



Fund Finance 2025

Ninth Edition

Contributing Editor:

Wes Misson

Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP



glg Global Legal Group

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Wes Misson

Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP

Industry Viewpoints

1 **Morganization: origins and evolution of private equity and fund finance**

Dr. Mick Young

JPMorganChase

11 **The end of Fund Finance?**

Mike Mascia

EverBank, N.A.

Expert Analysis Chapters

16 **NAV and hybrid fund finance facilities**

Leon Stephenson

Reed Smith

**29 **Collateral damage: what not to overlook in subscription line and
management fee line facility diligence****

Anthony Pirraglia, Peter Beardsley & Richard Facundo

Loeb & Loeb LLP

41 **Derivatives at fund level**

Jonathan Gilmour, Joseph Wren, Nicholas Baines & Nick Morgan

Travers Smith LLP

51 **Oh, what a sweet life it is with subscription facilities!**

Kathryn Cecil, Jons Lehmann & Jan Sysel

Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP

**60 **Fund finance in the secondaries context – liquidity breeds
financing needs****

Katie McMenamin, Mimi C. Cheng & Edward Ford

Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP

68 **NAV facilities – the investor’s perspective**

Patricia Lynch, Patricia Teixeira & Justin Gaudenzi

Ropes & Gray LLP

**75 **Enforcement: analysis of lender remedies under U.S. law in
subscription-secured credit facilities****

Ellen G. McGinnis, Richard D. Anigian & Emily Fuller

Haynes and Boone, LLP

- 94** **Use of preferred equity in private equity net asset value facilities**
Meyer C. Dworkin, David J. Kennedy & Kwesi Larbi-Siaw
Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP
- 101** **Financing evergreen funds: the growth of individual investors in the private equity secondaries market**
Brian Foster, George Pelling, Michael Newell & John Donnelly
Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP
- 105** **Umbrella facilities: pros and cons for a sponsor**
Richard Fletcher & Yagmur Yarar
Macfarlanes LLP
- 115** **Side letters: pitfalls and perils for a financing**
Thomas Smith, Margaret O'Neill & John W. Rife III
Debevoise & Plimpton LLP
- 125** **Fund finance lending in Cayman, Luxembourg and Ireland: a practical checklist**
James Heinicke, David Nelson, Jad Nader & Laura Holtham
Ogier
- 138** **Assessing lender risk in fund finance markets**
Robin Smith, Alistair Russell, Nick Ghazi & Holly Brown
Carey Olsen
- 152** **Fund finance meets securitisation**
Richard Day, Blake Jones & Julia Tsybina
Clifford Chance LLP
- 160** **Fund finance facilities: a cradle to grave timeline**
Bronwen Jones, Kevin-Paul Deveau & Brendan Gallen
Reed Smith
- 169** **Rated subscription lines: welcoming a new era of fund finance**
Danny Peel, Charles Bischoff, Laura Smith & Adam Burk
Travers Smith LLP
- 179** **Bespoke ABF and ABS liquidity structures of Cayman Islands funds**
Dr. Agnes Molnar & Richard Mansi
Travers Thorp Alberga
- 189** **NAV and holdco back-levering financings – practicalities of collateral enforcement by asset class**
Sherri Snelson & Juliesa Edwards
White & Case LLP
- 199** **Collateralised fund obligations**
Christopher P. Duerden, Caroline M. Lee, Anthony Lombardi & Lindsay Trapp
Dechert LLP

- 211 Innovative rated note structures spur insurance investments in private equity**
Pierre Maugüé, Ramya Tiller & Christine Gilleland
Debevoise & Plimpton LLP
- 220 Financing secondary fund acquisitions**
Ron D. Franklin, Jinyoung Joo & Allison F. Saltstein
Proskauer
- 228 Any preference? Preferred equity as part of the financing toolkit**
Ravi Chopra, Robert Emerson & Ed Saunders
Goodwin
- 237 Fund manager M&A: finance considerations and trends**
Matthew Bivona, Corinne Musa & Trevor Vega
Akin
- 244 Understanding true leverage at the fund level: a European market and sector approach**
Michel Jimenez Lunz & Antoine Fortier Grethen
SJL Jimenez Lunz
- 252 Institutional investors: the final frontier of net asset value-based finance**
Charlotte Lewis-Williams, Ryan Moreno, Soumitro Mukerji & Mei Mei Wong
DLA Piper
- 257 The fund finance market in Asia**
James Webb Travers Thorp Alberga
Ian Roebuck Baker McKenzie
Benjamin Masson Natixis Corporate & Investment Banking
- 267 Securing success: key considerations for account security in fund finance transactions**
Benjamin Berman, Jeremiah Wagner, Donald Cooley & Dan Marcus
Latham & Watkins
- 274 Private credit trends impacting fund finance**
Sarah Kessler, Daniel Durschlag, Mark Proctor & Allison Tam
Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP
- 282 Financing for continuation funds: a practical guide to market trends, opportunities and issue spotting**
Fiona Cumming & Parisa Clovis
A&O Shearman

