

## ARTICLE

*As published on GARP*

### Authors



Masha Muzyka

### Contact Us

Contact our customer service team:

|              |                  |
|--------------|------------------|
| Americas     | +1.212.553.1653  |
| Europe       | +44.20.7772.5454 |
| Asia-Pacific | +852.3551.3077   |
| Japan        | +81.3.5408.4100  |

# CECL: What's on Tap for the Future of Credit Loss Accounting?

A new model for expected credit losses is supposed to fix flaws in the accounting system and protect against future financial crises. But the so-called CECL model comes with its own set of challenges that will dramatically change firms' accounting practices for impaired loans.

The Financial Accounting Standard Board's (FASB) recently issued current expected credit loss (CECL) model attempts to align measurement of credit losses for all financial assets held at amortized cost, and specifically calls out potential improvements to the accounting for purchased credit impaired (PCI) assets.

Indeed, this new model changes the entire approach to credit loss accounting by increasing the scope to focus on purchased credit deteriorated (PCD) financial assets and by making the computation of the allowance for credit losses (and the recognition of interest income for PCDs) more comparable with the originated assets.

However, despite the expected benefits of CECL, potential complexities exist. In this article, we explore those complexities and discuss how this new model changes accounting for loans with evidence of deterioration of credit quality since origination.

First, though, let us take a quick look at how we have arrived at this stage. Historically, accounting standard setters such as FASB have recognized that collectability of the contractual amount is one of the key types of financial information investors would consider when making decisions about providing resources to a financial institution.

FASB also acknowledged that some loans cause more problems than others. For example, loans that have experienced deterioration of credit quality since origination present certain challenges in financial reporting, as their expectation of collectability is reflected in both purchase price and future expectations of cash flows.

Consequently, in December of 2003, PCI accounting — which required entities to implement complex accounting treatment of income and impairment recognition for PCI assets — was introduced. From its adoption, however, entities struggled with operational challenges, income volatility, and the comparability of PCI versus originated-assets accounting.

Today, to address impairment accounting by creditors, concepts of contractually required payments receivable, initial investment and cash flows expected to be collected are consistently used across

current Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) in the US. But CECL, which is expected to take effect for financial institutions in January 2020, requires significant changes to firms' credit loss accounting approach.

### Definitions and Scope

To explore how CECL revises the accounting for purchased loans, it is important to start with definitions. According to current GAAP, PCI loans are loans that (1) are acquired by completion of a transfer; (2) exhibit evidence of deterioration of credit quality since origination; and (3) make it improbable, at acquisition, for the investor to collect all contractually required payments receivable.

After a loan is accounted for as a PCI, it continues to be considered a PCI, regardless of its performance (unless it is modified as a troubled debt restructuring). In the past, accurately defining which acquired loans should be considered PCI presented a challenge.

Given the conservative nature of GAAP accounting and the often inadequate amounts of data available (at the time of acquisition) to the acquirer of financial assets, it is no real surprise that financial institutions often scope into PCI population those assets that, after acquisition, significantly outperform expectations over their remaining life. For these assets, PCI accounting often results in unusually high effective yields and — when a decrease in expected cash flows triggers discounting with such yields — unreasonable impairment amounts thus causing income statement volatility.

Furthermore, PCI accounting allows loans that have common risk characteristics that are not accounted for as debt securities — and that are acquired in the same fiscal quarter — to be aggregated into an accounting pool that is considered one unit of account. After a pool is assembled, it accrues income based on a composite interest rate and its integrity is maintained for purposes of applying the recognition, measurement and disclosure provisions of PCI accounting.

This pooling concept was designed to allow the investor to offset “winners against losers” within one pool and potentially achieve less income statement volatility, period-over-period. However, pool accounting presented dramatic challenges operationally, as core banking systems are not set up to manage it.

Incidentally, CECL does not provide for PCD pool accounting, due to individual allocation of the non-credit related discount, but does allow the holder of the assets to maintain existing pools at the time of transition from PCI to PCD upon CECL adoption.

