

RatingsDirect®

Criteria | Governments | U.S. Public Finance: Financial Management Assessment

Primary Credit Analyst:

Jane H Ridley, Chicago (1) 312-233-7012; jane.ridley@standardandpoors.com

Secondary Contact:

Horacio G Aldrete-Sanchez, Dallas (1) 214-871-1426; horacio.aldrete@standardandpoors.com

Table Of Contents

Assessing Financial Practices

Analytical Framework

Assessment Methodology

Analytical Process And Supporting Documentation

Criteria | Governments | U.S. Public Finance:

Financial Management Assessment

(Editor's Note: This criteria article originally was published on June 27, 2006. We're republishing this article following our periodic review completed on Feb. 5, 2015. As a result of our 2015 review, we updated the author contact information. Previously, we updated the author contact information following our 2014 review. In table 6, the debt derivative profile criteria referred to has been superseded by the criteria article titled, "Contingent Liquidity Risks in U.S. Public Finance Instruments: Methodology And Assumptions," published on March 5, 2012.)

The rigor of a government's financial management practices is an important factor in Standard & Poor's Ratings Services analysis of that government's creditworthiness. Managerial decisions, policies, and practices apply directly to the government's financial position and operations, debt burden, and other key credit factors. A government's ability to implement timely and sound financial and operational decisions in response to economic and fiscal demands is a primary determinant of near-term changes in credit quality. Standard & Poor's will now offer a more transparent assessment of a government's financial practices as an integral part of our general obligation and appropriation credit rating process.

Assessing Financial Practices

Major elements of governmental financial management include economic analysis, revenue forecasting, risk management, accounting practices, financial strategies, cash and liquidity administration, and debt management. All of these elements have an impact on a government's bottom line, and, as a result, on its credit quality. If a government is unable or unwilling to employ its authority in a timely manner to address events that impact its budget and financial condition, its credit rating can be adversely affected.

Many finance directors and other local government officials take pride in the managerial policies, practices, and structures they have established to ensure efficiency and quality of service, and to promote innovation and security. While credit ratings incorporate financial management as one of many factors, the impact of financial management on the rating may not be readily apparent because other factors may counterbalance, or even outweigh it. Examples of such factors include local economic conditions, debt levels, and statutory limitations. By focusing special attention on the assessment of financial practices, Standard & Poor's will more fully recognize governments' efforts in this important area.

Analytical Framework

Standard & Poor's has established an analytical methodology that evaluates established and ongoing management practices and policies in the seven areas most likely to affect credit quality. These areas are:

- Revenue and expenditure assumptions
- Budget amendments and updates
- Long term financial planning

- Long term capital planning
- Investment management policies
- Debt management policies
- Reserve and liquidity policies

The evaluation of each area focuses on best practices and policies that are credit-important in most governments rather than policies that address issues that are fairly unusual or unique to the government. The nature of the policies and practices considered are those that governments may use in some manner regardless of the size or type of government. Issuers that rank well in the evaluation should be those whose policies help reduce the likelihood of credit deterioration, or enable them to benefit more from changing conditions, whether they are economic, budgetary, statutory, or personnel related.

Users of the FMA, however, should also realize its limitations. By focusing on a government's policies and practices, the FMA is not an evaluation of the competency or aptitude of individual finance professionals; nor is it an evaluation of a finance department's ability to handle unique challenges. Moreover, the nature of the entity's governing body, the effectiveness of its governance practices, and issues of public policy pursued by the government are beyond the scope of this analysis.

Although Standard & Poor's considers in its analysis any material information that provides relevant context or influences financial management, it is important to note that this assessment of financial practices is based primarily on the existence and implementation of management practices, and not necessarily the results achieved by such practices. Results—both positive and negative—are assumed to manifest themselves in other visible ways. The purpose of the focus on policies and practices is to evaluate the potential for credit quality to move away from those currently indicated by results.

The following tables detail each of the seven financial practice areas examined by Standard & Poor's.

Table 1

Revenue And Expenditure Assumptions	
Are the organization's financial assumptions and projections realistic and well grounded from both long-term and recent trend perspectives?	
Strong	Formal historic trend analysis is performed and updated annually for both revenue and spending; regular effort is made to determine whether revenues or expenditures will deviate from their long-term trends over the next couple of years; evidence of independent revenue forecasting exists (when possible).
Standard	Optimistic assumptions exist that, while supportable, add risk; assumptions are based on recent performance, but little evidence of questioning or validating assumptions exists.
Vulnerable	Assumptions neglect likely shortfalls, expenditure pressures or other pending issues; assumptions exist which enjoy no prudent validation.

Table 2

Budget Amendments And Updates

Are there procedures for reviewing and amending the budget based on updated information and actual performance to ensure fiscal targets are met?

Strong	At least quarterly budget surveillance is maintained to identify problem areas and enable timely budget adjustments; management exhibits ability and willingness to address necessary intra-year revenue and expenditure changes to meet fiscal targets.
Standard	Semiannual budget reviews exist; management identifies variances between budget and actual performance.
Vulnerable	No formal process exists for regular review and timely updating of budget during the year.

Table 3

Long-Term Financial Planning

Does management have a long-term financial plan that allows them to identify future revenues and expenditures as well as address upcoming issues that might affect these?

