

Transaction Update: Caisse Francaise de Financement Local (Public Sector Covered Bonds)

Obligations Foncières Backed By Public Sector Assets

Primary Credit Analyst:

Denitsa Carouget, Paris +33 144207219; denitsa.carouget@spglobal.com

Research Contributor:

Ashlesha N Raikar, CRISIL Global Analytical Center, an S&P affiliate, Mumbai

Table Of Contents

Major Rating Factors

Outlook: Negative

Rationale

Program Description

Rating Analysis

Additional Rating Factors

Related Criteria

Related Research

Transaction Update: Caisse Francaise de Financement Local (Public Sector Covered Bonds)

Obligations Foncières Backed By Public Sector Assets

Ratings Detail

Reference Rating Level	aa	+	Jurisdiction-Supported Rating Level	aa	+	Maximum Achievable Covered Bond Rating	aa+	=	Covered Bond Rating	
Resolution Regime Uplift	0		Assigned Jurisdictional Support Uplift	0		Collateral Support Uplift	+1		AA+/Negative	
Systemic Importance	Very Strong		Jurisdictional Support Assessment	Very Strong		Overcollateralization Adjustment	-1		Rating Constraints	aa+
Resolution Counterparty Rating	N/A		Legal Framework	Very Strong		Liquidity Adjustment	0		Counterparty Risk	aa+
Issuer Credit Rating or Parent Rating or Guarantor Rating	AA		Systemic Importance	Very Strong		Potential Collateral Based Uplift	+2		Country Risk	aaa
N/A--Not applicable.			Sovereign Credit Capacity	Very Strong						

Major Rating Factors

Strength	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very high issuer credit rating (ICR) as a starting point for our notching up analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counterparty risks constrain the covered bond ratings to one notch above the long-term ICR on Caisse Francaise de Financement Local SCF's (CaFFiL) parent bank, Sfil. Available credit enhancement is sufficient to support only a one-notch uplift above the long-term ICR on Sfil.

Outlook: Negative

The negative outlook on our covered bond ratings reflects the negative outlook on CaFFiL's parent bank, Sfil (AA/Negative/A-1+). We would automatically lower our ratings on the covered bonds should we lower our ICR on Sfil, or if the available credit enhancement were to drop below the level that is commensurate with 'AA+' ratings. We would raise our ratings on the covered bonds if we raised our long-term rating on Sfil and if the derivatives in the program were compliant with our counterparty criteria, and in both cases if the available credit enhancement led to the number of notches required for the rating uplift.

Rationale

We are publishing this transaction update following our annual review of CaFFiL's legislation-enabled public sector covered bond program.

In our analysis, we assume that the issuer's parent has defaulted and look to the resolution regime, the jurisdictional support, and the cover pool to repay the covered bonds. The ratings reflect the likelihood of the covered bonds being repaid in a timely manner on their legal final maturity.

From our analysis of the legal and regulatory framework for covered bonds in France, we have concluded that the assets in the cover pool are isolated from the risk of the bankruptcy or insolvency of Sfil. This asset isolation allows us to assign a higher rating to the covered bonds than our long-term ICR on Sfil.

Sfil is domiciled in France, which applies the EU's Bank Recovery and Resolution Directive (BRRD). We assess the systemic importance of covered bonds in France as very strong. A successful resolution of the issuer's parent increases the likelihood that the issuer would continue servicing its covered bonds without accessing the cover pool or receiving jurisdictional support, even following a bail-in of Sfil's senior unsecured obligations.

Our assessment of the expected jurisdictional support for CaFFiL SCF's covered bond program--which is primarily backed by French public sector loans--is very strong. This could result in a potential uplift from the reference rating level (RRL) of up to three notches (see "Covered Bonds Criteria," published on Dec. 9, 2014). However, the number of notches of uplift is constrained at the rating on the sovereign.

Based on the credit and cashflow information as of June 30, 2023, our analysis shows that the available credit enhancement--14.97%--is in line with one notch of collateral uplift, at 7.73% (6.32% in our previous review), but below the 20.12% target credit enhancement (TCE) for the maximum potential collateral uplift. The covered bonds can therefore achieve a 'AA+' rating from a cash flow perspective.

Furthermore, counterparty risk caps our ratings on the covered bonds at 'AA+', one notch above the RRL.

There are currently no constraints on the ratings relating to legal, operational and administrative, or country risks.

We have based our analysis on criteria articles referenced in the "Related Criteria" section.

