



# 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

# Luxembourg

**Vassiliyan Zanev**

**Marc Meyers**

**Maude Royer**

**Loyens & Loeff Luxembourg SARL**

## Overview

Luxembourg continues to strengthen its ranking as the world's second-largest fund domicile after the United States and remains a major centre for traditional Luxembourg-domiciled undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities (**UCITS**) funds, as well as for alternative investment funds (**AIFs**) pursuing private equity, real estate, infrastructure and debt strategies.

Recent years have continued to be particularly active as regards fund finance transactions in Luxembourg, with positive growth, strong credit performance and an absence of credit defaults. While capital call credit facilities, also called subscription line facilities, remain an essential tool, permanent leverage facilities and net asset value (**NAV**) facilities are now frequently used in order to increase investment capacity, optimise performance and provide additional liquidity solutions for fund managers.

## Fund formation and finance

### Legal overview – fund formation

When selecting Luxembourg as their hub for setting up their investment fund, initiators generally opt for either a non-regulated ordinary commercial company (**SOPARFI**) or one of the following (regulated and non-regulated) fund regimes:

- an investment company in risk capital (**SICAR**), based on the Law of 15 June 2004, as amended, on the risk capital investment company (**SICAR Law**) (the SICAR is a vehicle specifically dedicated to private equity and venture capital investments, whether diversified or not);
- a specialised investment fund (**SIF**), based on the Law of 13 February 2007, as amended, on specialised investment funds (**SIF Law**);
- a reserved alternative investment fund (**RAIF**), based on the Law of 23 July 2016, as amended, on reserved alternative investment funds (**RAIF Law**); or
- an undertaking for collective investment (**Part II UCI**), based on Part II of the Law of 17 December 2010, as amended, on undertakings for collective investment (**UCI Law**, and together with the SICAR Law, the SIF Law and the RAIF Law, the **Product Laws**).

Part II UCIs, SIFs and SICARs are regulated investment funds that are subject to direct supervision of the Luxembourg supervisory authority for the financial sector (*Commission de Surveillance du Secteur Financier, CSSF*) and require the prior approval of the CSSF before they can be set up. RAIFs and SOPARFIs are unregulated investment funds that are not subject to direct supervision of the CSSF and do not require prior CSSF approval.

A considerable number of Luxembourg investment vehicles constitute AIFs subject to Directive 2011/61/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2011 on alternative investment fund managers (**AIFMD**), implemented in Luxembourg by the Law of 12 July 2013, as amended, on alternative investment fund managers (**AIFM Law**). An AIF is defined as a collective investment undertaking that, or the compartment(s) of which: (i) raise(s) capital from a number of investors; (ii) with a view to investing such capital in accordance with a defined investment policy for the benefit of those investors; and (iii) is not covered by Directive 2009/65/EC on UCITS.

While a RAIF must qualify as an AIF within the meaning of the AIFM Law (and must accordingly appoint an authorised alternative investment fund manager (**AIFM**) as well as a depository), exemptions under the AIFM Law may apply to the SICAR and the SIF (which are only required to appoint an AIFM if they qualify as an AIF).

It is important to note that any unregulated SOPARFI will be considered an AIF if it fulfils all of the above criteria, thereby triggering the application of the AIFM Law, including the obligation to appoint an AIFM and a depository.

### **Leverage under the AIFMD and the AIFM Law**

While SOPARFIs, SICARs, SIFs and RAIFs are not subject to any legally imposed limits with regard to leverage, insofar as those vehicles qualify as AIFs, the AIFM Law may, nevertheless, need to be taken into consideration.

#### *Meaning of leverage*

The AIFM Law defines leverage as any method by which the AIFM increases the exposure of an AIF it manages, whether through borrowing of cash or securities, leverage embedded in derivative positions, or by any other means.