Jurisdiction Chapters

- 289 Australia**
Tom Highnam, Rita Pang, Jialu Xu & Nick Swart
Allens
- 300 Bermuda**
Matthew Ebbs-Brewer & Arielle DeSilva
Appleby
- 308 British Virgin Islands**
Andrew Jowett & Johanna Murphy
Appleby
- 317 Canada**
Michael Henriques, John J. Oberdorf III, Kenneth D. Kraft & Tim T. Bezeredi
Dentons Canada LLP
- 324 Cayman Islands**
Simon Raftopoulos & Georgina Pullinger
Appleby
- 333 England & Wales**
Michael Hubbard, Samantha Hutchinson, Nathan Parker & Sukhvir Basran
King & Spalding International LLP
- 340 France**
Philippe Max & Meryll Aloro
Dentons
- 347 Guernsey**
Jeremy Berchem & Leona Maharaj
Appleby
- 356 Hong Kong**
James Ford, Patrick Wong & Natalie Ashford
A&O Shearman
- 368 Ireland**
Kevin Lynch, Ian Dillon, David O'Shea & Ben Rayner
Arthur Cox LLP
- 384 Italy**
Alessandro Fosco Fagotto, Edoardo Galeotti, Valerio Lemma & Giorgio Peli
Dentons
- 393 Jersey**
James Gaudin, Paul Worsnop, Simon Felton & Daniel Healy
Appleby

398 Luxembourg

Vassiliyan Zanev, Marc Meyers & Maude Royer

Loyens & Loeff Luxembourg SARL

409 Mauritius

Malcolm Moller

Appleby

416 Netherlands

Gianluca Kreuze, Michaël Maters & Ruben den Hollander

Loyens & Loeff N.V.

425 Scotland

Andrew Christie, Dawn Reoch & Ruaridh Cole

Burness Paull LLP

432 Singapore

Jean Woo, Danny Tan, Tao Koon Chiam & Hanyin Huang

Ashurst LLP

440 Spain

Jabier Badiola Bergara & Adelaida Torres Rovi

Dentons

448 USA

Jan Sysel, Duncan McKay & Yvonne Ho

Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP

Derivatives at fund level

Jonathan Gilmour

Joseph Wren

Nicholas Baines

Nick Morgan

Travers Smith LLP

Overview

Managers may consider entering into derivatives transactions at fund level for broadly one of two reasons: to protect investors from downside risks otherwise beyond the manager's control; and/or to seek to generate additional returns for investors.

This chapter considers, at a high level, certain key structuring and legal issues that should be considered. These issues are not tailored to any particular strategy, although certain considerations will be more relevant where derivatives transactions are used for hedging purposes, and other considerations will be more relevant where derivatives transactions are used for investment purposes.

Introduction

Derivatives use can generally be split between those entered into for speculative or investment purposes and those entered into to hedge risk. In the case of the former, funds can use derivatives in the active pursuit of return; for example, using total return swaps as a form of leverage to increase the fund's capacity to borrow or to gain exposure to assets. At the other end of the spectrum, derivatives can be used to mitigate the economic impact of a particular risk. The most common examples of risks managed at the fund level are: foreign exchange (FX) exposure (for example, mitigating the currency risk for a EUR fund that will be drawing investor commitments in EUR to fund an investment denominated in USD); and interest rate exposure (for example, mitigating the risk of an adverse movement in interest rates increasing the amount required to be paid on borrowings made by the fund).

Advantages and considerations when entering into derivatives at fund level

The primary economic motivation for entering into derivatives at fund level is that the benefit of the derivative (whether as an investment or a hedge) will sit at the most logical level within the capital structure. For example, where a particular risk affects the fund directly, it is often desirable to hedge that risk at the same level.

