

GLI GLOBAL
LEGAL
INSIGHTS

Fund Finance
2022

Sixth Edition

Contributing Editor: **Michael C. Mascia**

glg global legal group



CONTENTS

Introduction	Michael C. Mascia, <i>Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP</i>	
Expert analysis chapters	<i>Hybrid and asset-backed fund finance facilities</i> Leon Stephenson, <i>Reed Smith LLP</i>	1
	<i>Subscription line lending: Due diligence by the numbers</i> Bryan G. Petkanics, Anthony Pirraglia & Richard Facundo, <i>Loeb & Loeb LLP</i>	15
	<i>Derivatives at fund level</i> Vanessa Kalijnikoff Battaglia, Peter Hughes & Joseph Wren, <i>Travers Smith LLP</i>	26
	<i>To infinity and beyond! The remarkable journey of subscription facilities</i> Jan Sysel, Jons Lehmann & Kathryn Cecil, <i>Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP</i>	38
	<i>Backleverage financings: Insights into the margin loan</i> Mimi Cheng, Jennifer Levitt & Jonathan Lindabury, <i>Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP</i>	49
	<i>Sharpest tool in the shed: A primer on asset-backed leverage facilities</i> Patricia Lynch, Patricia Teixeira & Douglas Hollins, <i>Ropes & Gray LLP</i>	59
	<i>Enforcement: Analysis of lender remedies under U.S. law in subscription-secured credit facilities</i> Ellen G. McGinnis & Richard D. Anigian, <i>Haynes and Boone, LLP</i>	69
	<i>Considerations in the use of Aggregator Vehicles in NAV Facilities</i> Meyer C. Dworkin & Kwesi Larbi-Siaw, <i>Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP</i>	90
	<i>Navigating alternative liquidity solutions</i> Samantha Hutchinson & Brian Foster, <i>Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP</i>	97
	<i>Comparing the European, U.S. and Asian fund finance markets</i> Emma Russell & Emily Fuller, <i>Haynes and Boone, LLP</i> Ben Griffiths, <i>MUFG Investor Services</i>	101
	<i>Umbrella facilities: Pros and cons for a sponsor</i> Richard Fletcher, Duaa Abbas & Yagmur Yarar, <i>Macfarlanes LLP</i>	111
	<i>Side letters: Pitfalls and perils for a financing</i> Thomas Smith, Margaret O'Neill & John W. Rife III, <i>Debevoise & Plimpton LLP</i>	121
	<i>Fund finance lending: A practical checklist</i> James Heinicke, David Nelson & Daniel Richards, <i>Ogier</i>	131
	<i>Assessing lender risk in fund finance markets</i> Robin Smith, Alistair Russell & Rose Clements, <i>Carey Olsen</i>	142
	<i>Fund finance meets securitisation</i> Nicola Wherity & Jessica Littlewood, <i>Clifford Chance LLP</i>	155

Expert analysis chapters cont'd	<i>The Cayman Islands Private Funds Act and its impact on fund finance</i>	
	Derek Stenson & Michael O'Connor, <i>Conyers</i>	163
	<i>Fund finance in Ireland and Luxembourg: A comparative analysis</i>	
	Jad Nader, <i>Ogier, Luxembourg</i>	
	Phil Cody, <i>Arthur Cox LLP, Ireland</i>	169
	<i>The fund finance market in Asia</i>	
	James Webb, <i>Carey Olsen</i>	
	Daniel Lindsey, <i>Goodwin</i>	
	Emma Wang, <i>TR Capital</i>	180
	<i>Fund finance facilities: A cradle to grave timeline</i>	
	Bronwen Jones, Shervin Shameli & Kevin-Paul Deveau, <i>Reed Smith LLP</i>	190
	<i>Newer liquidity solutions for alternative asset fund managers – concept proven</i>	
Jamie Parish, Danny Peel & Katie McMenamin, <i>Travers Smith LLP</i>	200	
<i>The rise of ESG and green fund finance</i>		
Briony Holcombe, Robert Andrews & Lorraine Johnston, <i>Ashurst LLP</i>	208	
<i>Follow the money – Diverse liquidity options and considerations for complex Cayman Islands fund structures</i>		
Agnes Molnar & Richard Mansi, <i>Travers Thorp Alberga</i>	215	
<i>More than a decade of global fund finance transactions</i>		
Michael Mbayi, <i>Wildgen S.A.</i>	226	
<i>NAVigating the collateral waters: You have a boat but will it float?</i>		
Sherri L. Snelson, <i>White & Case LLP</i>	232	
Jurisdiction chapters		
Australia	Tom Highnam & Rita Pang, <i>Allens</i>	243
Canada	Michael Henriques, Alexandra North & Kenneth D. Kraft, <i>Dentons Canada LLP</i>	257
Cayman Islands	Simon Raftopoulos & Georgina Pullinger, <i>Appleby</i>	264
England & Wales	Samantha Hutchinson & Nathan Parker, <i>Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP</i>	274
France	Philippe Max, Guillaume Panuel & Meryll Aloro, <i>Dentons Europe, AARPI</i>	281
Guernsey	Jeremy Berchem, <i>Appleby</i>	288
Hong Kong	Charlotte Robins, James Ford & Patrick Wong, <i>Allen & Overy</i>	296
Ireland	Kevin Lynch, Ian Dillon & David O'Shea, <i>Arthur Cox LLP</i>	309
Italy	Alessandro Fosco Fagotto, Edoardo Galeotti & Valerio Lemma, <i>Dentons Europe Studio Legale Tributario</i>	325
Jersey	James Gaudin & Paul Worsnop, <i>Appleby</i>	334
Luxembourg	Vassiliyan Zanev, Marc Meyers & Maude Royer, <i>Loyens & Loeff Luxembourg SARL</i>	339
Mauritius	Malcolm Moller, <i>Appleby</i>	350

