

RESEARCH

14 JANUARY, 2020

Author

Scott Dietz, CPA

PCD assets post-CECL: The real-world implications of an accounting change

Even before its official publication in 2016, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) standard ASC 326, better known as Current Expected Credit Losses (CECL), has been a topic of great discussion and debate. As we approach the initial implementations of the new standard, much of the discussion has shifted to post-transition concerns. While there are many potential impacts that may result from CECL, one of the concerns is the effect on acquisition activity. I plan to focus here on the implications of a revised definition within the standard that deals with the classification of acquired assets.

One benefit CECL will bring to the accounting space is moving away from the complicated and burdensome accounting for Purchase Credit Impaired (PCI) assets. Since the economic downturn began more than 10 years ago, the challenges that PCI brought to the mergers & acquisitions (M&A) space were numerous. They could require significant investment in accounting processes or software to handle post-acquisition. As promised, CECL is moving away from PCI accounting and will shift to new requirements under the name Purchase Credit Deteriorated (PCD) assets.

While heralded, and in my opinion a change for the better, there are still implications beyond accounting that are important, and that everyone in the financial services industry should understand. I will examine a couple of these implications.

Moody's Analytics markets and distributes all Moody's Capital Markets Research, Inc. materials. Moody's Capital Markets Research, Inc. is a subsidiary of Moody's Corporation. Moody's Analytics does not provide investment advisory services or products. For further detail, please see the last page.

Definition

As stated, the name of the assets that fall under this accounting has changed from PCI to PCD. With this name change, there is also a change in the definition of what assets should receive this classification (and thus, accounting). PCI assets were defined as having “evidence of deterioration” at acquisition. This language led to a relatively consistent application across the industry that if a loan was impaired when acquired, it was PCI. In contrast, PCD is defined as having experienced a “more-than-insignificant deterioration” in credit quality since origination. What might not be obvious to people outside of the accounting profession is that the FASB clearly intended for this definition to give more flexibility. They have stated these intentions publicly as well. They wanted to offer companies the ability to include more assets into the classification than previous accounting rules allowed.

That flexibility does bring challenges in comparability between companies' financial statements. After CECL is implemented, company policy will dictate how a PCD asset is determined, which means that separate companies might classify the same purchase differently. For example, assume that a bank acquisition is forthcoming with two potential acquirers. Analysts would have to know each acquirer's policy for determining PCD assets to know the level of potential classifications for each. This makes predictability of M&A activity a bit more challenging. Analysts will need to understand how a company considers this definition to understand the future results post-acquisition. For reasons I will explain below, this classification could alter the long-term results of the acquisition. It will not only make the classification of a similar transaction among companies different, but the actual financial result as well.

Income recognition

There are several changes to the accounting for these assets under CECL as we move from PCI to PCD. One of the changes that may have considerable implications is the way that income recognition will now work. The accounting for PCI assets was performed where income was recognized based on a combination of cash received and the updated outlook for future payments. In other words, the current activity for a particular asset (or pool of assets) would drive a constant ebb-and-flow to the accounting and the income recognized. As projections improved, you would recognize more of the discount through yield adjustments and interest income. As projections worsened, overall income would diminish due to allowance adjustments. Without getting into the full details and previously mentioned complications, the key takeaway was that income recognition would move based on asset performance.

PCD accounting, while far more simplified, will have less of the ebb-and-flow and be more tied to the purchase date expectations. Under PCD accounting, on that purchase date an allowance for future losses will be established and a purchase discount (or premium) will be recorded. From that point forward, if the asset performs, the discount will accrete into interest income. Then, adjustments in the allowance will flow through the provision on the income statement. This process is far more simplified and consistent with non-PCD assets, both of which are great benefits. However, an asset that performs beyond expectation will no longer see that benefit in net interest income as it had before, but instead through the provision.

To complicate this matter further is a difference between PCD and purchased non-PCD assets that are established within the CECL guidance. PCD assets differ in their accounting from non-PCD assets in that the initial allowance established on purchase date does not affect profit & loss (P&L). Instead, the allowance is recorded as part of the difference between the purchase price of the asset and the par amount remaining. For example, let's assume a bank buys a singular PCD loan for \$65 with a remaining principal balance of \$100. If the allowance for potential future losses for this loan under CECL is \$25, the journal entry would appear as follows:

Loan	\$100
Cash	\$(65)
Allowance	\$(25)
Discount	\$(10)

What is clearly missing from this entry is the P&L impact of the allowance, which would be present for a non-PCD asset. Both this impact and the changes to income recognition after purchase date can have significant implications to the deal's income recognition. These implications could lead to material changes in the overall results if the acquisition is significant enough. The importance of this change should be considered with the definition change and flexibility a company has in how it defines and recognizes a PCD asset.

Overall, as an accountant who has worked extensively in this space, I view the accounting change moving from the PCI to PCD framework to be positive. However, I also understand the importance of recognizing the implications of such a change. In particular, how analysts will be able to understand and predict the financial statement impacts that an acquisition may have. There is also curiosity within the market about what these changes could mean to M&A activity. I do not believe it will play a role in the amount of activity seen in the market. However, I do think it could alter some of the timing and participants. For example, some companies have already discussed not getting involved in acquisitions until some of the nuances in the accounting can be better understood. This is especially true given the overall questions from analysts and the market about whether PCD treatment is preferred or not in the end. A second example that could affect both timing and participants is the acquisition of banks that have not yet adopted CECL. Say that the acquired bank has not yet done so and is not prepared with an estimate of the impact. It may be difficult to assess the portfolio without due diligence. Above all, the main point from this discussion is that the added flexibility and simplification will task financial statement users. It will also place more burden on companies to articulate the results within the footnotes and qualitative discussion. The added flexibility will be helpful for people who operationally must deal with the accounting. However, it will also drive challenges in comparability among industry participants. The real impact of these challenges is yet to be seen.

© 2020 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/OR ITS CREDIT RATINGS AFFILIATES ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND MATERIALS, PRODUCTS, SERVICES AND INFORMATION PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S (COLLECTIVELY, "PUBLICATIONS") MAY INCLUDE SUCH CURRENT OPINIONS. MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE 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 OR IMPAIRMENT. SEE MOODY'S RATING SYMBOLS AND DEFINITIONS PUBLICATION FOR INFORMATION ON THE TYPES OF CONTRACTUAL FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS ADDRESSED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE CREDIT RATINGS. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS, NON-CREDIT ASSESSMENTS ("ASSESSMENTS"), AND OTHER 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. AND/OR ITS AFFILIATES. MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS DO NOT COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS AND OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLISHES ITS 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, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS, AND 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, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS OR 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.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY ANY PERSON AS A BENCHMARK AS THAT TERM IS DEFINED FOR REGULATORY PURPOSES AND MUST NOT BE USED IN ANY WAY THAT COULD RESULT IN THEM BEING CONSIDERED A BENCHMARK.

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 its 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 CREDIT RATING, ASSESSMENT, 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 credit rating, agreed to pay to Moody's Investors Service, Inc. for credit ratings opinions and services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,000 to approximately \$2,700,000. MCO and Moody's Investors Service also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of Moody's Investors Service credit ratings and credit rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold credit ratings from Moody's Investors Service and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at 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 657AFSL 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.

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.

MJKK 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 MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) have, prior to assignment of any credit rating, agreed to pay to MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) for credit ratings opinions and services rendered by it fees ranging from JPY125,000 to approximately JPY250,000,000.

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