While CECL completely supersedes Subtopic 310-30, it continues to require different accounting for purchased loans with evidence of deterioration of credit quality. However, it also changes the definition for such loans and expands the scope, as follows: PCD assets must be treated as acquired individual financial assets (or acquired groups of financial assets with similar characteristics) that, as of the date of acquisition, have experienced more-than-insignificant deterioration in credit quality since origination (as determined by an acquirer's assessment).

Note the removal of the probability threshold from the definition, and the addition of more-than-insignificant criteria compared to the PCI definition. Identifying PCD assets could therefore present an operational challenge when defining what is “significant,” because FASB suggests considering multiple qualitative factors.

The ability to consume systematically large amounts of data points, apply data rules and appropriately tag

the acquired assets would be key in accurate designation of PCD assets. But how does PCD designation affect the financials at acquisition and beyond? To demonstrate, we will use the following table (see below) that summarizes the basis of accounting for the acquired loans under current and future GAAP:

**Table: Accounting for Acquired Loans under Current and Future GAAP**

|                  | GAAP Reference  | Loan Type  | Increase in Expected Cash Flows  | Decrease in Expected Cash Flows   | Interest Income Recognition   |
|------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| Current GAAP     | ASC 310-20, Receivables – Non-Refundable fees and Other Costs                                 | Acquired loan where an investor expects to collect all contractual cash flows due  | Reduce the Allowance amount. No impact to the Effective Interest Rate                      | Increase the Allowance amount. No impact to the Effective Interest Rate. At acquisition, book at fair value/purchase price, no Day 1 Allowance  | Based on Contractual Cash Flows. Effective Interest Rate is the Contractual rate adjusted for deferred premiums and discounts existing at acquisition   |
|                  | ASC 310-30, Receivables – Loans and Debt Securities Acquired with Deteriorated Credit Quality | Acquired loan where it is probable at acquisition that an investor is unable to collect all contractual cash flows due           | Reduce or reverse in full the Allowance amount first. Increase the Effective Interest Rate | Increase the Allowance amount. Use the current Effective Interest Rate to discount expected cash flows and calculate the impairment amount. At acquisition, book at fair value/purchase price | Based on Expected Cash Flows. Recalculate the accretable yield amount as the excess over revised expected cash flows and the loan's recorded investment |
| Future GAAP/CECL | ASC 326, Financial Instruments – Credit Losses  | Acquired loan that at acquisition experienced a more-than-insignificant deterioration in credit quality since origination        | Reduce the Allowance amount. No impact to the Effective Interest Rate                      | Increase the Allowance amount. At acquisition, recognize credit-related discount as an Allowance against the loan's amortized cost balance  | Based on Contractual Cash Flows. Accrete to income only the non-credit-related discount existing at origination   |
|                  |   | Acquired loan that at acquisition did not experience a more-than-insignificant deterioration in credit quality since origination | Reduce the Allowance amount. No impact to the Effective Interest Rate                      | Increase the Allowance amount. At acquisition, recognize the lifetime expected loss through Allowance and Income Statement  | Based on Contractual Cash Flows. Accrete to income the full difference between contractual cash flow and purchase price                                 |

### Changes to Day 1 Accounting

On Day 1 (at acquisition or origination), CECL requires measurement of the credit losses for newly-recognized financial assets. Moreover, for the purpose of presenting the net amount expected to be collected on the balance sheet, it also requires the recording of the allowance for credit losses.

For non-PCD assets, credit loss expense must be recorded through the income statement to establish the allowance. For PCD assets, there is no income statement impact on Day 1: the initial allowance for credit losses is added to the purchase price and considered to be part of the PCD loan's amortized cost basis.

CECL also calls for a loan-level, non-credit-related discount to be calculated as a derived value from the difference between the receivable and amortized cost and to be recorded into income over the remaining life of the PCD asset.