Netherlands	Gianluca Kreuze, Michaël Maters & Ruben den Hollander, <i>Loyens & Loeff N.V.</i>	358
Norway	Snorre Nordmo, Ole Andenæs & Stina Tveiten, <i>Wikborg Rein Advokatfirma AS</i>	366
Portugal	Maria Soares do Lago & Duarte Veríssimo dos Reis, <i>Morais Leitão, Galvão Teles, Soares da Silva & Associados</i>	373
Singapore	Jean Woo, Danny Tan & Evan Lam, <i>Ashurst LLP</i>	379
Spain	Jabier Badiola Bergara, <i>Dentons Europe Abogados, S.L. (Sociedad Unipersonal)</i>	388
USA	Jan Sysel, Stewart Ross & Flora Go, <i>Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP</i>	396

Newer liquidity solutions for alternative asset fund managers – concept proven

Jamie Parish, Danny Peel & Katie McMenamini
Travers Smith LLP

In the original iteration of this chapter, written in late 2020, we posed the question as to whether one impact of COVID-19 and other developments in the market had been proof of concept for some of the more innovative liquidity solutions that alternative asset fund managers had begun to implement, but whose more widespread usage was accelerated during 2020. One year on, and we can now answer that question – in our view, the concept has very much been proven with an increasing number of asset managers appreciating the benefits of these solutions. The COVID-19 drivers behind this acceleration remain relevant and we now assess the current fund finance market and liquidity solutions available to alternative asset fund managers – from traditional subscription facilities through to net asset value (NAV)/ hybrid facilities and preferred equity products, as well as broader general partner (GP)-led fund restructurings – in light of the impact of COVID-19 and other market trends.

Introduction

It became clear almost immediately that the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic would be severe and long-lasting. Many asset managers, nervous about the potential of their (fundamentally healthy) investments to weather the storm, were forced to seek ways to ensure they had the ability to shore up the balance sheets of their portfolio companies if this was required.

In the short term, that meant finding liquidity. Some managers found themselves considering funding sources that had previously been talked about, but not seriously explored, which were now seen as genuine and potentially critical options for providing that much-needed liquidity to support portfolios. That, in turn, has had a longer-term impact, to which the prevalence of these solutions (long after the initial liquidity concerns caused by the pandemic abated) attests. These sources of liquidity, having been given the chance to prove concept and to demonstrate they are both structurally feasible to execute and sufficiently flexible to suit a broad range of requirements, have increasingly begun to cement themselves in the asset manager's toolkit of core financing options throughout the traditional fund life-cycle. COVID-19 has, as a result, had a permanent impact on how some asset managers structure their funds and finance their investment activity.

A changed market

The fund finance market has undergone significant expansion in recent years. NAV facilities in particular, once the preserve of secondaries fund managers looking for leverage to finance their portfolio acquisitions of limited partner (LP) interests, have increasingly become standard fare across other asset classes. More recently, preferred equity structures have been used by fund managers willing to embrace more innovative solutions when

evaluating optimal capital structures. COVID-19 not only accelerated the uptake of these types of solutions for fund managers that had already started using them, but has also meant that others have started to see them as viable options.

