts to be paid to bonds based on a sequential basis, i.e. the most senior bonds are repaid first. Also, credit tranches may be divided into sequential-pay bonds that are repaid based on their stated maturity dates, whereby the earliest maturing bond is paid the entire amount of its tranche's share of principal collections until its balance is reduced to zero. Bonds that initially start out pro rata pay may flip to a sequential-pay basis upon breaching certain triggers, which are often based on performance of the underlying collateral.

- Ind-Ra's rating analysts review the processes of each originator, servicer, or asset manager participating in a SF transaction rated by Ind-Ra.

Bullet Classes

Bonds with bullet maturities only receive interest on each payment period and do not receive periodic principal distributions. Rather, principal on the bonds is paid in a lump sum at the expected maturity date, similar to a corporate bond, or over a timeframe of six to 12 months prior to its expected maturity. Often, during the period in which only interest is paid, referred to as the revolving period, collections received on the underlying collateral are reinvested in new receivables. The revolving period is for a predetermined time, depending on the underlying asset class. SF transactions with revolving periods usually are backed by revolving assets such as credit card receivables, dealer floorplan loans, and home equity lines of credit but can also be seen with longer term assets, such as residential mortgages.

At a specified period, often the end of the revolving period, principal begins to accumulate in an account or is paid to the bonds based on a predetermined amortisation schedule. Certain occurrences, such as a sharp deterioration in collateral performance, low prepayments, or the inability to reinvest and maintain a receivable balance, can trigger an early amortisation event where principal begins to be accumulated or distributed prior to the scheduled accumulation or expected maturity date. While repayment in full is typically based on an expected maturity date, Ind-Ra's rating addresses full repayment of principal by the stated legal final maturity, which can often be several years after the expected maturity date. Ind-Ra's rating analysis assesses if the distribution of interest and principal proceeds, including recoveries after working out defaulted assets, will be sufficient to repay the notes by the legal final maturity.

For all types of financial structures, Ind-Ra will apply the cash flow criteria for the specific asset class in question where relevant. For example, the criteria may specify scenarios involving varying prepayment speeds where a slow prepayment speed stress is applied to determine if a shorter pay bond with a legal final maturity earlier than that of the underlying assets will be repaid in full at its maturity. Similar stresses would test the ability of structures to accumulate sufficient principal funds to be able to meet bullet repayments by their legal final maturity. Ind-Ra also assesses if the legal final maturity date provides sufficient time needed for loans to be worked out beyond the expected maturity date. Similarly, bonds that pay pro rata will be tested in accordance with asset class criteria to assess whether credit enhancement will remain sufficient in the later stages of a transaction when the portfolio has amortised significantly, such that issues of asset concentration or adverse selection may arise in the portfolio.

Counterparty Risk

As part of its assessment of financial structure, Ind-Ra will analyse any counterparty dependencies — such as the provision of derivatives, bank accounts, or financial guarantees — as these represent credit exposures beyond the securitised asset pool.

Generally, SF transactions which are dependent on the credit quality of an underlying entity or guarantee provider are credit-linked to those entities (in the absence of any structural mitigants).

Originator, Servicer and Asset Manager Reviews

The originator, servicer and CDO asset manager as transaction participants can affect the performance of the underlying assets and, ultimately, the SF transaction. Ind-Ra's operational risk, funds and asset manager teams, or asset-specific rating analysts review the operational processes for each originator, servicer, or asset manager participating in a SF transaction rated by Ind-Ra. Whether indicated by an internal score, opinion, or public rating, the assessment may lead to adjustments to a transaction's base case expected loss and credit enhancement levels, application of a rating cap, or cause Ind-Ra to decline to rate a transaction. Ind-Ra's originator, servicer, and asset manager review criteria are published as part of the respective asset sector criteria reports or as separate criteria, which are available on Ind-Ra's Web site at www.indiaratings.co.in.

- In general, Ind-Ra expects an originator/SF issuer to have sufficient operating experience in the relevant market and in originating the product comprising the asset pool.

Originator Reviews

Ind-Ra assesses the risks associated with the originator's products, programs, and underwriting guidelines, including those risks embedded in less stringent and aggressive origination practices and controls, since these assets will have a greater propensity to underperform those assets originated under more stringent guidelines and controls. The review looks to assess whether collateral from an originator is likely to perform in line with, better, or worse than collateral from other originators in its peer group in times of stress. Propensity for better performance may be indicated by the quality of origination controls and the use of best practices. The quality of the originator's practices and controls will also be of particular importance in revolving transactions, where receivables that are to be originated in the future will be sold into the transaction using principal repayments on the existing portfolio.

For certain asset classes (as stated in sector-specific criteria) Ind-Ra will complete file review, of a small number of loan accounts, as part of the originator review. The purpose of the review is to provide an example of the origination and underwriting processes and to cross-check data provided in the portfolio data files. Such file reviews are typically very limited in terms of scope and sample size. For example, a review may consist of Ind-Ra selecting 10 loan accounts from a list of those expected to be included within the securitisation transaction. Ind-Ra will then review the originator's physical and/or electronic records of the selected accounts. Any inconsistencies identified (e.g. between paper and electronic files, or between the described and observed processes) would be discussed with the originator and may be taken into account in the rating analysis, depending upon Ind-Ra's opinion of the materiality of such inconsistencies.

