Russian market reputation is the key criterion used when choosing a rating agency

A Russian rating industry survey

- ACRA has conducted its third annual Russian rating industry survey. This year, the survey was carried out after the expiration of the transitional period in the national rating industry (July 13, 2017).

- 88% of respondents admitted that they trust the ratings assigned by agencies operating in Russia. It is a maximum level of trust demonstrated over the past two years. Ratings are most trusted by those who use ratings assigned under both national and international rating scales. In general, financiers increasingly apply ratings under both scales as complementary tools in making investment decisions.

- Stricter state regulations and correct risk assessments of rated issuers are the key drivers of trust. Over the past year, ratings assigned by agencies operating in the Russian market have gained trust among 42% of respondents, vs 30% in 2017 and mere 8% in 2016. The main drivers undermining the trust include credit risk underestimation, slow responsiveness and declining competitiveness in the Russian market. However, the share of respondents who believe that the current level of competitiveness in the rating industry pushes down the quality of ratings has declined.

- Dissatisfaction over credit ratings penetration in the Russian market has declined over the past year. The decline mostly relates to those who apply ratings under the national scale only. Sectors least covered by ratings are construction and real estate, agro-industry, and IT and media.

- Russian market reputation has become the main selection criterion applicable to rating agencies. Last year, respondents pointed to the equal importance of reputation on the national and global markets.
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About 88% of financial market professionals trust ratings assigned by agencies operating in Russia

The share of financial market participants who trust credit ratings assigned by agencies operating in the Russian market has grown from 56% to 88% over the last year (Fig. 2), including 22% who "trust" and 66% who "probably trust". This is a maximum level of trust over the last two years. The level of trust has increased most in those respondents who use ratings assigned under both national and international scales.

In general, financiers increasingly apply ratings under the both scales as complementary tools in making investment decisions. Ratings assigned under the both scales have become more in demand in the market (from 58% to 75%, Fig. 1). National ratings have become more popular (11% against 7% last year), unlike international ratings that have lost in popularity among each group of respondents.

Figure 1. You use credit ratings based on...

![Graph showing the use of credit ratings by different groups of respondents.]

**Source:** ACRA estimates

Figure 2. Do you trust ratings assigned by agencies operating on the Russian market?¹

![Graph showing the trust in ratings assigned by different agencies.]

**Source:** ACRA estimates

¹ The question was not included in the 2016 survey, therefore, only two last years were compared.
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Stricter state regulations and correct risk assessments are the key drivers of trust

42% of respondents indicated that their trust in the assessments made by rating agencies operating in the Russian market have grown (Fig. 3). For comparison: in 2017, the share of such respondents was 30%, and in 2016 — 8%. The maximum growth has occurred among financial sector players (44%), private investors (40%) and corporates (39%).

July 13, 2017, the transformation period of the Russian rating industry ended. 40% of respondents indicated that the state control tightening has driven up their trust (Fig. 4). Another 36% indicated correct risk assessments as such driver.

Figure 3. Over the last year, your confidence in credit ratings assigned by agencies working on the Russian market...

What group of market participants do you belong to?

![Bar chart showing the increase, stay unchanged, and decrease in confidence by market participants over the years 2016, 2017, and 2018.]

Source: ACRA estimates

Figure 4. What events occurred over the last 12 months that helped increase confidence in ratings assigned by agencies operating on the Russian market? (multiple answers were allowed)

![Bar chart showing the proportion of respondents for each event over the years 2016, 2017, and 2018.]

Source: ACRA estimates

Fig. 4 shows the proportion of those who answered the question. Respondents were allowed to tick more than one answer, so that the sum exceeds 100%.
Third year in a row, the participants have been most concerned about the underestimation of credit risk and the belated response (53%) of rating agencies operating in the Russian market (Fig. 5). However, the percentage of participants who responded so in the previous two years was significantly higher (59% in 2017 and 66% in 2016). The second most important event, which aroused concerns in respondents, is lower competition in the Russian market (28%). However, the share of such respondents has decreased over the past year from 30%. In general, this year, survey participants are less frequently respond that the current degree of competition in the market negatively affects the quality of ratings (42% vs 51% a year ago, Fig. 6).

Figure 5. What events occurred over the last 12 months that could challenge the objectiveness of ratings assigned by agencies operating on the Russian market? (multiple answers were allowed)

**Fig. 5 shows the proportion of those who answered the question. Respondents were allowed to select more than one answer, so that the sum exceeds 100%.

Figure 6. Could you gauge competitiveness in the Russian credit rating sector and assess whether it contributes to rating?