Thus, CECL presents an interesting misalignment between originated and acquired PCD assets where origination results in the recording of a lifetime loss through expense for assets that are less risky than PCD assets by definition.

Under the current GAAP, it is not appropriate to record a loss allowance at acquisition, and the acquired loan must be recorded at its purchase price. For loans acquired in a business combination, the initial recognition of those loans are based on the present value of amounts expected to be received. Moreover, the allowance for credit losses for the PCI loans must reflect only those losses that are incurred by the investor after acquisition.

The difference between gross expected cash flows and contractual cash flows over the life of the loan represents a non-accretable difference that must be disclosed at acquisition in the financial statement footnotes (but not on the balance sheet). The difference between PCI loan purchase price and gross expected cash flows is accreted to income over the life of the loan using effective interest rate (that is the accretable yield amount).

Given the CECL requirement to calculate, track, and amortize loan-level (non-credit-related) discounts, it seems that PCD accounting will continue to present an operational challenge to financial institutions.

### Changes to Day 2 Accounting

After acquisition, recognition of income and expected losses under current and future GAAP also differ.

CECL accounting for interest income recognition is consistent with non-PCD accounting, except for the non-amortization of the Day 1 discount attributable to credit losses, which is achieved through incorporation of the credit-related discount into the Day 1 amortized cost.

Interest income for PCD loans is recognized similar to originated assets, using a level yield methodology where the non-credit related discount is amortized over the remaining loan life. This is consistent with existing GAAP for amortization of deferred fees, costs, acquisition premiums, and discounts.

FASB decided that, under CECL, purchased assets and originated assets follow the same accounting model approach — to as large an extent as possible. Consequently, other than applying a “gross-up approach” for the PCD assets (including a Day 1 allowance on an amortized cost basis), estimation of the expected credit losses for PCD assets must follow the same methodology as originated assets.

An allowance method is not prescribed under CECL, so the discounted cash flow approach is not required for PCD loans. Rather, an investor must estimate credit losses over the contractual term of the financial asset (considering even the remote probability of a loss) and incorporate information on past events, current conditions and reasonable and supportable forecasts.

Current GAAP states that, a loan would be considered impaired, if, based on current information and events, it is probable that the investor is unable to collect all cash flows expected at acquisition (plus extra cash flows arising from changes in estimate after acquisition). Entities are required to use discounted cash flow methodology to estimate expected credit losses on the PCI loans.

Based on these outlined requirements, it is clear that the loss estimate would change for the same loan, even if the same methodology (that is the discounted cash flow approach) is used.

PCI accounting for interest income recognition is not only complex but also based on the expected cash flow changes over time. It requires effective interest rate recalculations, as the cash flow expectations improve over time.

To calculate PCI interest income, the investor must adjust the amount of accretable yield by reclassification from non-accretable difference, and the resulting yield must be used as the effective interest rate in any subsequent application — including the calculation of the future impairment amount. The amount of accretion is tied to the future expectations of cash flows, while contractual cash flows are ignored.

CECL's requirement to incorporate reasonable and supportable forecasts into the credit loss estimate for all instruments (including PCDs) measured at amortized cost presents a new challenge. However, potential competitive advantages can be derived from the use of appropriate modeling approaches for various segments; the ability to apply systematically qualitative factors; and the incorporation of forward-looking information.

### Parting Thoughts

As financial institutions transition to CECL, they will not be required to reassess retrospectively whether their existing PCI assets meet the definition of PCD upon CECL adoption. Rather, they will adjust the amortized cost basis of their PCI assets to reflect the addition of the allowance. Moreover, subsequently, they will begin accreting into income the non-credit related discount, after adjusting the amortized cost.

We expect that certain PCD accounting operational difficulties shall continue to exist, because of the allocation and amortization of the non-credit related discount at the individual asset level.

