

30 September 2026

Burkhard Heppe, PhD
Chief Technology Officer
Accuria Ltd.
burkhard.heppe@accuria.com
[accuria.com](https://www.accuria.com)

EU and UK securitisation disclosures and the value of loan level data. Part 2 - Operational Insights

Overview

Table of Contents		
Overview	1	The disclosure regimes governing securitisations in the European Union and the United Kingdom are undergoing their most comprehensive structural revision since the implementation of the Securitisation Regulation (see our Part 1 Regulatory Reform on www.accuria.com/insights). Both jurisdictions are actively considering reporting simplifications driven by market representations that compliance costs are disproportionate and that extensive loan-level disclosure creates operational burdens without generating corresponding investor utility. However, our empirical evidence accumulated across several hundred production cycles under the ESMA and FCA frameworks indicates that the primary costs of securitisation reporting do not stem from data granularity itself. Rather, operational friction originates from systemic template inconsistencies, semantic ambiguities in core credit fields, temporal misalignments across transaction structures, and the fragmentation of qualitative trigger logic across disparate transaction documents. This Part 2 reports on operational insights and the benefits from AI when creating and analysing securitisation disclosures.
Empirical Deficiencies in ESMA Reports	1	
The Borrower Overlap Impasse	2	
Borrower-Level Financial Health Indicators	3	
Annex XII Data Quality Failures	3	
Incompleteness of Private Sec Triggers	4	
Data Ingestion, Semantic Drift, Contractual Context	4	
Agentic AI Systems in Disclosures and Surveillance	6	
Governance for Market Participants	8	
Conclusions and Policy Recommendations	9	
References	10	

Empirical Deficiencies in the ESMA Reporting Framework: Five Years of Operational Evidence

The historical argument that institutional investors lack the specialised data engineering infrastructure, programming skills, and operational bandwidth to digest large loan-level files is no longer tenable. The deployment of dedicated artificial intelligence (AI) agents has automated granular data ingestion, semantic normalisation, and complex credit surveillance across both originators and institutional investors (Accuria 30 Sep 2026).

These computational capabilities arrive precisely as regulatory policy risks codifying

reporting carve-outs that obscure portfolio credit risk. Replacing loan-level disclosures with portfolio-level averages removes the distribution detail necessary to detect non-linear tail risks, such as barbell collateral profiles. In this Part 2 we highlight some operational insights like structural omissions within the ESMA disclosure architecture, specifically the absence of unique borrower identifiers, the loss of loan-level financial health indicators previously captured under historical European Central Bank (ECB) reporting standards, and erroneous investor report aggregations, that continue to impair market surveillance. Maintaining granular data transparency through governed, agentic architectures represents the only viable mechanism to reconcile regulatory proportionality with sound credit risk management.

Our production workflows across hundreds of ESMA and FCA reporting cycles over a five-year period highlight structural deficiencies that undermine the utility of current disclosures:

Analytical Vector	Empirical Structural Defect in Current Framework	Practical Market and Analytical Consequence
Obligor Identification & Overlap	Omission of borrower legal names and borrower Legal Entity Identifiers (LEIs) in Annex IV Corporate.	Multi-deal borrower overlap analysis is impossible; aggregate exposure to single large corporate entities across CLOs and SRTs cannot be tracked.
Borrower Financial Health	Exclusion of borrower-level financial ratios, internal ratings, PDs, and LGDs; removal of metrics previously captured under ECB standards.	Loss of early warning surveillance indicators; credit deterioration remains invisible until contractual payment default occurs.
Annex XII Portfolio Surveillance	Systematic under- population, syntax errors, and common mis-application of ND5 in credit risk tables.	Portfolio-level PD distributions and LGD metrics fail to reveal cohort default clustering, vintage migration, or risk trends.
Private Deal Structural Integrity	Regulatory exclusion of non-payment-altering triggers under ESMA Q&As; qualitative events omitted or contradictory.	Discrepancies between repository files and trustee payment reports obscure structural priority shifts, cure periods, and early amortisation triggers.