42% is the share of respondents who believe that the current degree of competitiveness is negative for the quality of rating

- Competition in the sector is excessive, which damages rating quality
- The sector is monopolized, which damages rating quality
- The sector is relatively competitive, which contributes to rating quality
- The sector is monopolized, but this does not affect rating quality

Source: ACRA estimates
Satisfaction with rating penetration in the Russian market has grown

Over the past year, the proportion of respondents who answered that they are satisfied with the degree of rating penetration in the Russian economy has increased from 38% to 46% (Fig. 7). The greatest increase in the degree of satisfaction occurred in those who focus on ratings assigned under the national scale only (from 542% to 65%). Although the overall level of dissatisfaction has decreased over the past year, it still has not reached the 2016 figure.

Most often, the participants indicate a lack of credit ratings in companies operating in the construction and real estate sector (42%), agro-industry (31%), retail sales (27%) and IT and media (27%) (Fig. 8); less often — in the oil and gas industry (8%), telecommunications sector (8%) and chemical industry (11%).

Figure 7. Are you satisfied with credit rating coverage of the Russian market?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International scale only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National scale only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International and national scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents

Source: ACRA estimates

Figure 8. In case a company you were interested in was not rated, which sector did such company belong to? (multiple answers were allowed)

* Excluding withdrawn ratings. For structured finance, the number of issue ratings is indicated. Source: ACRA estimates
The main criterion for selecting a rating agency is its business reputation in the Russian market

A year ago, participants responded that the reputation in the Russian and global markets is equally important for a rating agency: both criteria scored 4.2 points (Fig. 9). This year, for the first time, the respondents named the reputation in the Russian market as the main criterion used when choosing a rating agency. The indicator scored 4.5 points, while the international reputation scored only 4 points.

The second most important factor is pricing (3.7 points). Its relevance has been growing in the past three years, but, on the other hand, more and more respondents say that the price of credit rating agencies’ services is generally available to Russian issuers (79 against 70% a year ago, Fig. 10). The share of respondents who are generally satisfied with the level of information disclosure by rating agencies has also become higher. It has grown from 49% to 82% over the past three years (Fig. 10).

Figure 9. Name the most important criteria for selecting a rating agency (5 – maximum importance, 0 – minimal importance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: ACRA estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In Fig. 10, the share of respondents who believe that the prices offered by rating agencies are generally acceptable for Russian issuers is indicated without those respondents who have no pricing information (see Appendix).

Figure 10. Share of respondents who believe that the prices offered by rating agencies are generally acceptable for Russian issuers has increased over the past year.

| Source: ACRA estimates |
Appendix. Russian rating sector evaluation survey results

1. **Respondent profile**

   1. What group of market participants do you belong to?

   - 2016: 18% Public authorities, 10% Financial sector, 9% Corporate sector, 55% Private investors, 8% Other
   - 2017: 14% Public authorities, 5% Financial sector, 16% Corporate sector, 60% Private investors, 6% Other
   - 2018: 5% Public authorities, 15% Financial sector, 5% Corporate sector, 70% Private investors, 8% Other

   2. Is the company you represent a rating object?

   - 2016: Yes 43%, No 43%, Maybe 25%
   - 2017: Yes 57%, No 57%, Maybe 75%
   - 2018: Yes 70%, No 62%, Maybe 75%

   3. Have you ever worked with rating agencies for obtaining a credit rating?

   - 2016: Yes 38%, No 62%
   - 2017: Yes 51%, No 49%
   - 2018: Yes 28%, No 72%

   4. How well do you believe you know the field of credit ratings? For example, do you know the difference between international and national rating scales?

   - 2016: Yes 15%, No 85%
   - 2017: Yes 18%, No 82%
   - 2018: Yes 13%, No 87%

   5. Do you take credit ratings into account while making investment decisions?

   - 2016: Yes 25%, No 75%
   - 2017: Yes 31%, No 69%
   - 2018: Yes 26%, No 74%

   6. You use credit ratings based on...

   - 2016: International and national scales 3%, National scale only 40%, International scale only 75%
   - 2017: International and national scales 7%, National scale only 36%, International scale only 75%
   - 2018: International and national scales 11%, National scale only 14%, International scale only 75%
2

A correct estimate of future risks

7. Do you trust ratings assigned by agencies operating on the Russian market?²

- Yes
- Probably yes
- Probably no
- No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Over the past year, your confidence in ratings assigned by agencies operating on the Russian market...