Putting in place a derivatives platform, utilising market-standard International Swaps and Derivatives Association (ISDA) Master Agreements and Schedules with one or more counterparties, also means that the manager can enter into multiple derivatives transactions using the same documentation, avoiding the additional cost, complexity and delays associated with negotiating documentation on multiple occasions (as would be required if each new derivative were entered into, on a case-by-case basis, by different vehicles within the fund). Netting can also be effected across multiple transactions under the same ISDA Master Agreement, helping to reduce credit exposure, and therefore the likelihood of the fund having to post collateral to its counterparties.

Fund structuring considerations of entering into derivatives at fund level

When entering into derivatives at the fund level, managers should consider which fund vehicle (or vehicles) should enter into those transactions.

From an operational perspective, it is often most straightforward for the fund entity bearing the risk or seeking to benefit from the investment (e.g. the investor partnership) to enter into the derivatives transaction itself. However, in practice, fund structures are frequently more complex than this. Even where a fund has a single investment policy, it will often comprise multiple investment vehicles, with those vehicles collectively investing in a portfolio of assets in certain proportions. Each fund investment vehicle will either face a proportion of underlying risk (typically commensurate with the investment vehicle's investment proportion), or will want to obtain a proportion of the economic benefits of the derivatives transaction. It would be operationally and legally complex for each investment vehicle to enter into a derivatives transaction *pro rata* to the underlying proportion of risk faced or benefits sought by that vehicle.

A common solution to this problem is for managers to establish one or more special purpose vehicles within the fund "group" (or use existing entities within the fund group, such as an aggregator or a treasury vehicle) for the purposes of entering into derivatives transactions. This allows multiple investment vehicles to benefit from the fund's derivatives strategy whilst also streamlining counterparty trading lines and associated documentation through a single entity within the fund group.

The use of a special purpose vehicle comes with its own considerations. Firstly, the question of whether a special purpose vehicle falls within the fund group for the purposes of derivatives regulation can be legally complex. Secondly, counterparties are unlikely to be satisfied that a special purpose vehicle alone is sufficiently creditworthy (because it will have little or no assets of its own) and counterparties will therefore require some form of recourse against the fund itself (for example, by way of a guarantee from the fund of the special purpose vehicle's obligations, or by way of the fund providing an equity commitment letter to the special purpose vehicle). The impact of any such recourse needs to be considered carefully. Additional complexity will arise if the fund is set up, wholly or in part, as a liquid or semi-liquid fund (as counterparties will need to understand how this affects their recourse).

These structuring considerations are more complex where the fund comprises multiple sleeves, where different fund investment vehicles face different risks (or have different investment strategies). For example, in a fund structure which has multiple currency sleeves (as a result of investors advancing commitments to the fund in different currencies), it may be commercially desirable for different hedging strategies to be used in the different sleeves. Managers will need to give thought as to how to structure the fund in order to implement multiple hedging strategies within the same fund. One possible solution to this issue is to establish a different special purpose vehicle within each sleeve.

Regulatory considerations of entering into derivatives at fund level

Although fund-level derivatives transactions are now entered into by funds routinely, there are regulatory considerations that the manager must be aware of.

Obligations may be imposed as a result of derivatives regulation. Regulatory regimes including the European Market Infrastructure Regulation (EMIR) (and its “onshored” UK equivalent, UK EMIR) and the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act impose obligations on parties entering into derivatives transactions. These include to report on, and actively mitigate the risk of, their derivatives transactions. Specified classes of derivatives face more onerous regulatory obligations, including requirements to clear specified classes of derivatives through approved clearing houses (mainly affecting certain interest rate and credit default derivatives), and to post cash or securities as credit support (margin/collateral).

If a derivatives transaction involves an obligation to transfer or post margin, the manager must monitor and respond to margin requirements, which may be required on a daily basis. Some managers will not have the in-house resources to manage such processes, nor the ready access to liquidity (particularly those managers who would need to rely on calling unfunded commitments from their investors). Even for those managers that do have access to such liquidity, the deployment of cash or securities as margin constitutes a drag, which may have an adverse impact on fund returns.

Consequently, careful analysis of these regulatory obligations is required by any manager who is considering entering into derivatives at fund level. For example, the definition of “Financial Counterparty” under EMIR/UK EMIR determines the types of entity that are in-scope for material obligations such as mandatory clearing or mandatory transfer or posting of variation margin. A range of funds (including, in particular, regulated alternative investment funds) potentially fall within this definition, so managers will need to consider whether their funds may fall within scope of those obligations.