Program Description

Under the program term, CaFFiL issues covered bonds (obligations foncières), which are backed by a pool of exposures to public sector assets. As a société de crédit foncier (SCF), CaFFiL is licensed and regulated by the French banking regulator, Autorité de Contrôle Prudentiel et de Résolution.

The program was first established in 1999 as Dexia Municipal Agency, an entity of Dexia Credit Local. In 2013, Dexia Municipal Agency was sold to the new Sfil and the covered bond program, which from then on was entirely independent from Dexia Credit Local, was renamed CaFFiL. This change in name and ownership did not affect its status as an SCF. CaFFiL is therefore the refinancing arm of Sfil and as such fulfills a public role of providing affordable financing to French local authorities and, to a lesser extent, to support large French export contracts. Starting in 2023, thanks to the new partnership between Sfil and Banque des Territoires, CaFFiL has started refinancing projects with strong ecological, energy, and social dimensions for French local governments and the hospital sector.

Caisse des Dépôts et Consignations (CDC), Sfil's reference shareholder since September 2020, confirmed its commitment in a letter of support, completed by a letter of support from the State, in the context of Sfil's continuing status as a state-owned development bank.

Table 1

Program overview*	
Jurisdiction	France
Year of first issuance	1999
Covered bond type	Legislation-enabled
Outstanding covered bonds (bil. €)	51.96
Redemption profile	Hard bullet
Underlying assets	Public sector loans
Jurisdictional support uplift	0
Unused notches for jurisdictional support	0
Target credit enhancement (%)	20.12
Credit enhancement commensurate with 'AA+' rating (%)	7.73
Available credit enhancement (%)	14.97
Collateral support uplift	1
Unused notches for collateral support	0
Total unused notches	0

*As of June 30, 2023 analysis.

Table 2

Program participants			
Role	Name	Rating	Rating dependency
Originator	Sfil	AA	N
Originator	La Banque Postale	A+	N
Issuer	CaFFiL	N/A	N/A
Bank account provider	Banque de France	NR	Y
Bank account provider	Trésor Public (French sovereign)	AA	N

Table 2

Program participants (cont.)			
Role	Name	Rating	Rating dependency
Bank account provider	Natixis S.A.	A	N
Bank account provider	La Banque Postale	A+	N
Bank account provider	Skandinaviska Enskilda Banken AB (publ)	A+	N
Bank account provider	Belfius Bank SA/NV	A	N
Bank account provider	Citibank N.A.	A+	N
Custodian	Société Générale Securities Services Luxembourg	NR	N
Swap counterparty	Sfil	AA	Y
Swap counterparty	Banco Santander SA	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	ING Bank NV	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	Royal Bank of Canada	AA-	Y
Swap counterparty	Société Générale	A	Y
Swap counterparty	Natixis S.A.	A	Y
Swap counterparty	Natwest Markets PLC	A	Y
Swap counterparty	BNP Paribas SA	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	JP Morgan SE	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	Crédit Agricole Corporate and Investment Bank	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	Belfius Bank SA/NV	A	Y
Swap counterparty	Credit Suisse International	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	Deutsche Bank AG	A-	Y
Swap counterparty	Barclays Bank PLC	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	HSBC Continental Europe	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	Morgan Stanley Capital Services LLC	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	Morgan Stanley Europe SE	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	Goldman Sachs Mitsui Marine Derivative Products LP	AA-	Y
Swap counterparty	Bank of America NA	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	Bank of America Europe DAC	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	DZ BANK AG Deutsche Zentral-Genossenschaftsbank, Frankfurt am Main	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	Citibank Europe PLC	A+	Y
Swap counterparty	Banco Bilbao Vizcaya Argentaria S.A.	A	Y

NR--Not rated. Y--Yes. N--No. N/A--Not applicable. Information as of September 2023.

Rating Analysis

Legal and regulatory risks

Under an SCF program, the issuer, a special-purpose entity licensed as a credit institution, issues "obligations foncières" (OFs), which are unsubordinated senior secured obligations and rank pari passu among themselves. OF-holders have recourse first to the issuer and, second, to the SCF's assets--the cover pool--over which they have a senior claim.

In our view, France's legal framework for OFs, defined in article L513-2 and related articles of the "Code Monétaire et

Financier," sufficiently addresses the legal risk considerations highlighted in our covered bonds criteria such as asset isolation and the absence of bond acceleration, enabling us to rate the covered bonds higher than the issuer.

If the issuer becomes insolvent, OFs and other privileged debts, such as swaps, pay in accordance with their payment schedule, ahead of the SCF's other debts or nonprivileged creditors in relation to the SCF's assets.