The Borrower Overlap Impasse

Under the current ESMA reporting framework for corporate exposures (Annex IV), reporting entities are required to populate anonymised, deal-specific obligor identifiers while omitting both the legal name of the entity and its Global Legal Entity Identifier. This design choice prevents market participants from conducting borrower overlap analysis across securitisations. Confidentiality and bank secrecy prevent the public disclosure of borrower names and identifiers. However, for private securitisations like cash CLOs and large corporate loan SRT portfolios the name by name disclosure to investors under confidentiality is common. A regulatory disclosure report that requires undisclosed pools while investors receive disclosed loan tapes separately will not be deemed relevant.

In European leveraged loan markets, syndicated corporate facilities are routinely distributed across dozens of competing CLO vehicles, direct lending funds, and bank-held significant risk transfer (SRT) reference pools (Accuria 2024). Because every issuing entity generates an internal, pseudonymous identifier for the same corporate obligor, analysts cannot track aggregate institutional exposure to single distressed corporate groups across different transactions. During severe liquidity strains, financial sponsors, rating agencies, and regulatory supervisors are unable to evaluate systemic contagion or counterparty exposure concentrations across the financial system.

Erosion of Borrower-Level Financial Health in Corporate Portfolios

The informational depth of corporate loan disclosures has declined relative to historical ECB reporting standards. Under the ECB loan-level reporting regime established for Eurosystem collateral eligibility, originators of corporate and SME asset-backed securities were encouraged to provide loan-level financial health indicators. These included the bank's internal credit rating, internal probability of default (PD) estimates, loss given default (LGD) estimates, actual corporate turnover, balance sheet leverage, and financial statement dates. While some balance sheet measures are retained in the ESMA templates they are not commonly reported in practice.

Under the current ESMA disclosure framework, these loan-level financial health indicators have largely been removed from exposure schedules (Annex IV) and replaced with high-level portfolio aggregations in Annex XII. Furthermore, loan-level financial covenants such as maintenance covenants on net leverage, minimum EBITDA thresholds, and interest coverage ratios are absent from standardised corporate templates.

Financial covenants function as primary early warning indicators for corporate credit deterioration. When a borrower breaches a leverage covenant, incurs penalty interest, or requires an equity cure from a financial sponsor, the loan has experienced a material credit shock long before an actual payment default is recorded on servicing tapes. Omitting borrower-level financial metrics forces analysts to rely strictly on lagging payment arrears

indicators, impairing forward-looking credit surveillance (Accuria 01 Sep 2026).

Annex XII Data Quality Failures

Annex XII of Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/1224 was intended to provide a standardised monthly or quarterly investor report summarising structural performance, waterfall distributions, and portfolio credit quality for non-ABCP securitisations. Over five years of production experience, the credit risk sections of Annex XII, specifically the portfolio PD distribution schedules and average LGD metrics, have proven structurally deficient.

In practice, these sections are frequently omitted, populate static boilerplate figures carried over from original marketing presentations, or contain calculation errors. Originators regularly utilise regulatory No Data options, particularly the code ND5 ("not applicable"), when mapping internal risk models to regulatory schemas.

Furthermore, because these credit distributions are reported as portfolio aggregates, they cannot be cross-referenced against underlying loans to track rating migrations, cohort seasoning, or risk concentrations across vintages. The portfolio-level aggregation in Annex XII conceals the very risk trends it was designed to reveal.

Incompleteness of Private Securitisation Triggers

Operational gaps exist in the reporting of performance triggers, early amortisation events, and qualitative covenants within private transactions. Regulatory technical standards, interpreted through ESMA's published Q&A guidance (specifically answers 5.14.1 and 5.14.2), mandate disclosure only for tests, events, and triggers that directly alter the priority of payments or result in the replacement of counterparties.

Consequently, reporting entities routinely exclude operational covenants, credit watch events, and servicer oversight triggers that are actively monitored in trustee payment reports and investor compliance certificates. Furthermore, where qualitative and quantitative test events are disclosed within regulatory repository filings, the reported values are sometimes inconsistent with the data published in contemporaneous payment reports.

A performance ratio reported as compliant in an Article 7 repository submission may be reported as entering a cure period or experiencing a technical breach in the monthly trustee payment report. This disconnect creates operational confusion and undermines market confidence in centralised regulatory filings.