The subscription finance arena remains a huge and thriving market that is utilised by a high percentage of fund managers. Subscription facilities constitute a cheap, flexible and now (broadly) investor-accepted route to putting debt in place at the fund level. However, subscription facilities are predicated on a fund having enough uncalled capital to borrow against to enable it to borrow at the quantum required. When COVID-19 hit, funds of a certain vintage that were fully (or mostly) invested had little or no remaining uncalled capital. For these funds, a purely subscription facility-based solution was off the table.

In a volatile economic environment, cash is paramount. As the rapid and global spread of COVID-19 took hold, fund managers undertook an urgent review of their investment portfolios in order to ascertain (i) which of their portfolio companies were likely to need additional funding as a result of their business being hit by the pandemic, and (ii) whether their funds had sufficient firepower to meet those requirements. The conclusion, in the case of some older vintage funds in particular (and especially those with retail and/or leisure-heavy portfolios), was that the worst-case scenario could see the short-term funding quantum required far exceed the financing currently available (whether from existing cash resources at portfolio company level; headroom on asset-level facilities; additional leverage at the asset level; or investor capital (especially if this had largely been deployed already)). Fund managers feared the value they had created during years of sourcing, investing in and developing businesses would be destroyed overnight – not due to investment decisions they had made, but due to the immense strain arising from an almost entirely unforeseeable global pandemic that threatened even the healthiest of businesses.

The liquidity solutions that have gained the most traction in the market are NAV facilities and preferred equity solutions. These products look to tap liquidity from assets other than investor commitments, principally the fund's equity in existing investments within its portfolio, as a means to generate immediately available cash. These tools have gained increasing popularity in recent years due to the greater flexibility they afford asset managers in maximising returns from their investments. For example, a fund later in its life (and therefore with limited investor capital available to call upon) may not have funding available for follow-on investment but holds assets that would benefit from bolt-ons or additional capex. Rather than the arbitrary timing of the stage of the fund's life-cycle meaning these assets are left underfunded, NAV facilities and preferred equity products can be used to release capital for this purpose. COVID-19 meant that, for different reasons, readily available cash was a premium asset, and so unlocking value from the equity in the portfolio via a NAV facility or a preferred equity product became an obvious option to explore for a broader range of funds.

NAV facilities *versus* preferred equity – the details

In simple terms, the distinction between these products is that NAV facilities comprise fund- (or fund holdco-) level debt secured against the value of the assets in the investment portfolio (paired with, in the case of a hybrid facility, uncalled investor commitments), whereas preferred equity products comprise prior ranking third-party equity invested in the fund in return for priority claims over future distributions. Managers using these products for the first time might choose to run dual tracks until relatively late in the process (to ensure they have a full understanding of the pros and cons of each) before settling on the most appropriate solution for their specific needs.

NAV facilities, being a debt product, are typically cheaper. However, the lender will usually take at least some security over the assets and will require a reasonably wide-ranging suite of covenants that restrict the fund's ongoing activities. In addition, the facility will have a fixed tenor (which may be difficult to refinance at expiry) and there are likely to be ongoing finance costs such as servicing cash-pay interest payment obligations (which may be challenging for a non-cash generative portfolio).

In contrast, a preferred equity provider will not require security or typically as much by way of behavioural controls. Equally, it is unlikely to require payments of principal or cash-pay interest on set dates (although, where the cost of capital becomes increasingly punitive as time passes, funds may be so heavily incentivised to realise value and return capital to the provider that these effectively are time-limited products). Instead, the provider will receive a specified percentage of future distributions from investments until it has received a pre-agreed return on the capital provided, typically set at an internal rate of return (IRR) hurdle with a minimum multiple on invested capital requirement. Preferred equity products are by their nature very flexible and will often be bespoke, with providers marketing themselves as having the creativity to tailor solutions to suit the specific requirements of individual funds.