Our legal analysis is based on our criteria "Asset Isolation And Special-Purpose Entity Methodology," published on March 29, 2017, and our covered bond rating framework criteria.

The EU Covered Bonds Directive and Regulation were implemented into national legislation through changes to the French Monetary and Financial Code and the CRBF 99-10 by decree law (ordonnance) n. 2021-858 dated June 30, 2021, decree (décret) n. 2021-898 dated July 6, 2021, ministerial decree (arrêté) dated July 7, 2021, decree (décret) n. 2022-766 dated May 2, 2022, ministerial decree (arrêté) dated Dec. 1, 2022, and decree (décret) n. 2023-102 dated Feb. 16, 2023. These amendments apply to covered bonds issued from July 8, 2022. The main changes include:

- A soft bullet maturity extension, allowed in case of a principal payment default by the issuer or the sponsor on the scheduled maturity date of the covered bonds, or if the issuer or sponsor becomes subject to insolvency proceedings. Soft bullet extensions cannot invert the maturity order of outstanding bonds.
- Soft bullet extensions cannot invert the outstanding bonds' maturity order upon SCF's insolvency. However, maturity inversion is not forbidden once the maturity extension has been triggered by one of the aforementioned events associated with the parent.
- Premium and standard labels, with premium covered bonds requiring enhanced monitoring activity by the cover pool monitor (contrôleur spécifique) to ensure compliance with article 129 of the Capital Requirements Regulation (CRR).

Other changes are related to the elements of the regulatory coverage ratio, its calculation as well as enhanced disclosures and reporting.

Since the French legislation is already well aligned with the EU Directive, the scope of updates is limited and does not affect our analysis of the French legal framework.

CaFFil updated the program documentation and was granted the premium covered bond label by the French banking regulator, French Resolution and Prudential Control Authority (Autorité de contrôle prudentiel et de resolution, ACPR) on Sept. 6, 2022.

Operational and administrative risks

Sfil services the cover pool assets, which are recorded separately to ensure segregation from its own assets. Use of the cover pool assets for other purposes is restricted.

We have not identified any operational or administrative risks that would affect our assessment of the program. We consider the servicing and origination procedures to be in line with CaFFiL's peers. In addition, we believe that the bank's management is committed to maintaining an adequate level of overcollateralization (OC) for the covered bonds.

As a regulated entity, CaFFiL is subject to ongoing monitoring of its compliance with legal covenants from the

contrôleur spécifique.

Our analysis of operational and administrative risks follows the principles laid out in our covered bonds rating framework criteria.

Resolution regime analysis

Sfil is headquartered in France, a jurisdiction that applies the EU BRRD resolution framework. We assess the systemic importance for French public sector covered bonds as very strong. This assessment means that the RRL can be two notches above the long-term ICR. As we consider the issuer to be a core entity of Sfil, we therefore uplift the rating on the bonds from the long-term ICR (AA/Negative/A-1+) on Sfil. The RRL is equal to the ICR, that is, 'aa'. According to our covered bond criteria, if an issuer is a government-related entity (GRE), the RRL is typically equal to the ICR.

Jurisdictional support analysis

In our jurisdictional support analysis, we assess the likelihood that a covered bond program facing stress would receive support from a government-sponsored initiative instead of from the liquidation of collateral assets in the open market. We have assessed jurisdictional support for French public-sector covered bonds as very strong, reflecting that the program can receive up to three notches of jurisdictional uplift above the RRL.

However, as the rating on the sovereign (France: unsolicited AA/Negative/A-1+) caps the jurisdictional support uplift, and Sfil is rated at the same level as France, the covered bonds do not benefit from any notches of uplift, resulting in a jurisdiction-supported rating level (JRL) of 'aa'. Moreover, because Sfil is directly or indirectly 100% owned by the French state and benefits from an almost certain likelihood of extraordinary support from the government in the event of financial distress, we consider it extremely unlikely that these unused notches could ever be realized and conclude that there are no unused notches of jurisdictional support for ratings uplift.

Collateral support analysis

We analyzed loan level data as of June 30, 2023, and assessed the portfolio's credit quality by applying our criteria for rating covered bonds backed by public sector assets (see "Methodology And Assumptions For Assessing Portfolios Of International Public Sector And Other Debt Obligations Backing Covered Bonds And Structured Finance Securities," published on Dec. 9, 2014).