In general, Ind-Ra expects an originator to have sufficient operating experience in the relevant market and originating the product comprising the asset pool. Ind-Ra also will expect the originator to provide historical performance data as well as historical loss severity and recovery data.

Servicer Reviews

The primary responsibility of the servicer is to collect and distribute payments from the underlying assets to the trustee for the benefit of the bondholders. In certain SF sectors, servicers have additional responsibilities such as advancing delinquent loan payments and negotiating loan workouts. The servicer review and rating process is designed to identify and evaluate the quality of a servicer's loan administration and default management processes, compliance with stated guidelines, and operational and financial stability. The servicer rating process assesses the company's strategy for handling assets in various jurisdictions and conditions, procedures to stay informed on current legislation, and methods of integrating these changes into its loan servicing processes. In addition, a servicer's internal control framework is of particular importance to Ind-Ra as it demonstrates the servicer's commitment to sound operational business practices.

RMBS, CMBS, and ABS servicers may be assigned public servicer ratings. Ind-Ra maintains a detailed and specific scorecard incorporating its criteria for each servicing type. Each servicer rating is based on a select set of criteria, from which a composite score is derived. The score is based on a review of the servicer's corporate organisation, financial condition, staffing, procedures, and technological capabilities. Ind-Ra conducts servicer reviews for each servicer participating in a SF transaction it rates irrespective of whether the servicer is assigned a public servicer rating by Ind-Ra.

Surveillance

Once Ind-Ra rates a SF transaction and if the ratings are not point in time, it is assigned to Ind-Ra's asset sector surveillance group. Of the five key rating factors outlined in this report; asset quality, credit enhancement, and originator and servicer quality often evolve over the term of a transaction. Legal structure and financial structure in contrast are usually stable and affected only by specific events.

- Transactions are reviewed using the latest remittance reports and any other relevant information available.

With respect to asset quality, credit enhancement and originator and servicer quality Ind-Ra monitors rated transactions using asset performance and cash remittance information supplied by servicers and trustees and any other relevant information. The surveillance process involves a number of quantitative and qualitative functions to assess the performance of rated tranches, including monitoring pool-level performance indicators, comparing current credit enhancement levels against forecast or stressed assumptions, assessing the impact of market developments on the performance of transactions, and loan-level analysis.

Ratings are reviewed at least annually by a rating committee. If a rating action appears warranted for reasons including reported transaction performance, Ind-Ra's asset performance outlook or the occurrence of a credit event, a committee review will be undertaken promptly. Rating actions for some transactions occur more frequently, particularly if performance of the underlying pool exhibits rapid deterioration.

Credit events are discrete developments that may affect the rating analysis of certain transactions. Examples of credit events include: a reduction in the rating of a counterparty; a change to the underlying legal framework; a transaction document amendment; or any other event on a case-by-case basis thought to have a material credit impact. Upon Ind-Ra observing or being notified of any such event, the agency will consider the extent to which the rating analysis may be impacted.

In respect of potentially material events, Ind-Ra will convene a rating committee to review the impact of such event upon the relevant ratings. To the extent that the event is not expected to have an impact on ratings, Ind-Ra may publish a non-rating action commentary (NRAC) with a description of the event, the relevant ratings and the rationale behind Ind-Ra's analysis. The occurrence of such events will not in itself trigger a full committee review of a transaction; rather, the analysis will focus on the impact of the specific event.

Specific surveillance criteria may be published by individual asset groups to explain the process for that group's surveillance and any methodological aspects that are specific to the surveillance of the rating. For example, specific surveillance criteria may address the process for downgrade rating action for sectors that have experienced stress to explain how rating actions are taken. Published asset sector-specific surveillance criteria are available on Ind-Ra's Web site at www.indiaratings.co.in.

Rating Sensitivity Analysis

For each new rating, Ind-Ra completes rating sensitivity analysis. For public ratings, the analysis is published in the transaction presale and new issue reports. For each class of rated note, the analysis indicates the rating impact from the application of more stressful asset performance assumptions. For example, the sensitivity analysis may show that the rating of the Class A note would be expected to migrate to 'IND A(SO)' from 'IND AAA(SO)' if the base case default assumption is increased by 50%, and other factors are kept constant. The sensitivity analysis parameters are selected according to the key performance parameters of the relevant asset class and will include at least three stress assumption scenarios.

Reasonable Investigation

In issuing and maintaining its ratings, Ind-Ra relies on the factual information it receives from issuers and underwriters and from various third-party sources Ind-Ra believes to be credible. Ind-Ra conducts a reasonable investigation of the factual information relied upon by it in accordance with its ratings methodology, and obtains reasonable verification of that information from independent sources (to the extent such sources are available for a given security or in a given jurisdiction).