Data Ingestion, Semantic Drift, and Contractual Context

Our operational experience in processing large volumes of securitisation disclosures highlights that the primary friction in reporting stems from four data management bottlenecks:

Production Stage	Technical and Operational Challenge	Underlying Cause	Systematic Control Requirement
Source Data Ingestion	Format fragmentation; PDF processing failures; structural data corruption	Unstructured inputs (images, Word, Excel); inconsistent servicer delivery formats.	Automated schema normalisation; dynamic layout parsing; multi-column table extraction.
Semantic Standardisation	Definitional drift across core metrics; temporal cut-off misalignments.	Divergent calculation methodologies; ABCP conduit reporting lags.	Strict semantic mapping dictionaries; persistent multi-identifier tracking; reconciliation of component dates.
Covenant & Trigger Evaluation	Misleading binary test statuses; false compliance passes and breaches.	Omission of legal context; cure mechanics.	Multi-tier recalculation engines; proximity-to-breach warning bands; contractual parameter extraction.
Auditability & Corrections	Corrupted historical time series; untracked retroactive data adjustments.	Servicers submitting restated loan tapes without version flags; unverified balance roll-forwards.	Deterministic balance roll-forward equations; immutable version logs.

Standardised templates provide a structured reporting schema, but the underlying data inputs require extensive, bespoke handling. **Originator source files** arrive across a wide range of digital formats, including proprietary XML feeds, delimited text files, and unstructured spreadsheets. Covenant compliance packages add further complexity, often combining scanned PDFs, Word files, digitally signed certificates, and auto-generated XBRL tables.

Optical character recognition pipelines frequently drop tables when processing multi-column financial statements or scanned PDFs. As a result, critical balance schedules can be omitted from the processing pipeline, undermining compliance checks. Furthermore, servicer data feeds frequently rename columns, drop fields, or alter date formats between reporting cycles. When ingestion systems fail to reconcile these changes, new loans can be silently omitted from output schedules, distorting reporting histories.

Semantic inconsistencies across data fields present an equally significant challenge. For

example, delinquency reporting diverges based on whether an originator measures arrears using the entire outstanding balance of delinquent accounts or restricts the calculation to overdue installment amounts. An unannounced shift in calculation methodology within an originator's core database produces an apparent change in delinquency performance under identical template headings.

Similarly, cut-off dates introduce distortion, particularly in **Asset-Backed Commercial Paper** (ABCP) conduits governed by Annexes XI and XIII. A conduit disclosure carries a single reporting cut-off date, yet its underlying seller portfolios report on divergent schedules, often with lags of 30 to 60 days. Because templates lack a linking field connecting a funded transaction's underlying identifier to its conduit identifier, reconstructing consistent historical trends across ABCP programmes remains difficult.

Evaluating **performance covenants** requires deconstructing the underlying contractual provisions. The same covenant often carries different titles across payment reports, investor presentations, and legal documentation. Furthermore, binary pass/fail indicators conceal proximity to trigger limits, preventing analysts from tracking approaching breaches.

Servicer adjustments, loan repurchases, and accounting corrections require strict version control. Servicing platforms routinely adjust historical data retroactively to account for delayed recoveries, legal rectifications, and repossession proceeds. Without strict data versioning, updated tapes overwrite historical baselines, corrupting vintage performance tracking and loss forecasting. Operational workflows require complete balance roll-forwards, reconciling opening balances, scheduled amortisations, prepayments, drawdowns, write-offs, and closing balances.

Agentic AI Systems in Disclosure and Surveillance

The operational challenges of securitisation reporting have driven the transition from brittle rule-based scripts to autonomous, glass-box artificial intelligence agents. These domain-specific agents automate the end-to-end data processing lifecycle, spanning ingestion, semantic mapping, legal interpretation, and verification across both issuer and investor workflows (Accuria 16 Mar 2026, 21 Sep 2026).