- Increased
- Stayed unchanged
- Decreased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What events occurred over the last 12 months that helped increase confidence in ratings assigned by agencies operating on the Russian market? (multiple answers were allowed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State control tightening over rating agencies in Russia</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct risk assessments of rated issuers</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition growth on the Russian market</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please, specify)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What events occurred over the last 12 months that could challenge objectiveness of ratings assigned by agencies operating on the Russian market? (multiple answers were allowed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State control tightening over rating agencies in Russia</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence between ratings and capital market indicators</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit risk underassessment and delayed reaction</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating assignment to affiliates</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition decline on the Russian market</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please, specify)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² The 2016 survey did not feature this question.
11. What would you attribute to rating agency mistakes that you know of in credit risk assessment? (multiple answers were allowed)

- Insufficient rating analysts’ professionalism: 37%, 32%, 32%
- Methodological glitches: 35%, 36%, 30%
- Inaccuracies in forecasting methods: 41%, 41%, 39%
- Impossibility to see the future: 41%, 26%, 34%
- Conflict of interest: 39%, 34%, 40%
- Other (please, specify): 6%, 4%, 5%
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Strong influence on the market with substitution of state functions

12. Do you believe that ratings have an excessive impact on the Russian financial market?

- The impact is unacceptable; the blame for the 2008 global financial crisis lies on rating agencies: 18%, 38%, 43%
- Yes, the impact is excessive, and I saw it damage the financial market: 13%, 36%, 51%
- The impact is obvious, but it causes no negative effect on the market: 1%, 16%, 50%
- No, for investors this is just one of information sources: 0%, 1%, 0%

13. Is it acceptable for you that ratings represent only an opinion of a rating agency and formally the latter is not responsible for them?

- I do not care, as I do not trust rating agencies: 1%, 1%, 1%
- No, this is unacceptable; agencies should be responsible for their assessments: 27%, 23%, 49%
- Yes, but this undermines their credibility: 19%, 33%, 47%
- Yes, this is normal for rating services markets; agencies’ concern about their reputation is the best guarantee: 17%, 30%, 52%

14. If you believe that rating agencies have a significant influence and yet formally are not responsible for their assessments, then, perhaps, the rating function must be reassigned to a state authority?

- No, this would badly affect rating quality: 96%, 97%, 92%
- Yes, rating agencies offer infrastructure services, which should be provided by a state agency: 4%, 3%, 8%

15. Could you gauge competitiveness in the Russian credit rating sector and assess whether it contributes to rating quality?

- Competition in the sector is excessive, which damages rating quality: 9%, 36%, 34%
- The sector is monopolized, which damages rating quality: 3%, 48%, 20%
- The sector is relatively competitive, which contributes to rating quality: 1%, 41%, 41%
- The sector is monopolized, but this does not affect rating quality: 1%, 20%, 39%
A “paradox”: ratings are used by investors, but issuers pay for them

16. Do you see a conflict of interest in the fact that issuers pay for their ratings themselves?

- The conflict exists and cannot be minimized, as agencies’ income depends on entities they rate
- The conflict exists, but agencies know how to minimize it
- No conflict, if rating analysis and client procurement are separated by “Chinese walls”

Availability of credit ratings

18. If your entity has a credit rating, the impetus for obtaining it was...

- Public debt issuance
- Increasing investment appeal
- Regulative requirements
- Other (please, specify)

20. Do you think that services provided by credit rating agencies are affordable for Russian issuers?

- Yes
- Probably yes
- Probably no
- No
- I know nothing about this

17. Who should pay for credit ratings?

( multiple answers were allowed )

- Rated entities
- Investors
- Exchanges
- Government

19. Name the most important criteria for selecting a rating agency (5 – maximum importance, 0 – minimal importance)

- Reputation on the Russian Market
- Reputation on the global market
- Cost of services
- Easy interaction with the agency
- Large number of other issuers’ ratings

21. Do you find rating agencies’ requirements for obtaining a credit rating acceptable?

- Yes
- Probably yes
- Probably no
- No
- I know nothing about this

3 In the 2016 / 2017 polls, respondents were not allowed to select more than one answer.

4 The figure shows the average score.
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22. Are you satisfied with the credit rating coverage of the Russian market?