The pool comprises loans to public sector entities, the majority of which (79.10%) are French (see table 6). The pool also comprises substitute assets: bank bonds, loans to Sfil, and cash (see table 3). Cash is a non-defaulting asset that is not part of our credit analysis but is considered in our cash flow analysis.

Table 3

Cover pool composition					
Asset type	--As of June 30, 2023--		--As of June 30, 2022--		
	Value (mil. €)	Percentage of cover pool (%)	Value (mil. €)	Percentage of cover pool (%)	
Public sector	57,833.06	96.51	58,106.76	97.21	
Substitute assets	1,366.90	2.28	579.15	0.97	
Cash	727.45	1.21	1,089.22	1.82	
Total value	59,927.41	100	59,775.12	100	

We assess asset credit quality using our 'AAA' stressed measure of the level of defaults--the scenario default rate (SDR)--and our measure of recoveries given default. We view French public-sector hospitals as central GREs, ruled and supervised by the central government and not by local and regional governments (LRGs). However, if a French hospital were to default on a loan, we expect that the defaulted debt would be restructured in a similar manner to that of an LRG, and would not be as marketable as defaulted sovereign debt. We also consider that French public-sector hospitals are very dependent on central government decisions, due to their limited revenue flexibility and rigid cost structures. These features similarly characterize French departments, which we assess as category B under our aforementioned criteria. We have therefore assessed our recovery assumptions for French public-sector hospitals as category B.

The SDR is slightly higher than that in our previous analysis, reflecting the higher share of export refinancing loans on the majority of which we apply last resort assumption ratings (see table 6). Our credit analysis for export refinancing loans follows the methodology for granular pools (as defined in our criteria "Methodology And Assumptions For Assessing Portfolios Of International Public Sector And Other Debt Obligations Backing Covered Bonds And Structured Finance Securities", Dec. 9, 2014). There are currently 29 loans with spread-out maturities to effectively 18 underlying borrowers, which represent almost 12% of the pool, (up from 1% five years ago).

According to our granular pools methodology, we consider the credit rating on the underlying asset instead of that on the ultimate guarantor (France in this case). We consider the recovery amount coming from the guarantor on top of that of the underlying obligor (after the corporate's recovery).

The higher share of sovereign and non-LRG exposures (see table 7) has, on the one hand, a positive effect on the portfolio's time to recovery (to 3.07 years in 2023 from 3.25 years in 2022). On the other hand, it has a negative effect on the portfolio's recovery rate, which, as of June 30, 2023, stands at 37.14% compared to 36.21% last year (see table 4). The latter is partially offset by the portfolio's higher share of export refinancing loans, which benefit from recoveries from both the obligor and the guarantor (see table 6).

Table 4

Key credit metrics		
Public sector loans	As of June 30, 2023	As of June 30, 2022
20 largest obligors (% of cover pool)	23.14	21.24
Credit analysis results:		
Scenario default rate (%)	37.14	36.21
Weighted-average recovery rate (%)	77.5	78.2
Weighted-average time to recovery (years)	3.07	3.25
Largest obligor test result (% of covered bonds)*	4.81	4.35
Largest industry test result (% of covered bonds)*	2.54	2.64
Largest sovereign test result (% of covered bonds)*	6.07	2.56
Largest T&C test result (% of covered bonds)	0	0

*As a percentage of outstanding covered bonds and before giving credit to excess spread. N/A--Not applicable. T&C--Transfer and convertibility.

Table 5

Public sector and substitute assets distribution by credit assumptions				
Percentage of cover pool excluding cash (%)				
Rating category (aggregate)	As of June 30, 2023		As of June 30, 2022	
AAA	0.48		0.16	
AA	5.99		6.04	
A	21.61		21.46	
BBB	52.39		55.6	
BB	0.26		0.23	
B or lower	19.27		16.51	
Total	100		100.00	

Table 6

Geographical distribution				
Percentage of cover pool excluding cash (%)				
	As of June 30, 2023		As of June 30, 2022	
France	79.10		81.16	
Export refinancing exposures	11.82		9.22	
Italy	5.72		6.75	
Canada	0.87		0.67	
Others	2.49		2.20	
Total	100		100	