The principal trade-off between these two products is cost of capital (which remains a challenge for preferred equity providers to justify) *versus* loss of control over the portfolio (which is their key sell to managers when compared with a debt product). However, there are a number of other detailed considerations for fund managers when putting in place these types of products, including:

- **Investor relations considerations:** Even if investor consent is not required (or the transaction can be structured such that consent is not required), keeping investors fully apprised of the rationale for (and impact on investor returns and risk profile of) putting a product of this nature in place is of fundamental importance. In particular, managers should have regard to (i) investors' concerns around assets within the fund being cross-collateralised, and (ii) the fact that the different products can have different impacts on individual investors – for example, some investors' cost of capital will increase if a fund in which it has invested becomes leveraged for the purposes of the Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive (AIFMD). From a commercial perspective, key messages a manager needs to be able to give to investors are that (i) the manager will retain control of the assets, even following a loan-to-value (LTV) breach, such that it can avoid a fire sale, and (ii) the status of their investment in the fund as part of a non-leveraged, long-term investment strategy remains.
- **Fund documentation considerations:** It may be the case that the fund documentation does not envisage this type of product and so LP/Limited Partner Advisory Committee (LPAC) formal consent is required (which, depending on the consent threshold required, will impact on timing). For newer funds, a NAV facility will often not require investor consent, but leverage limitations in the fund documentation will invariably apply to a NAV facility and so managers must ensure these will be complied with. Preferred equity products typically require an amendment to the waterfall set out in the fund's limited partnership agreement (LPA), which would always require investor consent, but it may nonetheless be possible to execute such a transaction without requiring investor consent, particularly where undertaken at a holdco/aggregator level.
- **Structuring considerations:** Both NAV facilities and preferred equity deals are simplest to structure where there is an aggregator vehicle in place between the fund partnership and the underlying portfolio assets. The existence of such a vehicle enables a single

clean security interest to be granted over the equity in that vehicle (in the case of a NAV facility) or that vehicle to issue the preferred equity instrument (in the case of a preferred equity transaction) without the direct involvement of the fund. If there is no such existing aggregator, then ideally one would be introduced into the structure. This requires an analysis of any transfer or change of control provisions in the underlying equity or debt arrangements relating to each portfolio asset. It also requires the tax implications of doing so to be considered to ensure that dry tax charges are not inadvertently triggered. Ultimately, if it is not possible to put this structure in place, it may still be feasible to execute a NAV facility where the investment agreements in relation to the various investment holdcos do not prohibit the grant of security over the shares in that investment holdco, but the cost of this may be significant – especially if the holdcos are incorporated across multiple different jurisdictions.

- **Regulatory considerations:** It may be that putting a product of this nature in place impacts the regulatory status of the fund – for example, causing a previously non-leveraged fund for AIFMD purposes to be leveraged for the purposes of AIFMD (which may also impact the manager itself if it was previously a manager only of non-leveraged funds). If Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) (or its equivalent in other jurisdictions) approvals are required, this will of course impact on timing, but in addition it may affect the compliance requirements applicable to the manager, reporting requirements (to regulators and investors) and (as alluded to above) the capital treatment of investors' own interests in the relevant fund.
- **Valuation considerations:** Agreeing which assets will be (and will remain) “eligible” for inclusion in the LTV covenant, and the basis on which those assets will be valued, is fundamentally important to the viability of the transaction. A manager will push for its own internal valuations to be used, but a liquidity provider is likely to require a third-party valuer's input either at the outset or (at the very least) if there is subsequently a dispute over valuation. These valuations will be used to size the funding that will be made available originally and to set the financial covenants and/or drawdown conditions going forward – with the value of an asset in default or forecasting a covenant breach under its asset-level debt often excluded from these calculations. In addition, certain assets (such as credit assets) are much easier to value than others (such as buyout assets), including taking into account the process for realising that value. Providers of these products need to understand both fund structures and the underlying asset class in order to price the risk correctly. It is for this reason that such providers often combine internal expertise from their fund finance and asset-level debt teams when negotiating the commercial terms of these facilities.

Whilst some clearing banks were prepared to consider providing products of this nature during the pandemic, it was only for their most valued and long-standing customers (and only on a NAV facility basis). For the most part, managers had to look to institutions that, for some time, had been specifically focusing on NAV facilities and preferred equity products – including funds dedicated to these strategies, traditional secondary players and investment banks. These institutions were in many cases far better placed to design and provide the bespoke solutions individual funds needed. Many of these entities have been extremely successful at grasping the opportunity to demonstrate their structuring capabilities and the value of their products – such that they are now very much part of the mainstream universe of liquidity providers.