There are, however, some useful carve-outs and exemptions that may apply to funds. For example, EMIR/UK EMIR includes a “Small Financial Counterparty” classification, exempting certain financial counterparties from the requirement to clear their derivatives transactions, so many smaller funds that use interest rate derivatives (of a type that would otherwise need to be cleared) may be able to sidestep the clearing obligation. Further, under EMIR and UK EMIR, physically settled FX forwards and swaps are exempt from the obligation to transfer or post variation margin provided that the fund is not a credit institution or an investment firm treated as an institution for prudential purposes that is established in the EEA (in the case of EMIR) or the UK (in the case of UK EMIR) (or equivalent entities located in a third country). The result is that most funds can trade physically settled FX forwards and swaps without being subject to the requirement to transfer or post variation margin.

When assessing how these rules might affect a fund’s derivatives strategy, the regulatory burden can often be reduced by careful structuring of the derivatives or by using an appropriate vehicle (such as a special purpose vehicle, as described earlier in this chapter) to enter into the transactions. For example, a special purpose vehicle that is used by the fund to enter into derivatives transactions can usually be structured as a “Non-financial Counterparty” for the purposes of EMIR/UK EMIR. This is a beneficial regulatory classification, as certain Non-financial Counterparties are not in scope of some of the more onerous regulatory obligations applying to derivatives transactions under EMIR/UK EMIR (such as mandatory clearing and mandatory collateralisation). However, this is dependent on the quantum of derivatives transactions (measured by reference to the aggregate notional amount of in-scope derivatives) entered into by the special purpose vehicle and, potentially, other entities within the fund’s “group” that have entered into derivatives, and the nature of those transactions (i.e. whether they are for speculative or hedging purposes). This requires careful consideration on a case-by-case basis.

Brexit has complicated matters further. Whilst obligations for funds under EMIR and UK EMIR are currently largely aligned, it is possible that there will be divergence between EMIR and UK EMIR in the future. For example, the most recent changes to EMIR (dubbed “EMIR 3.0”), which, among other things, will change how fund managers make certain calculations of their aggregate exposure to derivatives across their fund structures, are not currently scheduled to be implemented in the UK. Similarly, the

planned reforms to financial services legislation in the UK may touch upon the regulation of derivatives in the UK. In view of these changes, managers are advised to work with their legal counsel to stay abreast of potential implications for their funds. Where there are differences between the EMIR and UK EMIR regimes, UK managers managing EU funds (or EU managers managing UK funds) may be required to comply with both EMIR and UK EMIR, which will increase the regulatory burden on the manager.

Another consideration for funds subject to the Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive (AIFMD) is whether the use of derivatives at fund level would create leverage within the fund, and the extent to which this may be undesirable. Detailed consideration of these issues sits outside the focus of this chapter, but funds that are “leveraged” for AIFMD purposes will be subject to more onerous disclosure requirements, both during the fundraising process and during the lifecycle of the fund.

Constitutional considerations when entering into derivatives at fund level

A manager that is considering entering into derivatives at fund level will need to ensure that it has the power and authority under the fund’s constitutional documentation to do so (taking into account any limits on quantum/type of its derivatives exposure, which, in certain circumstances, may be contained in side letters with its investors). Ideally, the question of whether, and in what circumstances, the fund is entitled to enter into derivatives transactions should be considered at the formation stage with any permission, together with any parameters around that permission, clearly addressed in the constitutional documentation when the fund is established.

An express prohibition on entering into derivatives in the fund’s constitutional documents is rare; however, for older funds, it is possible for constitutional documentation to be silent on derivatives use, which may require the fund’s legal counsel to opine on the fund’s ability to enter into derivatives transactions.

Examples of other restrictions that may appear in fund constitutional documents are:

- (a) *Limitation on the level of financial indebtedness that the fund may incur.* If the constitutional documents contain limits on the financial indebtedness that the fund is permitted to incur, then the fund will need to consider whether actual (or contingent) exposures under derivatives will constitute financial indebtedness and, if so, how the exposure under the derivatives will be valued for the purpose of complying with the relevant provisions.
- (b) *Prohibition from entering into speculative derivatives.* Here, the manager will need to consider carefully the nature of the derivatives to be entered into by the fund and whether, on a correct construction of the limitation language, they could be caught. For example, a derivatives transaction entered into to hedge FX rate exposure is unlikely to be speculative, because it is hedging a genuine risk faced by the fund. However, managers looking to use, for example, total return swaps as part of the investment strategy of the fund will need to carefully consider whether these are speculative derivatives transactions for the purposes of the limitation language.