Table 7

Public sector loans distribution and key assumptions						
	As of June 30, 2023			As of June 30, 2022		
	'AAA' recovery rate (%)	Time to recovery (years)	Share of pool (%)	'AAA' recovery rate (%)	Time to recovery (years)	Share of pool (%)
Category A LRGs	90	4	48.18	90	4	50.50
French municipalities, communes urbaines, communes de communes, communes d'agglomeration			41.75			42.94
French regions			4.41			4.99
French social housing			0.94			1.37
Swiss assets			0.00			0.01
Other French LRGs			0.23			0.25
Other non-French LRGs			0.85			0.93
Category B LRGs	75	4	28.44	75	4	30.80
French departments			11.76			12.48
French public hospitals			10.30			10.38
Italian assets (municipalities, regions, provinces)			3.76			4.77
Other French LRGs			1.86			2.06
Other non-French LRGs			0.75			1.12

Table 7

Public sector loans distribution and key assumptions (cont.)						
Sovereigns	37	0	7.22	37	0	6.44
France			0.99			0.49
Italy			1.95			1.98
Portugal			1.72			0.01
Others			2.56			3.95
Non-LRGs			16.16			12.26
French non-LRGs secured	50	0	1.54	50	0	0.15
French non-LRGs unsecured	18	0	6.91	18	0	5.79
Other non-LRGs	18	0	7.71	18	0	5.51
Total/weighted-average	77.50	3.1	100	78.20	3.3	100

LRGs--Local and regional governments.

Our analysis of the covered bonds' payment structure shows that the cover pool assets' cash flows would be sufficient to make timely payments of interest and principal to the covered bondholders at a 'AA+' rating level.

We analyze the cash flows under our credit stresses, as well as under liquidity and interest rate stresses. We assume a servicing fee of 10 basis points (bps).

The program is exposed to structural asset-liability mismatch risk as the covered bonds have bullet maturities. Our model simulates a stressed sale of assets whenever a liquidity gap occurs in our analysis. The discount applied for the assets in the program is 433 bps, on top of the stressed interest rate at the time of the shortfall. This discount is a function of the nature of the assets and is outlined in our criteria.

Interest and currency mismatches are covered by swaps, which we took into account regardless of whether the swap contracts reflect our current counterparty criteria or not (see our "Counterparty risk" section).

There are no structural mechanisms to allocate assets proportionately to each bond or to check for amortization. The bonds are never accelerated. There is therefore a risk of time subordination for bonds with later maturity dates if there is a cash shortfall. Our rating addresses the timely repayment of all bonds. All of the outstanding covered bonds are hard bullet.

Because there is an active secondary market for the assets in the cover pool, the program can potentially benefit from up to four notches of collateral-based uplift above the JRL, although the available credit enhancement currently limits such uplift.

Liquidity risk. We do not apply any adjustment for liquidity risk because the program covers 180 days of liquidity in application of the SCF regulation. The vast majority of assets in the cover pool are repoable with the Banque de France (BdF) with which the program is already registered, so that liquidity can be realized immediately from the cover pool.

Overcollateralization commitment. The program complies with the 5% regulatory minimum overcollateralization (OC) but this is not a dynamic figure and is below the OC commensurate with the current rating. We therefore deduct a notch for uncommitted OC from the maximum number of potential notches of uplift. This means that in order to

benefit from one notch of collateral uplift, the program will need to cover 'AAA' credit risk, and to benefit from two notches of collateral uplift, it would need to cover 'AAA' credit risk and 75% of the refinancing costs.

Based on information provided as of June 30, 2023, our analysis shows that the available credit enhancement of 14.97% covers the credit risk at a 'AAA' level (7.73%), allowing the program to achieve one notch of uplift above the RRL.

Required credit enhancement for coverage of 'AAA' credit risk reflects the OC level assuming no asset-liability mismatch after applying stressed assumptions on asset default and recovery rates, stressed interest rates and transaction costs. In addition to 'AAA' credit risk, our TCE also includes the additional expected credit enhancement required to cover refinancing risk, i.e., forced asset sales.

As of June 30, 2023, both AAA credit risk (7.73%) and TCE (20.12%) have increased since our previous analysis (6.32% and 18.40% respectively), mainly due to a higher SDR, lower recoveries and slightly lower excess spread in the program. The latter is the difference between the interest earned on the assets and the coupon due on the covered bonds. The higher asset liability mismatch, which is the difference between the weighted average maturity of the assets and the covered bonds' weighted average maturity, has further contributed to the increase in TCE.