The AIFMD gives the European Commission the power to adopt delegated acts to specify the methods of leverage as defined in the AIFMD, including any financial and/or legal structures involving third parties controlled by the relevant AIF when those structures are specifically set up to, directly or indirectly, create leverage at the level of the AIF. It is important to note, in particular for private equity and venture capital funds, that leverage existing at the level of a portfolio company is not intended to be included when referring to those financial or legal structures.<sup>1</sup> The European Securities and Markets Authority (**ESMA**) considers that debt raised by a financial structure held by an AIF that is a private equity fund as referred to in recital 78 of the AIFMD in order to finance the acquisition of assets shall be included in the calculation of the exposure where: (1) those structures are specifically set up to directly or indirectly increase the exposure at the level of the AIF; and (2) the AIF controls such a structure. If these two conditions are fulfilled, the debt raised by the financial structure is to be included in the calculation of the exposure of the AIF. If an AIF does not have to bear losses beyond its investment in a financial structure that is used to acquire non-listed companies or issuers, the financial structure should not be considered as having been set up to directly or indirectly increase the exposure at the level of the AIF.<sup>2</sup>

The European Commission considers that borrowing arrangements entered into by an AIF are excluded from the leverage calculations if they are: (i) temporary in nature; and (ii) fully covered by capital commitments by investors (i.e. a contractual commitment by an investor to provide the AIF with an agreed amount of investment on demand by the AIFM).<sup>3</sup> In case of subscription/capital call facilities,



borrowings would not be considered as leverage for AIFMD purposes if they (i) are temporary in nature (being viewed by the industry consensus as for no more than 12 months), and (ii) relate to and are fully covered by investors' capital commitments. Depending on how they are structured, NAV financings may constitute leverage within the meaning of the AIFMD.

### *Impact of leverage under the AIFMD and the AIFM Law*

Any leverage at the AIF level may affect whether or not the AIF must appoint an authorised AIFM and a depositary.<sup>4</sup> Under the AIFM Law, any vehicle qualifying as an AIF must appoint an AIFM, although a lighter regime applies to AIFMs managing: (i) AIFs whose total assets under management (**AuM**), including any assets acquired through use of leverage, do not exceed a threshold of €100 million; or (ii) AIFs whose total AuM do not exceed a threshold of €500 million and which are unleveraged and have no redemption rights exercisable during the five years following the date of the initial investment in each AIF (each a *de minimis* exemption). AIFMs qualifying for a *de minimis* exemption must nonetheless register with the relevant supervisory authority of their home Member State (**Regulator**).

The AIFM Law also requires AIFMs to set a maximum level of leverage that they may employ on behalf of each AIF they manage, as well as the extent of the right to reuse collateral, or guarantees that could be granted under the leverage arrangement.

The AIFM concerned must provide investors with disclosures in respect of the AIF in which they intend to invest, including, but not limited to: a description of the circumstances in which the AIF may use leverage; the types and sources of leverage permitted and the associated risks; any restrictions on the use of leverage and any collateral and asset reuse arrangements; and the maximum level of leverage that the AIFM is entitled to employ on behalf of the AIF. In addition, AIFMs managing EU AIFs employing leverage, or marketing AIFs employing leverage in the EU, must disclose, on a regular basis for each such AIF: (i) any changes to the maximum level of leverage that the AIFM may employ on behalf of the AIF, plus any right to the reuse of collateral or any guarantee granted under the leveraging arrangement; and (ii) the maximum level of leverage that the AIFM is entitled to employ on behalf of that AIF.

In addition to the disclosures to be made, AIFMs must also provide the Regulator with information in respect of the AIFs they manage. In this context, AIFs employing leverage on a substantial basis must make available information on: the overall level of leverage employed by each AIF they manage; the breakdown between leverage arising from borrowing of cash or securities and leverage embedded in financial derivatives; and the extent to which the AIFs' assets have been reused under leveraging arrangements.

### **Structuring the security package**

Capital call credit facilities are typically secured by the available commitments of the funds' investors. These facilities are subject to a borrowing base determined by the value of the pledged/assigned investors' commitments satisfying certain eligibility criteria. Investors' commitments relating to Luxembourg funds may be structured in different ways and may take the form of equity capital commitments (i.e. to make equity contributions to the fund) and/or debt capital commitments (i.e. to provide debt financing to, or to subscribe for, debt instruments issued by the fund).

The security package typically comprises: (i) a pledge by the fund of the rights in and to the available capital commitments of the investors and the claims against the investors in relation to those commitments; and (ii) a pledge over the bank account into which investors are required to pay their contributions.