Strong	A multi-year financial plan exists where future issues are identified and possible solutions are identified, if not implemented; revenue and expenditure decisions are made primarily from a long-term perspective. Structural balance is a clear goal.
Standard	Multi-year projections are done informally; multi-year projections are done, but without discussion of pending issues, so that issues are not addressed; some one-shot actions exist, but the long-term consequences of these actions are acknowledged and communicated.
Vulnerable	No long-term financial planning exists; operational planning is done on a year-to-year (or budget-to-budget) basis; one-shot budget fixes are used with little attention to long-term consequences.

Table 4

Long-Term Capital Planning

Has the organization created a long-term capital improvement program?

Strong	A five-year rolling CIP with funding identified for all years exists and is linked to the operating budget and long-term revenue and financing strategies.
Standard	A five-year CIP is done, but is generally limited to projects to be funded from the current budget plus a four-year wish list; some funding for out-year projects is identified, but not all.
Vulnerable	No five-year CIP exists; capital planning is done as needs arise.

Table 5

Investment Management Policies

Has the organization established policies pertaining to investments, such as the selection of financial institutions for services and transactions; risk assessment; investment objectives; investment maturities and volatility; portfolio diversification; safekeeping and custody; and investment performance reporting, benchmarking, and disclosure?

Strong	Investment policies exist and are well defined; strong reporting and monitoring mechanisms exist and are functioning.
Standard	Informal or non-published policies exist; policies are widely communicated and followed.
Vulnerable	Absence of informal or non-published policies

Table 6

Debt Management Policies	
Has the organization established policies pertaining to the issuance of debt, such as projects that may or may not be funded with debt (including economic development projects); maturity and debt service structure; use of security and pledges, credit enhancement, and derivatives; and debt refunding guidelines?	
Strong	Debt policies exist and are well defined; strong reporting and monitoring mechanisms exist and are functioning. If swaps are allowed, a formal swap management plan that follows S&P's guidelines (see the DDP) has been adopted.
Standard	Basic policies exist; policies are widely communicated and followed. If swaps are allowed there is a swap management plan in place, but it does not follow S&P's guidelines.
Vulnerable	Absence of basic policies or clear evidence that basic policies are followed. Swaps are allowed but there is no swap management plan in place, and/or there is no local (non-FA) knowledge about the swap.

Table 7

Reserve And Liquidity Policies	
Has the organization established a formalized operating reserve policy, which takes into account the government's cash flow/operating requirements and the historic volatility of revenues and expenditures through economic cycles?	
Strong	A formal operating reserve policy is well defined. Reserve levels are clearly linked to the government's cash flow needs and the historic volatility of revenues and expenditures throughout economic cycles. Management has historically adhered to it.
Standard	A less defined policy exists, which has no actual basis but has been historically adhered to it.
Vulnerable	Absence of basic policies or, if they exist, are not followed.

Assessment Methodology

Standard & Poor's evaluates and assigns each of the seven areas a qualitative ranking, based on the above framework. In determining the overall assessment, the revenue and expenditure assumptions, budget amendments and updates are given a relatively higher importance; long-term financial planning and liquidity policies are given an average importance; and capital planning, debt policies, and investment policies receive relatively less weight. The difference in degrees of importance is limited, however, so that each factor's contribution to the assessment is meaningful.

Overall assessments are communicated using the following terminology: The term "good", in addition to the terms "strong", "standard", and "vulnerable", is used to further differentiate governments with a mix of strong and standard practices.

"Strong"

A Financial Management Assessment of 'strong' indicates that practices are strong, well embedded, and likely sustainable. The government maintains most best practices deemed critical to supporting credit quality and these are well embedded in the government's daily operations and practices. Formal policies support many of these activities, adding to the likelihood that these practices will be continued into the future and transcend changes in the operating environment or personnel.

"Good"

A Financial Management Assessment of 'good' indicates that practices are deemed currently good, but not comprehensive. The government maintains many best practices deemed as critical to supporting credit quality, particularly within the finance department. These practices, however, may not be institutionalized or formalized in policy, may lack detail or long-term elements, or may have little recognition by decision makers outside of the finance department.

"Standard"

A Financial Management Assessment of 'standard' indicates that the finance department maintains adequate policies in most, but not all key areas. These policies often lack formal detail and institutionalization, and may not include best practices.

"Vulnerable"

A Financial Management Assessment of 'vulnerable' indicates that the government lacks policies in many of the areas deemed most critical to supporting credit quality. The 'vulnerable' designation suggests a high degree of uncertainty regarding a government's ability to effectively adapt to changing conditions that could threaten its long-term financial position.

Analytical Process And Supporting Documentation

To perform its analysis of local government financial practices, Standard & Poor's will rely on documentation provided by the government and discussions with the organization's management. Relevant documents include, but are not limited to, audited financial statements and accompanying notes, budget documents, financial plans, management policy statements, procedure manuals, and periodic reports. Discussions provide an important opportunity for management to elaborate on the factors listed above, as well as answer specific questions, so as to enable Standard & Poor's analysts to assess the factors as thoroughly as possible.

Copyright © 2016 Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC, a part of McGraw Hill Financial. 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.

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 acknowledgement 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 acknowledgement 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 nonpublic information received in connection with each analytical process.

S&P may receive compensation for its ratings and certain analyses, normally from issuers or underwriters of securities or from obligors. S&P reserves the right to disseminate its opinions and analyses. S&P's public ratings and analyses are made available on its Web sites, www.standardandpoors.com (free of charge), and www.ratingsdirect.com and www.globalcreditportal.com (subscription) and www.spcapitaliq.com (subscription) and may be distributed through other means, including via S&P publications and third-party redistributors. Additional information about our ratings fees is available at www.standardandpoors.com/usratingsfees.