As an aside, it is interesting to note that, though some clearing banks have, in response, selectively widened their offering (including making available products that they would not

previously have had the risk appetite to provide and to new customers) in order to compete with those newer liquidity providers that consolidated their position in the market during the pandemic, there remains a relative paucity of providers of NAV facilities, particularly in the mid-market. Subscription finance remains the primary offering of the clearing banks. The investment banks may require a minimum ticket size that is well beyond the liquidity a fund requires and is willing to pay for. Sector focus may limit what other banks are able to provide. All of which means that the field remains open for specialist providers to continue to embed themselves in the market – but also that there is an opportunity for lenders who, through different parts of the same institution, understand (and likely frequently leverage) a fund’s underlying assets, and have (or are building) expertise in the subscription finance market, to develop an attractive offering through internal collaboration.

As a result, managers have become increasingly familiar with products of this nature and are more actively seeking them out, with a much better understanding of the basis on which they will be provided. Whilst remaining some way off the subscription facility as a staple source of cash for a fund, these products are increasingly part of the toolkit for a fund manager looking to optimise the operations of its funds. As they are tested throughout the life-cycle of a fund and are proven to be of value, and assuming that, in any downside scenarios, they are proven to offer both robust protections for the provider whilst also not giving rise to any regret on the part of a manager that has implemented them, they will become even more so. Far from being a source of liquidity available as a last resort, these products are increasingly being seen by managers as an option to be used in the ordinary course.

In addition, more sophisticated LPs have increasingly begun considering the benefits of using products of this nature to leverage their portfolios of LP interests, not least to help them better manage the capital call profiles of the funds in which they have invested. A NAV facility to an LP secured by its investment portfolio is fundamentally similar to a NAV facility to a secondaries fund. This area of the market is ripe for expansion, with those institutions that have, for some time, underwritten facilities to secondaries funds well placed to take advantage.

A shout-out to GP-led restructurings

Those funds employing the most sophisticated financing structures have, for some time, been using NAV facilities and preferred equity products not just to protect value, but more proactively to create, release and extend value. For example, by generating cash for distributions to investors earlier in the fund’s life-cycle than would otherwise be available because exits from investments are not envisaged in the imminent future, this can be used to aid IRRs or release capital to investors at an opportune moment when fundraising for a successor fund. In these respects, these types of products are in line with (and can also be used as an alternative to) secondaries transactions, which are used to generate liquidity for investors as well as potentially the funds themselves.

Trading in LP interests on the secondaries market has become a mainstream method for new entrants on the investor side to gain exposure to alternative assets without having blind pool investment risk, as well as for investors with large portfolios of LP interests to manage their cashflows by realising value in advance of receiving distributions. The emergence of GP-led fund restructurings, whereby a continuation vehicle is managed by the same GP and funded by new investors and/or investors in the existing fund that choose to roll their position into the new vehicle, is testament again to the increasing proactivity that managers are showing in finding different liquidity solutions, both for themselves and their investors.

These are involved and complex transactions, requiring delicate structuring (for example, to ensure any rollover structured as tax-free genuinely does avoid any tax obligations being crystallised – noting that the position may be different for individual investors).

GP-led restructurings have the significant benefit of allowing managers to offer their investors a liquidity option (but not a requirement) – roll into the new structure, thereby maintaining their exposure to the portfolio, or realise value and cash-out now. In that respect, they differ from NAV facilities and preferred equity products in that they can give rise to different outcomes for the existing investor base. They also enable fund managers to hold on to assets for longer where they see additional value-creation opportunities, rather than being forced to exit because the fund is reaching the end of its life-cycle.

Another key difference is in relation to valuations. Secondaries transactions necessarily must land on a fixed value for the NAV of the fund, with the purchase price typically being a set discount to that NAV. These transactions therefore require greater conflict management, with increasingly sophisticated investors expecting robust, market-tested pricing and potentially fairness opinions to ensure they are not being prejudiced – whether they are an existing investor exercising the option to take liquidity out, an existing investor rolling into the new structure, or a new investor providing liquidity to capitalise the continuation vehicle.

However, in our view, the trend towards increasing volumes of secondaries transactions (with GP-led solutions forming an ever-larger part of that) will continue. Investors will continue to look to more actively manage their investment portfolios, and the denominator effect is felt from proportionate allocations to alternative assets increasing as public markets continue to fall. In complete contrast, and to demonstrate the complexity of what underpins market participants' engagement with these types of products, where a NAV facility or preferred equity product is being put in place, some investors are actively seeking to participate as providers of these – thereby further blurring the boundaries between investors, traditional lenders and providers of capital throughout the fund structure.