Constitutional limitations in relation to granting credit support for derivatives transactions

If, commercially or as a matter of regulation, the fund’s derivatives transactions will need to be collateralised or supported by a fund guarantee or an equity commitment letter (for example, if the derivatives are being entered into by a special purpose vehicle), then the manager will need to ensure that giving that credit support is permitted under the fund’s constitutional documentation:

- (a) *Security.* Fund documentation will frequently circumscribe the ability to grant security. This may be prohibited or limited by reference to either the value of collateral that may be posted or the assets over which security may be granted, and the manager will need to ensure that the limitations are not breached.

Security or quasi-security arrangements for derivatives can be effected in a number of ways, including by the creation of security interests over collateral or by title transfer collateral arrangements. When

derivatives arrangements are required, either as a result of regulation or by virtue of the commercial agreement between the parties, to include security or title transfer collateral arrangements, the market-standard approach is to employ the appropriate form of ISDA's Credit Support Annex (CSA) or Credit Support Deed.

However, due to investment drag caused by both security and title transfer collateral arrangements, many managers will, where possible, look to either agree CSAs with embedded thresholds that ensure that collateral is only required to be posted once the fund's exposures exceed an agreed limit, or establish non-CSA trading lines and provide different forms of credit support to their counterparties.

- (b) *Guarantees.* The fund may be required by its counterparty to guarantee the obligations of a fund-owned or special purpose vehicle that has entered into derivatives transactions for the benefit of the fund. In these circumstances, it will be necessary to consider whether the fund's constitutional documents limit its ability to do so. A limitation could take the form of a direct limit on the giving of guarantees, or it could be effected indirectly by including exposure under the relevant guarantee within another limitation (for example, a limitation on financial indebtedness).

If guarantees are so limited, then the manager will need to understand how the guaranteed obligations are to be valued for the purpose of ensuring compliance with the limitation. For example, is the maximum contingent exposure used, or is the correct figure for these purposes the accounting value placed upon the guarantee?

- (c) *Indemnities.* Similar to guarantees, the manager will need to consider whether the fund's constitutional documents limit its ability to give indemnities in respect of derivatives and, if so, how the contingent liability under any such indemnity is to be valued for the purpose of the limitation. For example, the standard form 2002 ISDA Master Agreement contains an indemnity for certain costs and expenses.

Constitutional limitations on the ability to draw investor commitments to make payments in respect of derivatives transactions

The manager will also need to consider any ongoing requirements under the proposed derivatives transaction to make payments or to transfer or post collateral. The proposed source of any required liquidity will need to be identified. It would usually be undesirable for investors' uncalled commitments to be used for making payments or transferring or posting collateral because of the investment drag associated with this as well as the relative illiquidity of uncalled commitments. However, if it is intended that investors' uncalled commitments will fund the making of payments or the transferring or posting of collateral, the manager will need to consider whether commitments can be drawn down for this purpose under the fund's constitutional documents and whether those commitments can be posted to counterparties within the timeframes specified in the relevant credit support documents.

If the fund has a subscription facility or other credit agreement where the available facility is calculated by reference to uncalled commitments, the manager will also need to factor into its use of such a facility the effect of payments funded from undrawn commitments.

Other considerations

In addition to legal considerations, a manager will need to understand the accounting, regulatory and tax treatments of any fund-level derivatives, and will also want to consider the operational impact of the derivatives on the fund.

The derivatives documentation

The manager will need to negotiate its derivatives documentation with reference to the fund's circumstances and needs. Among the matters that the manager should consider are:

- (a) *Recourse*. The manager will need to ensure that its derivatives documents reflect the correct separation of liability and recourse across its fund structure (for example, if hedging is only for liabilities relating to certain investors (say a USD sleeve of a fund that mainly raises capital in EUR and invests in EUR assets) or certain fund-owned vehicles but not others (such as friends-and-family or carry vehicles)). Further, and as noted earlier in this chapter, derivatives counterparties will likely require recourse against the fund where they are transacting with a special purpose vehicle and managers will usually want to ensure that a counterparty's recourse to the fund's investment vehicles is limited in line with each investment vehicle's proportionate participation in the derivative.
- (b) *Cross-default*. The manager should consider carefully the extent to which a default under any credit agreement could give rise to a termination right under its derivatives documents (for example, under paragraph 5(a)(vi) (Cross-Default) of the 2002 ISDA Master Agreement). The manager should seek to agree appropriate thresholds in its ISDA documentation to ensure that only material breaches of the fund's other debt obligations will give rise to a potential close-out of derivatives under the ISDA.
- (c) *Additional termination events*. Derivatives counterparties will usually seek to include additional termination events (ATEs) in their derivatives documents, unless the manager has a very strong negotiating position or established relationship with the derivatives counterparty. Examples of ATEs commonly seen in the London market include:

- (1) *Uncalled commitments cover*. This termination event is triggered if the financial indebtedness of the fund exceeds an agreed ratio of the fund's uncalled capital commitments.

The problem with this ATE is that a reduction in the fund's uncalled capital commitments is not necessarily a sign that it is in financial difficulty. Indeed, managers will be actively seeking to draw down investor commitments in order to invest them. Without careful consideration, this ATE could give rise to a "hair trigger" later in the lifecycle of the fund where the manager has substantially drawn down commitments from its investors. A common approach is for this kind of ATE to include a "sunset" provision whereby the ATE "switches off" once an agreed percentage of the fund's commitments has been drawn down and the ATE pivots to test a different financial metric (such as the fund's net asset value (NAV)).

- (2) *NAV floor*. This termination event is triggered if the fund's NAV drops below a particular level. The problem with this ATE is that a successful fund expects to reduce its NAV as it realises assets and returns value to investors. Conversely, "zombie" funds that continue well beyond their scheduled termination date, or that are not being actively managed, may not trigger this ATE. If a NAV floor is set too high, the fund should not plan to have derivatives transactions outstanding with the relevant counterparty significantly beyond the point where the fund's NAV is expected to approach the floor (with a suitable degree of headroom). Depending on where the NAV floor has been set, this could be as early as the beginning of the fund's realisation and distribution phase. Even the most generous NAV floors will, at some point, become problematic for the fund as its NAV will, at some point, fall below the NAV floor.

Whilst the need for derivatives may reduce as the fund's lifecycle moves to the realisation and distribution phase, it does not disappear entirely. If a particular counterparty refuses to agree to there being appropriate flexibility in the NAV floor trigger (for example, a step down following the realisation of assets in line with the fund's strategy), the manager would want to be able to trade with one or more alternative counterparties who do not insist on a NAV floor trigger that would prevent or seriously limit derivatives use towards the end of the fund's lifecycle.

- (3) *NAV decline*. This termination event is triggered if the fund's NAV decreases by more than prescribed amounts (or percentages) over particular periods. This trigger is difficult for a manager if the termination event has not been calibrated to deal with expected NAV movements – particularly where the manager is seeking to return cash to investors during the realisation

and distribution phase, or where it wishes to realise an asset early in its investment period (which could trigger a dramatic decrease in NAV if it is the only, or one of only a handful of, investment(s) made by the fund at that date). The manager should seek to mitigate any such trigger appropriately. This could be achieved by, for example, adjusting the trigger movement thresholds to reflect different stages of the fund's life; adding back distributions to investors that remain eligible for recall; or applying the trigger only to decreases that have a material adverse effect upon the fund's ability to perform its payment obligations under the relevant derivative.

There are other ways for the manager to mitigate this point, such as agreeing that instead of a termination trigger, a decrease in NAV will increase the level of collateral required to be transferred or posted by the fund in respect of its hedging exposure (which a manager may consider to be the lesser of the two evils).

- (d) *Use of collateral.* In addition to the issues relating to collateral highlighted above, managers should note that, to the extent the fund is required by regulation to exchange collateral in respect of its derivatives, it may not be possible for the manager to control the amount and frequency of collateral by setting large transfer threshold amounts and minimum transfer amounts. However, as noted earlier in this chapter, these risks can be mitigated by the careful structuring of the derivatives transactions or by the use of an appropriate vehicle from which to enter into derivatives on behalf of the fund group.
- (e) *Compliance with applicable regulation.* Relatedly, and where transacting through a vehicle that is directly subject to EMIR or UK EMIR, managers will need to ensure that appropriate provisions enabling the fund to comply with its other risk mitigation and reporting obligations under EMIR/UK EMIR are included in the derivatives documentation.