- Yes, issuers I am interested in always had credit ratings
- Probably yes, as all largest issuers are rated
- Probably no, as only the largest issuers have credit ratings
- No, as entire sectors of the Russian economy are not covered by credit ratings

23. In case a company you were interested in was not rated, which sector did such company belong to? (multiple answers were allowed)

- Construction and development: 42%
- Agribusiness: 31%
- Retail trade: 27%
- Media and IT: 27%
- Machinery and equipment production: 24%
- Power generation and utilities: 22%
- Asset management companies: 22%
- Banks: 17%
- Trading: 17%
- Transport: 17%
- Insurance: 16%
- Leasing: 16%
- Municipalities and regions: 16%
- Structured finance: 16%
- Metals and mining: 13%
- Other (please, specify): 11%
- Chemicals: 11%
- Telecommunications: 8%
- Oil and gas: 8%

24. Are you satisfied with rating agencies’ information disclosure?

- Yes
- Probably yes
- Probably no
- No

25. What extra services and products by rating agencies\(^5\) do you use or would like to use? (multiple answers were allowed)

- Research reports: 93%
- Market data: 58%
- Non-credit ratings: 41%
- Trainings: 41%
- Credit risk management tools (rating model validation, simulation, stress testing): 38%
- Indices: 38%
- Other (please, specify): 22%

\(^5\) Options “Credit risk management tools (rating model validation, simulation, stress testing)” and “Indices” appeared in 2018.
Analytical Credit Rating Agency (ACRA) was founded in 2015, with its 27 shareholders representing major Russian corporate and financial institutions and its authorized capital exceeding RUB 3 bn. ACRA’s main objective is to provide the Russian financial market with high-quality rating products. Methodologies and internal documents of ACRA are developed in compliance with Russian legislation and with regard to global rating industry best practices.

The provided information, including, without limitation, credit and non-credit ratings, rating assessment factors, detailed credit analysis results, methodologies, models, forecasts, analytical reviews and materials, as well as other information placed on the ACRA website (further referred to as Information), coupled with the ACRA website software and other applications, are intended for information purposes only. Information must not be modified, reproduced or distributed by any means, in any way or form, either in whole, or in part, in marketing materials, as part of public relations events, in news bulletins, in commercial materials or reports without prior written consent from, and reference to, ACRA. Any use of Information in violation of these requirements or the law is prohibited.

ACRA credit ratings reflect ACRA’s opinion about the ability of a rated entity to meet its financial obligations or about the credit risk of individual financial obligations and instruments of a rated entity at the time of publication of the relevant Information.

Non-credit ratings reflect ACRA’s opinion about certain non-credit risks assumed by interested parties interacting with a rated entity.

The assigned credit and non-credit ratings reflect all material information pertaining to a rated entity and known by ACRA (including the information received from third parties), the quality and reliability of which ACRA considers appropriate. ACRA shall not be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by clients or relevant third parties. ACRA does not audit or otherwise verify the provided data and shall not be held responsible for their accuracy and completeness. ACRA conducts rating analysis of information provided by customers using its own methodologies, with the texts thereof available on ACRA’s website – www.acra-ratings.com/criteria.

The only source that reflects the latest Information, including the one about credit and non-credit ratings assigned by ACRA, is ACRA’s official website – www.acra-ratings.com. Information is provided on an “as is” basis.

Information shall be considered by users exclusively as ACRA’s statement of opinion and must not be regarded as advice, recommendation or suggestion to buy, hold or sell securities or other financial instruments of any kind, nor shall it be viewed as an offer or advertisement.

Neither ACRA, nor its employees and persons affiliated with ACRA (further referred to as the ACRA Parties) provide any direct or implied guarantee expressed in any form or by any means regarding the accuracy, timeliness, completeness or applicability of Information for making investment and other decisions. ACRA does not act as a fiduciary, auditor, investment or financial advisor. Information must be regarded solely as one of the factors affecting an investment decision or any other business decision made by any person who uses ACRA’s information. It is essential that each of such persons conduct their own research and evaluation of a financial market participant, as well as an issuer and its debt obligations that may be regarded as an object of purchase, sale or possession. Users of Information shall make decisions on their own, involving their own independent advisors, if they deem it necessary.

ACRA Parties shall not be responsible for any action taken by users based on Information provided by ACRA. ACRA Parties shall under no circumstances be responsible for any direct, indirect or consequential damages or losses resulting from interpretations, conclusions, recommendations and other actions taken by third parties and directly or indirectly connected with such information.

Information provided by ACRA is valid only as of the date of preparation and publication of materials and may be amended by ACRA in the future. ACRA shall not be obliged to update, modify or supplement Information or inform anyone about such actions, unless the latter was recorded separately in a written agreement or is required by legislation of the Russian Federation.

ACRA does not provide advisory services. ACRA may provide additional services, if this does not create a conflict of interest with rating activities. ACRA and its employees take all reasonable measures to protect all confidential and/or material non-public information in their possession from fraud, theft, unlawful use or inadvertent disclosure. ACRA provides protection of confidential information obtained in the course of its business activities as required by legislation of the Russian Federation.