GGA RESEARCH & METHOD

Collection Outcomes by Invoice Age

By GGA Research & Business Intelligence Team · Published and reviewed 3 October 2026

This paper reports GGA's rolling internal measure of collection outcomes by invoice-age band. It states what has been excluded and why the figures must not be used to forecast the outcome of any individual book.

>95%	Collected by value where the invoice is 0–3 months old
65–70%	At 6–12 months
40–45%	At 12–24 months
~10%	Beyond 36 months
2	Exclusions, both of which raise these figures

Older invoice-age bands have lower collection percentages in this measure. The table does not establish a monthly decay rate, prove that age causes the difference, or show that age is the best predictor.

01 · In short

How to read the evidence in this paper. measured computed directly from client line-item data. observed a pattern recorded across assignments rather than calculated. Every percentage states the denominator it is taken against; figures on different denominators are not comparable and are never averaged.

1. **Collection percentages are lower in older age bands.** Across GGA's Revenue Assurance and Revenue Realization engagements, measured by value, more than 95% of receivable value is collected where the invoice is under three months old, and approximately 10% beyond thirty-six months.
2. **The later bands show the larger total difference.** The gap is 15–25 percentage points from 3–6 to 6–12 months, compared with 45–55 points from 6–12 to 24–36 months. These are between-band differences, not measured monthly decay rates.
3. **This is GGA's own measure, not a market benchmark.** Every portfolio in it reached GGA because a company decided it needed attention. That is not a representative sample of Indian B2B receivables and should not be presented as one.

4. **Two exclusions shape the numbers, and both raise them.** Matters transferred to legal proceedings leave the calculation at the point of transfer. Accounts later reclassified under GGA's Risk category are removed from subsequent periods. Read every figure below with those two removals in mind.
5. **Difficult receivables are not excluded.** Disputed, insolvent and otherwise problematic balances remain inside the measure for as long as they are actively managed. The exclusions above are about matters that leave active management, not about matters that are hard.
6. **It does not forecast an individual book.** A population curve describes a population. Whether a specific receivable converts depends on counterparty solvency, documentary completeness, dispute position, and whether the invoice was ever made payable at all.

02 · What the measure shows

GGA maintains a rolling internal measure of collection outcomes by the age of the invoice, taken across Revenue Assurance and Revenue Realization engagements spanning multiple clients and sectors. It is measured by value rather than by invoice count, because a count treats a ₹4,000 invoice and a ₹40 lakh invoice as equivalent, and no finance function does.

Collection outcome by invoice age, by value, across GGA engagements

Age of invoice	Collected, by value	What is usually happening at this age
0–3 months	More than 95%	Ordinary payment-run timing; documentation and approval steps still open
3–6 months	85–90%	A blocker has formed — a defect, a deduction, an unapproved file
6–12 months	65–70%	Ownership inside the customer has usually changed or lapsed
12–24 months	40–45%	Commercial memory thinning; evidence harder to assemble
24–36 months	15–20%	Counterparty position frequently changed; disputes hardened
Beyond 36 months	Approximately 10%	Recovery rather than collection; often a different exercise entirely

Invoice age runs from the invoice date, not the due date. That is a deliberate choice and it makes these figures look more conservative than an overdue-ageing report from the same book. An operational ageing report starts the clock when payment became late; this measure starts it when the obligation was created. A sixty-day credit term means an invoice is three months old before it has been overdue for a month.

The portfolio changes continuously. New mandates arrive, books close, and the composition of what is under management on any given day is different from the month before. This is a rolling measure of live work, not a cohort tracked from a fixed start date to a fixed end.

The 3–6 to 6–12 month gap is 15–25 percentage points. The 6–12 to 24–36 month gap is larger, at 45–55 points. Neither comparison measures monthly decay.

Comparing the age bands

The reported range is 85–90% at 3–6 months and 65–70% at 6–12 months: a difference of 15–25 percentage points. From 6–12 months to 24–36 months, the range changes from 65–70% to 15–20%: a larger difference of 45–55 points.

A percentage-point difference is not a rate per month. These age bands have unequal widths and represent a changing population, not one cohort followed over time. The table therefore cannot establish when value was lost, the monthly speed of decline, or whether age rather than other factors explains the difference.

03 · What has been excluded, and what that does to the numbers

Any published recovery figure is shaped as much by what has been taken out of it as by what is in it. Two categories leave this measure, and both of them push the percentages up. They are stated here rather than in a footnote because a reader cannot interpret the table above without them.

Matters transferred to legal proceedings

Once a matter moves into litigation, arbitration or an insolvency process it leaves the calculation from the point of transfer. The rationale is that the outcome is no longer determined by receivables management, and the timetable belongs to a court rather than to a collections process. The consequence is that a category of receivable with a long tail and an uncertain outcome stops being counted at the moment it becomes hardest.

Accounts reclassified under GGA's Risk category

Where an account is established as uncollectable — the counterparty has ceased to exist, the claim is time-barred, the obligation is genuinely disputed on the merits — it is reclassified and removed from subsequent periods. Again the logic is defensible and again the effect is upward.

Both exclusions remove matters at the point they become least likely to convert. A reader should treat these figures as the outcome on receivables that stayed inside active management, not on everything that was ever handed over.