Interaction with credit agreements

The manager will also need to be aware of any contractual restrictions contained in any credit agreements to which the fund is party. Depending on the fund, and its use of leverage, this might be a subscription (or capital call) facility, a NAV facility, a hybrid facility or something else as the options in a manager's liquidity toolkit continue to grow.

Contractual limitations under credit agreements in relation to entering into derivatives transactions

Limitations commonly appear in credit agreements that address directly the ability of the fund to enter into derivatives transactions:

- (a) *Restriction on entering into derivatives transactions.* The underlying credit agreement should be reviewed for any restrictions on entry into derivatives transactions. Although a blanket prohibition is unlikely, other restrictions are more common and may include, for example, restrictions on entering into derivatives for speculative purposes.
- (b) *Restriction on incurring financial indebtedness.* Credit agreements will often restrict the fund's ability to incur financial indebtedness. The exposure of the fund under derivatives transactions will usually, but not always, be treated as financial indebtedness. If derivatives exposure is treated as financial indebtedness, then the next question is how the exposure should be measured. The common measure is the mark-to-market value of the derivatives transactions from time to time, but again this is a question of interpretation of the contractual provision. A manager may be able to mitigate this risk by negotiating a sufficiently large permitted "basket" of financial indebtedness to allow for anticipated fluctuations in derivatives exposure.

Contractual limitations under credit agreements in relation to granting credit support for fund-level derivatives transactions

Credit agreements will also commonly contain provisions that would otherwise limit the fund's ability to give credit support in relation to derivatives so, if the fund needs to transfer or post collateral or give any guarantee in respect of the proposed derivatives, appropriate permissions will need to be included:

- (a) *Security.* Credit agreements will usually include a negative pledge that limits the fund's ability to grant security. This restriction will always (in the context of a subscription facility) apply to security over the investors' uncalled commitments and any collateral or deposit account into which any investor commitments are paid when called, but it may apply to the creation of other security as well. A fund that may be required to enter into security arrangements in relation to derivatives should seek to include appropriate permissions to allow for this.
- (b) *Guarantees.* If a fund guarantee may be required, the manager will need to ascertain whether any finance documents limit its ability to give such a guarantee. This could be by way of a direct limitation on the giving of guarantees, or an indirect limitation where another restriction is broad enough to apply to guarantees (such as guarantees being designated as financial indebtedness for the purposes of the limitation on financial indebtedness). Alternatively, such guarantees may be permitted but constitute financial indebtedness for the purposes of calculating the borrowing base (on a subscription line) or otherwise for financial covenant purposes. In this scenario, the manager will need to understand how the guarantee will be valued for these purposes.
- (c) *Indemnities.* As with guarantees, careful thought must be given as to whether indemnities are limited, directly or indirectly, through any other limitation (for example, on financial indebtedness) and, if so, how the indemnity liability is to be valued for this purpose.

Further issues to consider under credit agreements in relation to the fund entering into derivatives

There are a number of other potential points of interaction between a fund's credit agreement and its derivatives documents. These need to be considered on a case-by-case by reference to the terms of the relevant documents, but common issues are:

- (a) *Availability of subscription facility.* Derivatives transactions may impact upon the availability of a subscription facility (or other credit agreements, where the facility limit is dictated by the level of uncalled commitments). This is because the terms of the credit agreement may require that, when calculating the borrowing base, the uncalled commitments are reduced by the amount of any derivatives liabilities (and any guarantee given in relation to derivatives liabilities).

More generally, if the manager proposes to use a subscription facility to fund payments under, or to fund collateral in respect of, its derivatives transactions, then the manager will need to ensure that the subscription facility permits such use and that it can be drawn down quickly enough (taking into account the currency in which the relevant collateral needs to be transferred or posted) to meet the requisite timing of the payment.

- (b) *Financial covenants.* The manager will also need to consider the impact of any derivatives on the financial covenants (if any) contained in its credit agreements. Whilst a pure subscription facility is unlikely to look much beyond uncalled commitments cover, NAV facilities (for example) are likely to contain a more comprehensive suite of financial covenants. When negotiating its credit agreements, the manager should seek to tailor the terms of any financial covenant definitions and ratios so that anticipated derivatives use does not erode headroom and, as the fund moves through its lifecycle, the financial covenants do not dictate or materially compromise the fund's derivatives strategy.