Operational	Traditional Reporting Architecture	Modern Agentic AI Operating
-------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------

Workflow		Architecture
Source Data Mapping	Manual column mapping; brittle scripts that break on formatting shifts; recurring configuration overhead.	Autonomous mapping agents querying core databases directly; dynamic semantic schema matching with complete audit trails.
Covenant & Test Value Extraction	Manual review of compliance certificates; spreadsheet modeling; selective trigger tracking.	Natural language parsing agents extracting legal definitions, cure mechanics, and thresholds; automated multi-tier recalculation.
Quality Verification	Basic syntactic XML schema validation; semantic errors and conflicting fields pass undetected.	Independent validation agents executing re-extractions; deterministic cash-flow reconciliation; cross-report audits.
Investor Surveillance	Specialised programming skills required; manual data cleaning; capacity bottlenecks in processing loan tapes.	Conversational data agents enabling plain-language queries; automated vintage stratification, stress testing, and memo generation.
Auditability & Lineage	Dispersed spreadsheets; untracked manual overrides; unversioned adjustments.	Glass-box architecture; full data provenance citations; deterministic calculation engines; human-in-the-loop review.

Autonomous **mapping agents** query originators' core banking systems and data warehouses directly, eliminating the need to manually standardise source files prior to ingestion. When encountering novel servicer formats, an agent inspects the file, normalises date and numerical syntax, removes duplicates, and maps source data to target schemas, including ESMA and FCA taxonomies. Operating within a glass-box architecture, the agent assigns an explicit confidence score and data provenance citation to each mapped field. If source data is missing, ambiguous, or structurally inconsistent, the agent flags the issue for analyst review rather than inferring data or defaulting to arbitrary numeric values, such as zero.

Covenant extraction agents parse unstructured legal documents, including credit agreements, trustee and servicer reports. These agents locate relevant covenant and performance test definitions, extract threshold parameters, and identify applicable grace periods and curing mechanisms. Once extracted, these terms are linked to quantitative calculation engines, allowing agents to execute multi-tier covenant tests across two distinct levels:

- **Loan-Level Corporate Surveillance:** Agents ingest underlying financial statements and compute actual debt-to-EBITDA, interest cover, and debt-service coverage ratios, generating early warning indicators across corporate and SME loan portfolios.
- **SPV and Tranche Structural Tests:** Agents recalculate transaction-level performance metrics, including Overcollateralisation (OC) and Interest Coverage (IC) ratios, and verify reserve account replenishment triggers. By modelling the transaction's cash flow waterfall, agents determine whether performance triggers alter payment priorities, divert excess spread to note amortization, or lock out junior distributions.

To ensure reporting accuracy, institutions deploy **independent validation agents** operating within segregated execution environments (Accuria 2026). Financial calculations execute within deterministic software tools, while language models interpret edge cases and explain discrepancies. Validation agents employ a dual-run protocol: they independently re-extract and recalculate reporting fields without access to the primary pipeline's outputs. Discrepancies between the parallel runs trigger automated escalation for human review. Beyond checking schema syntax, validation agents cross-reconcile outputs across transaction reporting layers. They verify that loan-level cash flows match aggregate investor reports, reconcile servicing data to audited financial statements, and cross-reference Article 7 disclosures against payment reports.

The expansion of AI agents has removed historical constraints on **investor-side due diligence**. Institutional investors no longer require dedicated quantitative teams or bespoke coding infrastructure to analyse complex, loan-level exposure tapes. Domain-specific AI data agents interpret conversational instructions, allowing analysts to run complex portfolio queries across millions of loans in seconds.

Analysts can segment portfolios, evaluate default rates by origination vintage, model cash-flow haircuts across specific collateral segments, and generate committee memos through interactive text prompts. This capability eliminates the policy argument that loan-level reporting imposes an unmanageable analytical burden on institutional investors.

Governance Recommendations for Market Participants

To maintain compliance and investment discipline during this period of regulatory reform, market participants should adapt their operational and technical architectures.

Reporting institutions should decouple their core internal data storage from jurisdiction-specific regulatory reporting templates. Standardised regulatory schedules should be treated as automated exports generated from a centralised internal data repository, rather than serving as the baseline for internal portfolio surveillance.

Institutions that reduce internal data collection to match simplified regulatory minimums

lose the ability to support secondary market liquidity, track internal credit risk, and adapt to future regulatory shifts. A unified canonical data model should maintain complete, granular asset histories; external reporting schedules should function merely as automated exports generated by agentic transformation pipelines.

Institutional investors should formally specify their data requirements in transaction documentation rather than relying exclusively on regulatory compliance covenants. These requirements should mandate the delivery of borrower Legal Entity Identifiers, standardised corporate financial ratios, and unredacted compliance certificates, ensuring complete asset data remains accessible regardless of regulatory reporting carve-outs. Where aggregate reporting is accepted, transaction documentation should establish clear requirements for static vintage histories, concentration metrics, and cross-tabulated stratifications.