While CECL closely aligns credit loss measurement methodologies across originated and purchased portfolios, and provides for consistent income recognition models based on contractual cash flows, the introduction of the lifetime loss estimate — including the incorporation of forward-looking information — demands significant improvements in financial institutions' data collection, accessibility and retention capabilities.

What is more, firms need to implement expanded analytics and reporting and to adopt more granular — and potentially more sophisticated — loss measurement methodologies.

© 2017 Moody's Corporation, Moody's Investors Service, Inc., Moody's Analytics, Inc. and/or their licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ISSUED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE, INC. AND ITS RATINGS AFFILIATES ("MIS") ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY INCLUDE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES. MOODY'S DEFINES CREDIT RISK AS THE RISK THAT AN ENTITY MAY NOT MEET ITS CONTRACTUAL, FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THEY COME DUE AND ANY ESTIMATED FINANCIAL LOSS IN THE EVENT OF DEFAULT. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S OPINIONS INCLUDED IN MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY ALSO INCLUDE QUANTITATIVE MODEL-BASED ESTIMATES OF CREDIT RISK AND RELATED OPINIONS OR COMMENTARY PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ANALYTICS, INC. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. NEITHER CREDIT RATINGS NOR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS AND PUBLISHES MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL, WITH DUE CARE, MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY RETAIL INVESTORS AND IT WOULD BE RECKLESS AND INAPPROPRIATE FOR RETAIL INVESTORS TO USE MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS OR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WHEN MAKING AN INVESTMENT DECISION. IF IN DOUBT YOU SHOULD CONTACT YOUR FINANCIAL OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL ADVISER.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources MOODY'S considers to be reliable including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process or in preparing the Moody's publications.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability to any person or entity for any indirect, special, consequential, or incidental losses or damages whatsoever arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information, even if MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers is advised in advance of the possibility of such losses or damages, including but not limited to: (a) any loss of present or prospective profits or (b) any loss or damage arising where the relevant financial instrument is not the subject of a particular credit rating assigned by MOODY'S.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability for any direct or compensatory losses or damages caused to any person or entity, including but not limited to by any negligence (but excluding fraud, willful misconduct or any other type of liability that, for the avoidance of doubt, by law cannot be excluded) on the part of, or any contingency within or beyond the control of, MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers, arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information.

NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY SUCH RATING OR OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

Moody's Investors Service, Inc., a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO"), hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by Moody's Investors Service, Inc. have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to Moody's Investors Service, Inc. for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,500 to approximately \$2,500,000. MCO and MIS also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of MIS's ratings and rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold ratings from MIS and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at [www.moody.com](http://www.moody.com) under the heading "Investor Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

Additional terms for Australia only: Any publication into Australia of this document is pursuant to the Australian Financial Services License of MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657 AFSL 336969 and/or Moody's Analytics Australia Pty Ltd ABN 94 105 136 972 AFSL 383569 (as applicable). This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. MOODY'S credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail investors. It would be reckless and inappropriate for retail investors to use MOODY'S credit ratings or publications when making an investment decision. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.

Additional terms for Japan only: Moody's Japan K.K. ("MJKK") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Group Japan G.K., which is wholly-owned by Moody's Overseas Holdings Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of MCO. Moody's SF Japan K.K. ("MSFJ") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of MJKK. MSFJ is not a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization ("NRSRO"). Therefore, credit ratings assigned by MSFJ are Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings. Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings are assigned by an entity that is not a NRSRO and, consequently, the rated obligation will not qualify for certain types of treatment under U.S. laws. MJKK and MSFJ are credit rating agencies registered with the Japan Financial Services Agency and their registration numbers are FSA Commissioner (Ratings) No. 2 and 3 respectively.

MJJK or MSFJ (as applicable) hereby disclose that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MJJK or MSFJ (as applicable) have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to MJJK or MSFJ (as applicable) for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from JPY200,000 to approximately JPY350,000,000.

MJJK and MSFJ also maintain policies and procedures to address Japanese regulatory requirements.