Derivatives use may impact upon a number of financial covenants:

- (1) *Uncalled commitments cover.* This financial covenant typically measures the level of financial indebtedness incurred by the fund against the quantum of its uncalled commitments. As noted above, the manager will need to understand to what extent derivatives exposure (including any guarantee, where relevant) is included within financial indebtedness for the purpose of this covenant and how that exposure is measured.
- (2) *Interest cover.* This financial covenant, often seen in NAV or hybrid facilities, measures the level of finance charges that the fund must pay under its financial indebtedness against net cashflow generated by its portfolio of investments. The manager will need to determine to what extent payments and other charges on its derivatives will constitute finance charges for the purpose of calculating the covenant.
- (3) *Loan to value.* This financial covenant, usually found in NAV or other “aftercare” facilities, compares the level of financial indebtedness to fund NAV. The manager will need to identify the extent to which derivatives transactions will either need to be included in the financial indebtedness calculation or will impact upon the NAV figure. Impact on NAV is more likely in circumstances where the derivatives have been entered into below fund level.

Conclusion

Fund-level derivatives transactions are now entered into by funds routinely, and managers continue to use these instruments both for the purpose of hedging risks faced by the fund and as part of the investment strategy of the fund. A manager who intends to enter into derivatives transactions at fund level should obtain appropriate legal and regulatory advice in order to ensure that the fund’s investment and/or hedging programme is legally robust.



Jonathan Gilmour

Tel: +44 20 7295 3425 / Email: jonathan.gilmour@traverssmith.com

Jonathan is a partner and Head of Travers Smith's Derivatives & Structured Products Group. Specialising in derivatives and structured products from both a transactional and advisory standpoint, he is widely regarded by peers and clients as one of the leading specialists in his field, and as a champion of "buy-side" interests in the UK derivatives market. He counts among his clients some of the UK's largest and most sophisticated private capital managers and funds, financial institutions, investment managers, corporates, fintechs and occupational pension schemes. Jonathan is rated as a "Leading Individual" by both *Chambers* and *The Legal 500* and is "Highly Regarded" by the *IFLR*.



Joseph Wren

Tel: +44 20 7295 3401 / Email: joseph.wren@traverssmith.com

Joseph is a Derivatives & Structured Products partner at Travers Smith. He advises private equity, private credit, infrastructure, real estate and secondaries funds, investment managers, corporates, and sell-side institutions such as banks and brokers. His practice includes advising on interest rate, FX, credit, equity, inflation, and commodity transactions, as well as on repo, securities lending, custody, clearing, collateral management and security arrangements, as well as the impact of related regulation such as EMIR and SFTR. He is ranked by *The Legal 500*, with clients viewing him as "approachable, knowledgeable and commercial" and valuing his ability to "think creatively about solutions to new challenges and lines of business".



Nicholas Baines

Tel: +44 20 7295 3062 / Email: nicholas.baines@traverssmith.com

Nicholas is a senior associate in the Derivatives & Structured Products Group at Travers Smith. He regularly advises private equity, private credit and infrastructure fund managers on the construction and implementation of hedging strategies to mitigate interest rate, FX and commodities exposures including advising on fund structuring to ensure optimal regulatory treatment, ISDA negotiations, collateral arrangements (including mandatory regulatory collateral as well as commercial collateral arrangements) and EMIR/UK EMIR compliance. Nicholas also assists managers with interest rate hedging required in connection with GP facilities, sub-lines, NAV facilities and on asset-level hedging arrangements.



Nick Morgan

Tel: +44 20 7295 3871 / Email: nick.morgan@traverssmith.com

Nick is an associate in the Derivatives & Structured Products Group at Travers Smith. He regularly advises private equity, private credit and infrastructure fund managers on the construction and implementation of hedging strategies to mitigate interest rate, FX and commodities exposures, both at fund level and at asset level. This includes advising on fund structuring and on the impact of related regulation including EMIR and UK EMIR, as well as negotiating ISDA Master Agreements, collateral documentation and other credit support documentation.

Travers Smith LLP

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



Global Legal Insights – Fund Finance provides in-depth analysis, insight and intelligence across 31 expert analysis chapters and 19 jurisdictions, covering key industry trends and developments including:

- Fund formation and finance
- Net asset value facilities
- Hybrid facilities
- Subscription lines
- Enforcement
- Secondaries
- Ratings
- Collateralised fund obligations

Written by leading industry participants from across the industry, this is the definitive legal guide for the global fund finance industry in 2025.

globallegalinsights.com