Conclusion

Whilst it may have been contingency planning in the context of COVID-19 that brought these products into the consciousness of managers that had not previously considered using them, it has been demonstrated beyond doubt that they are here to stay. This is, however, only an acceleration of an already established trend. Fund managers across asset classes have, for some time, sought an array of funding solutions provided on a fund-wide basis that are more flexible than the traditional pairing of a subscription facility at fund level (used to bridge capital calls) and asset-level debt packages (put in place for each investment individually).

The market is also reacting to the increasing prevalence of whole portfolio financing structures, including the use of technology from the securitisation markets. At a purely documentation level, LPAs are increasingly providing for much greater clarity and flexibility in what liquidity solutions the fund may put in place. At the other end of the spectrum, there are questions as to whether funds using these types of structures as a matter of course (with leverage throughout the capital structure of the fund rather than just at asset level) have a different risk profile from that traditionally associated with such funds.

There continues to be much talk at a macroeconomic level of a green recovery from the COVID-19 lockdown, and the fund finance market has proven to be no different. Sustainable finance initiatives have been gathering pace for some time, and in particular there has been

significant demand for lenders to provide ESG-linked fund-level facilities. There can be no doubt that such facilities are here to stay and that, even for non-ESG-linked facilities, fund managers' ESG credentials will be the subject of laser-like focus from lenders as much as investors.

Expect these products to become ever more commonplace and, given the range of institutions that provide them and their innovative approaches in doing so, to continue developing to adapt to fund managers' increasingly sophisticated requirements.

* * *

Acknowledgments

This chapter was authored by Jamie Parish, with thanks to contributions from Charles Bischoff, Danny Peel and Katie McMenamin.

**Jamie Parish****Tel: +44 20 7295 3464 / Email: jamie.parish@traverssmith.com**

Jamie Parish is a partner in the Finance Group at Travers Smith specialising in fund finance and real estate finance. He advises some of the most active participants in the fund finance space on the full spectrum of products, in particular investor call bridge/subscription facilities, NAV and hybrid facilities, GP support/co-invest facilities, and equity commitment-backed facilities to funds, GPs, managers and investors across a range of asset classes. Jamie's clients include numerous private equity real estate funds that, in addition to advising on fund finance products, he advises on all aspects of real estate debt financing, at all levels of the capital structure. He previously completed a secondment at the Royal Bank of Scotland in the Financial Institutions Group.

**Danny Peel****Tel: +44 20 7295 3441 / Email: daniel.peel@traverssmith.com**

Danny Peel is a partner and Head of the Finance Group at Travers Smith where he also co-heads the Fund Finance team alongside Charles Bischoff. Danny specialises in fund finance and has a long-established lender-side practice where he regularly advises many of the most active lenders in the market on subscription, co-invest, NAV and hybrid facilities for private equity, private equity real estate, infrastructure and private credit funds. He also has a burgeoning borrower-side practice. Danny also specialises in real estate finance, advising lenders, sponsors and borrowers on investment and development facilities across the full range of asset classes.

**Katie McMenamin****Tel: +44 20 7295 3350 / Email: katie.mcmenamin@traverssmith.com**

Katie McMenamin is a partner in the Finance Group at Travers Smith specialising in fund finance, leverage finance and general corporate lending. She regularly advises some of the most active fund finance providers and borrowers on some of the most highly structured and complex facilities across the spectrum of fund finance products available in the market, from subscription facilities to GP-led secondary transactions, preferred equity investments and NAV-based debt financings. Katie is a key member of the firm's cross-practice team supporting asset management clients and she was featured as a 'Private Equity Rising Star' by *Legal Week* in 2020. She previously completed a secondment with the Investec Bank plc Fund Solutions team.

Travers Smith LLP

10 Snow Hill, London EC1A 2AL, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7295 3000 / URL: www.traverssmith.com

www.globallegalinsights.com

Other titles in the **Global Legal Insights** series include:

AI, Machine Learning & Big Data

Banking Regulation

Blockchain & Cryptocurrency

Bribery & Corruption

Cartels

Corporate Tax

Employment & Labour Law

Energy

Fintech

Initial Public Offerings

International Arbitration

Litigation & Dispute Resolution

Merger Control

Mergers & Acquisitions

Pricing & Reimbursement