What is not excluded

Disputed receivables, receivables against counterparties in financial difficulty, and receivables with incomplete documentation all remain inside the measure for as long as they are being actively worked. The exclusions concern matters that have left receivables management altogether, not matters that are difficult. A measure that dropped every hard case would not be worth publishing.

04 · Why this differs from the trade-channel figures

GGA has separately published recovery yields from a single trade channel book worked over five years: 35.2% recovered inside one year, 19.0% at one to two, 9.9% at three to four, and 2.4% beyond five. Set beside the table above, those numbers look irreconcilable. They are not — they measure different things on different populations.

Two measures, and what separates them

	This measure	The trade channel book
Population	Many clients and sectors, actively managed	One distressed dealer book
Condition at handover	Mixed; much of it current	Aged, much of it already impaired
What the percentage describes	Value collected at that invoice age	Yield at the age the balance converted
Legal and Risk matters	Excluded from the point they leave	Retained throughout
What it is useful for	Understanding the shape of decay	Understanding what a distressed book returns

The two measures describe different populations and denominators. Neither is a benchmark for the other, and averaging them would be meaningless. Neither establishes the effect of acting earlier or forecasts the outcome of a particular receivable book.

One institutional Day 0 mandate illustrates the limits of age alone: a legacy book already twelve to thirty-six months old at takeover still reached 92.0% ultimate recovery. This engagement does not establish a general prediction rule for institutional, dealer or distributor receivables. Assess the counterparty, evidence and dispute position as well as age.

05 · What management should take from this

Know the age composition of your own book, by value. Review the split between balances inside twelve months and beyond twenty-four alongside counterparty condition, evidence and disputes. Age alone does not determine the appropriate collection or recovery route.

Set an escalation date and an accountable owner. Consider the evidence, counterparty position and commercial context when deciding the next review or intervention. This table does not measure which governance decisions caused balances to age.

Check both internal and customer-side blockers. Review documents, approvals, reconciliation and disputes before deciding how to intervene. The age-band percentages do not identify the cause of delay or establish that internal blockers are the most common explanation.

Do not plan against this curve. It describes a population. Your book has its own counterparties, its own documentary position and its own disputes, and a portfolio-level review will tell you where it actually sits in a way that no published figure can.

06 · Method and limitations

Basis. A rolling internal measure maintained across GGA's Revenue Assurance and Revenue Realization engagements, spanning multiple clients and sectors, computed by value rather than by invoice count.

Clock. Invoice age runs from the invoice date. Figures are therefore not comparable with an operational overdue ageing report, which conventionally runs from the contractual due date.

Inclusions. Disputed, insolvent and otherwise difficult receivables remain included for as long as they are actively managed.

Exclusions. Matters transferred to legal proceedings are excluded from the point of transfer. Accounts reclassified under GGA's Risk category are excluded from subsequent calculations. Both exclusions raise the reported percentages.

Rolling population. The book under management changes continuously as mandates begin and close. This is not a fixed cohort tracked over time, and period-to-period movement may reflect a change in composition rather than a change in performance.

Ranges. Bands are reported as ranges rather than point estimates because the underlying population changes. A single decimal figure would imply a precision this measure does not have.

Not a market benchmark. Every portfolio in the measure reached GGA because a company decided it required attention. The measure describes GGA's own book of work and is not a sample of Indian B2B receivables generally.

Not a forecast. Population evidence does not predict the outcome of an individual receivable, counterparty or portfolio.

07 · Frequently asked questions

Is this a benchmark for the Indian receivables market?

No. It is GGA's own rolling internal measure, drawn from receivables GGA has been engaged to manage. Those portfolios reached GGA because somebody decided they needed attention, which is not a representative sample of Indian B2B receivables. It should be read as what GGA has observed on its own book of work, not as a market rate.

Why is the figure for 0 to 3 months so high?

The measure reports a high collection percentage for the 0–3 month band under active management. It does not establish what would have been collected without that management or why those invoices paid. Read the figure with the stated population and exclusions.

What is excluded from these percentages?

Two things, and both raise the numbers. Matters transferred to legal proceedings leave the calculation from the point of transfer. Accounts later reclassified under GGA's Risk category are removed from subsequent periods. Disputed, insolvent and otherwise difficult receivables remain included for as long as they are actively managed.

Can I use this to forecast recovery on my own overdue book?

No. These are population figures across many clients and sectors. A single portfolio's outcome depends on counterparty solvency, documentary completeness, dispute position and whether the invoice was ever made payable. A portfolio-level review establishes the position for a specific book; this measure does not.

Why do these figures differ from the trade-channel recovery rates GGA has published?

They measure different things. The trade-channel figures describe one distressed aged book worked over five years, with everything retained in the calculation and yield measured at the age the balance converted. This measure runs across actively managed mandates, by value, from the invoice date, with legal and Risk-classified matters excluded. Different populations and different denominators produce different numbers, and the two are not comparable.

Evidence boundary

This publication reports a rolling internal measure maintained by GGA across its own engagements. It is not an industry benchmark, a forecast, or a representation about the outcome of any individual receivable, counterparty or portfolio.

Figures are reported as ranges. The stated exclusions — matters transferred to legal proceedings, and accounts reclassified under GGA's Risk category — raise the reported percentages, and every figure should be read with those removals in mind.