Finally, deploying AI systems within structured finance operations requires strict governance controls. Financial institutions remain legally liable for reporting accuracy and regulatory compliance. While supervisory model risk frameworks are designed for traditional quantitative models, their core governance principles like independent model validation, ongoing performance monitoring, and clear operational ownership apply directly to agentic environments. Generative processes must be governed by deterministic guardrails, complete data lineage citations, and mandatory human review for low-confidence exceptions.

Technical Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

The regulatory reviews underway across the EU and the UK demonstrate an institutional willingness to streamline securitisation reporting. However, reducing reporting fields does not solve operational inefficiencies if the underlying data lacks consistency and comparability. Replacing loan-level transparency with portfolio-level averages removes the distribution detail required to evaluate non-linear credit risk, while omitting borrower LEIs and loan-level financial covenants limits systemic surveillance. Simultaneously, the deployment of agentic AI systems has eliminated legacy operational bottlenecks, disproving the argument that institutional investors lack the tools to process granular loan files.

Policymakers and market participants should pursue three structural priorities:

- **Mandate Standardised Counterparty Identifiers:** European corporate and SME disclosure templates (Annex IV) should incorporate borrower LEIs, enabling cross-transaction concentration analysis across CLO, private credit, and SRT markets.
- **Restore Granular Corporate Health Metrics:** Disclosure frameworks should reintroduce loan-level internal ratings, default probabilities, and early warning financial covenants, moving away from uninformative portfolio-level investor report aggregates.
- **Align Reporting Rules with Modern Agentic Architectures:** Regulatory policy should

focus on standardising semantic field definitions, harmonising cut-off dates, and establishing reliable data access channels, allowing agentic AI systems to automate compliance and surveillance without sacrificing portfolio transparency.

References

- Accuria 30 Sep 2026 European and UK Securitisation Disclosures: Part 1 Regulatory reform
- [Accuria 21 Sep 2026 Part 2 Creating Trust in Valuations of Non-Performing Loans - Part 2: Reporting Agents](#)
- [Accuria 01 Sep 2026 Agentic Borrower Viability Surveillance](#)
- [Accuria 16 Mar 2026 Software Engineering was Solved. The Next Shift Comes in Backoffice Automation](#)
- [Accuria 2024 Managing Concentration Limits. Research Driven Strategies for Risk Management](#)
- [ESMA33-128-563 Q&As on the Securitisation Regulation](#),

About Accuria

Accuria is a cutting-edge credit portfolio management platform that helps clients trade and monitor loan portfolios using a series of domain expert AI agents to automate the processing of data, documents and transactions. Accuria offers automated due diligence, data migration, valuation and reporting services for performing and non performing assets across 28 jurisdictions.

With the help of its proprietary data mapping and transformation tool Accuria helps financial institutions to map their data to a variety of data formats such as those defined by EBA for NPL transactions, EBA for the valuation in resolution, and by ESMA for securitisation disclosures. Once standardised and validated, the loan-level data can be uploaded to the Accuria valuation tool to conduct a detailed discounted cash flow analysis using pre-populated pricing parameters in different macroeconomic scenarios across all major asset classes.

This article has been written with the help of Accuria's market research agent and AI document analysis pipelines. All Accuria articles are available on www.accuria.com/insights

Disclaimer

This paper contains confidential information about Accuria, current at the date hereof. This presentation is not intended to provide the sole basis for evaluating Accuria and should not be considered as a recommendation with respect to it or any other matter.

This document and the information contained herein are not an offer of securities for sale in the United States and are not for publication or distribution to persons in the United States (within the meaning of Regulation S under the United States Securities Act of 1933, as amended).

This presentation and the information contained herein does not constitute or form part of any (i) offer or invitation or inducement to sell or issue, or any solicitation of any offer to purchase or subscribe for, any securities or (ii) invitation or inducement to engage in investment activity within the meaning of Section 21 of the United Kingdom Financial Services and Markets Act 2000, as amended, nor shall any part of this presentation nor the fact of its distribution form part of or be relied on in connection with any contract or investment decision relating thereto.