Table 8

Collateral uplift metrics		
	As of June 30, 2023	As of June 30, 2022
Asset WAM (years)*	7.76	7.82
Liability WAM (years)	6.66	7.14
Available credit enhancement	14.97	15.15
Required credit enhancement for coverage of 'AAA' credit risk (%)	7.73	6.32
Required credit enhancement for current rating ('AAA' credit risk (%))	7.73	6.32
Coverage of 'AAA' credit risk and 75% of refinancing costs (%)	17.02	15.38
Target credit enhancement for maximum uplift (%)	20.12	18.4
Potential collateral-based uplift (notches)	2	2
Adjustment for liquidity (Y/N)	N	N
Adjustment for committed overcollateralization (Y/N)	Y	Y
Collateral support uplift (notches)	1	1

*Based on the assets' consolidated amortizing profile. WAM--Weighted-average maturity.

Additional Rating Factors

Counterparty risk

We have identified several counterparty risks to which the covered bonds could be exposed. Some are structurally addressed, while others are not and therefore constrain the ratings on the bonds to 'AA+'.

Bank accounts CaFFiL has several bank accounts. Typically, these are swept daily, such that CaFFiL does not have an overnight credit exposure to the counterparty. CaFFiL is exposed to the credit risk of the BdF, as it holds cash there in an account that does not have any downgrade language. The ratings on the covered bonds are therefore weak-linked

to the creditworthiness of the BdF.

Commingling risk 10% of CaFFiL borrowers' payments are directed to CaFFiL's accounts at commercial banks. In the past we would size one month's worth of collection losses for these payments in our cash flow analysis.

We have now revised our approach to analyzing commingling risk and we no longer consider that there is a risk associated with the notification of borrowers paying into CaFFiL's accounts held at commercial banks. Therefore, we no longer size for commingling risk.

Asset and liability swaps From a counterparty risk perspective, there are two types of swaps in this transaction:

- Swaps with a related entity, Sfil, the documentation of which is in line with our previous counterparty criteria (replacement option three). We consider that these swaps' counterparty risk is structurally mitigated and does not constrain the rating on the bonds. We take the hedges into account in our cash flow analysis.
- Swaps with unrelated entities that have no replacement framework or replacement frameworks from older criteria. Because swap termination payments are not subordinated to the payment on the covered bonds, and because the notional amount of these swaps is currently above the threshold defined in our covered bonds counterparty criteria, we account for the liquidity risk of these potential payments by limiting the ratings on the covered bonds to the higher of one notch above our RRL, and the outcome from the relevant table in our counterparty criteria. This results in a 'AA+' rating. As these swaps already introduce a cap to the ratings, we take the benefit of their hedges into account in our cash flow simulations.

Sovereign risk. We analyze sovereign risk under our structured finance sovereign risk criteria (see "Incorporating Sovereign Risk In Rating Structured Finance Securities: Methodology And Assumptions," published on Jan. 30, 2019).

This is a multi-jurisdictional pool of public sector assets. The issuer is located in France, which is part of a monetary union, and liquidity risk is covered for six months. The multi-jurisdictional treatment for covered bonds under the applicable criteria, including the supplemental tests--largest sovereign test and largest transfer and convertibility test, results in the rating on the program not being constrained by sovereign default risk.

Related Criteria

- Environmental, Social, And Governance Principles In Credit Ratings, Oct 10, 2021
- Criteria | Structured Finance | General: Counterparty Risk Framework: Methodology And Assumptions, March 8, 2019
- Criteria | Structured Finance | General: Incorporating Sovereign Risk In Rating Structured Finance Securities: Methodology And Assumptions, Jan. 30, 2019
- Legal Criteria: Structured Finance: Asset Isolation And Special-Purpose Entity Methodology, March 29, 2017
- Global Investment Criteria For Temporary Investments In Transaction Accounts, May 31, 2012
- Global Derivative Agreement Criteria, June 24, 2013
- Methodology And Assumptions For Assessing Portfolios Of International Public Sector And Other Debt Obligations Backing Covered Bonds And Structured Finance Securities, Dec. 9, 2014

- Covered Bond Ratings Framework: Methodology And Assumptions, June 30, 2015
- Covered Bonds Criteria, Dec. 9, 2014
- General Criteria: Principles Of Credit Ratings, Feb. 16, 2011

Related Research

- Global Covered Bond Insights Q4 2023, Oct. 20, 2023
- French Covered Bond Market Insights, Sept. 7, 2023
- Covered Bonds Outlook Midyear 2023, July 19, 2023
- Societe de Financement Local (Sfil), June 5, 2023
- Outlooks On Seven French Government-Related Entities Revised To Negative From Stable After Similar Action On France, Dec. 6, 2022
- S&P Global Ratings Definitions, June 9, 2023
- Covered Bond Monitor: Technical Note, Sept. 6, 2019

Copyright © 2023 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.