- A servicer's internal control framework is of particular importance to Ind-Ra's analysis as it demonstrates the servicer's commitment to sound operational business practices.

ALL CREDIT RATINGS ASSIGNED BY INDIA RATINGS ARE SUBJECT TO CERTAIN LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS. PLEASE READ THESE LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS BY FOLLOWING THIS LINK: [HTTP://WWW.INDIARATINGS.CO.IN/UNDERSTANDINGCREDITRATINGS.JSP](http://www.indiaratings.co.in/understandingcreditratings.jsp) IN ADDITION, RATING DEFINITIONS AND THE TERMS OF USE OF SUCH RATINGS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE AGENCY'S PUBLIC WEBSITE [WWW.INDIARATINGS.CO.IN](http://www.indiaratings.co.in). PUBLISHED RATINGS, CRITERIA, AND METHODOLOGIES ARE AVAILABLE FROM THIS SITE AT ALL TIMES. INDIA RATINGS' CODE OF CONDUCT, CONFIDENTIALITY, CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, AFFILIATE FIREWALL, COMPLIANCE, AND OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ARE ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CODE OF CONDUCT SECTION OF THIS SITE.

Copyright © 2015 Fitch Ratings, Inc., Fitch Ratings, Ltd. and its subsidiaries 33 Whitehall Street, NY, NY 10004. Telephone: 1-800-753-4824, (212) 908-0500. Fax: (212) 480-4435. Reproduction or retransmission in whole or in part is prohibited except by permission. All rights reserved. In issuing and maintaining its ratings, Fitch relies on factual information it receives from issuers and underwriters and from other sources Fitch believes to be credible. Fitch conducts a reasonable investigation of the factual information relied upon by it in accordance with its ratings methodology, and obtains reasonable verification of that information from independent sources, to the extent such sources are available for a given security or in a given jurisdiction. The manner of Fitch's factual investigation and the scope of the third-party verification it obtains will vary depending on the nature of the rated security and its issuer, the requirements and practices in the jurisdiction in which the rated security is offered and sold and/or the issuer is located, the availability and nature of relevant public information, access to the management of the issuer and its advisers, the availability of pre-existing third-party verifications such as audit reports, agreed-upon procedures letters, appraisals, actuarial reports, engineering reports, legal opinions and other reports provided by third parties, the availability of independent and competent third-party verification sources with respect to the particular security or in the particular jurisdiction of the issuer, and a variety of other factors. Users of Fitch's ratings should understand that neither an enhanced factual investigation nor any third-party verification can ensure that all of the information Fitch relies on in connection with a rating will be accurate and complete. Ultimately, the issuer and its advisers are responsible for the accuracy of the information they provide to Fitch and to the market in offering documents and other reports. In issuing its ratings Fitch must rely on the work of experts, including independent auditors with respect to financial statements and attorneys with respect to legal and tax matters. Further, ratings are inherently forward-looking and embody assumptions and predictions about future events that by their nature cannot be verified as facts. As a result, despite any verification of current facts, ratings can be affected by future events or conditions that were not anticipated at the time a rating was issued or affirmed.

The information in this report is provided "as is" without any representation or warranty of any kind. A Fitch rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a security. This opinion is based on established criteria and methodologies that Fitch is continuously evaluating and updating. Therefore, ratings are the collective work product of Fitch and no individual, or group of individuals, is solely responsible for a rating. The rating does not address the risk of loss due to risks other than credit risk, unless such risk is specifically mentioned. Fitch is not engaged in the offer or sale of any security. All Fitch reports have shared authorship. Individuals identified in a Fitch report were involved in, but are not solely responsible for, the opinions stated therein. The individuals are named for contact purposes only. A report providing a Fitch rating is neither a prospectus nor a substitute for the information assembled, verified and presented to investors by the issuer and its agents in connection with the sale of the securities. Ratings may be changed or withdrawn at anytime for any reason in the sole discretion of Fitch. Fitch does not provide investment advice of any sort. Ratings are not a recommendation to buy, sell, or hold any security. Ratings do not comment on the adequacy of market price, the suitability of any security for a particular investor, or the tax-exempt nature or taxability of payments made in respect to any security. Fitch receives fees from issuers, insurers, guarantors, other obligors, and underwriters for rating securities. Such fees generally vary from US\$1,000 to US\$750,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent) per issue. In certain cases, Fitch will rate all or a number of issues issued by a particular issuer, or insured or guaranteed by a particular insurer or guarantor, for a single annual fee. Such fees are expected to vary from US\$10,000 to US\$1,500,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent). The assignment, publication, or dissemination of a rating by Fitch shall not constitute a consent by Fitch to use its name as an expert in connection with any registration statement filed under the United States securities laws, the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 of the United Kingdom, or the securities laws of any particular jurisdiction. Due to the relative efficiency of electronic publishing and distribution, Fitch research may be available to electronic subscribers up to three days earlier than to print subscribers.