Luxembourg law typically governs the security interests granted by the borrowing fund over the rights in and to the investors' available capital commitments, and any claims against the investors in relation to such commitments. The relevant security interest is in the form of a financial collateral arrangement governed by the Law of 5 August 2005 on financial collateral arrangements, as amended (**Collateral Law**). According to the Collateral Law, security interests over claims against the investors may be created by

way of a pledge or an assignment for security purposes. Pledges are the most common security interests over investors' commitments in relation to Luxembourg funds. The pledge/assignment agreement must be evidenced in writing, and the relevant security interest agreement must be executed by the fund (as pledgor or assignor), the fund's general partner and the security taker. It may be signed by way of electronic signature, subject to certain conditions. If the AIFM is empowered to make capital calls and/or enter into borrowing and security interest arrangements on behalf of the fund, it must be added as party to the security interest agreement.

According to Luxembourg conflict-of-law rules, the courts in Luxembourg will generally apply the *lex loci rei sitae* or *lex situs* (the law of the place where the asset subject to the security interest is situated) in the case of creation, perfection and enforcement of security interest over the asset. Thus, Luxembourg law will apply in relation to the creation, perfection and enforcement of security interests over assets that are located or deemed to be located in Luxembourg or governed by Luxembourg law. Claims (*créances*) governed by Luxembourg law or owed by a debtor located in Luxembourg, or accounts opened with banks located in Luxembourg, will be considered located in Luxembourg and thus fall within the scope of the Collateral Law. In addition, the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2015/848 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 May 2015 on insolvency proceedings (recast), as amended, must be considered. According to that regulation, claims against a third party (other than claims in relation to cash held in bank accounts) will be considered situated in the EU Member State within the territory of which the third party required to meet the claims (i.e. the debtor) has its centre of main interests.

Concerning claims against investors that are subject to security interests, certain conflict-of-law rules must be taken into consideration when structuring the security package. According to article 14 of Regulation (EC) 593/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 on the law applicable to contractual obligations (**Rome I Regulation**): (i) the relationship between the security provider and the security taker is governed by the law applicable to the contract between the security provider and the security taker under the Rome I Regulation; and (ii) the law governing the pledged/assigned claim will determine its assignability, the relationship between the security taker and the debtor, the conditions under which the pledge or assignment may be invoked against the debtor, and whether the debtor's obligations have been discharged. Because the fund documentation and subscription agreements are typically governed by Luxembourg law, that law will apply to such matters. Since the Rome I Regulation does not provide explicitly for any conflict-of-law rules concerning the enforceability of and possibility to invoke a pledge/assignment over claims against third parties other than the debtor, a pledge over, or assignment of, claims would become invocable *vis-à-vis* third parties other than the debtor if the legal formalities applicable in the debtor's jurisdiction are duly complied with.

Given that investors in Luxembourg funds are generally located in different jurisdictions outside Luxembourg, the lenders and the security takers will need to take the above considerations into account when structuring the security package.

On 12 March 2018, the European Commission published a proposal for a regulation on the law applicable to the third-party effects of assignments of, and security interests over, claims. The new rules clarify which law applies to the third-party effects of assignments of claims in cross-border transactions. As a general rule, the law that governs the third-party effects of assignments of, and security interests over, claims is the law of the country where the assignor has its habitual residence.

Under Luxembourg law, pledges/assignments for security purposes that are not notified to or accepted by the investors are fully recognised and enforceable. However, the debtor of a pledged/assigned claim may be validly discharged from its obligation *vis-à-vis* the security provider if it had no knowledge of the pledge/assignment in favour of the security taker. It is therefore usual for lenders to require security interests granted by the fund to be notified to and accepted by the investors, in order to ensure that the investors act in accordance with the security taker's instructions and pay the available commitments to

the pledged accounts if the security interest is enforced. Another reason for notifying the investors of the creation of the security interest over their commitments is to ensure that the investors will not be able to invoke their good faith if they act in a way that adversely affects the rights of the security taker (for instance, if the investors accept a release of their commitments, which are subject to a pledge). Additional remedies, such as “*action paulienne*”, may be available to the security taker in case of detrimental acts of the fund and the investors acting in bad faith in relation to the pledged commitments.

Notices may be served to the investors by different means (registered letters, emails, electronic communications, etc.). Alternatively, notices may be included in the financial reports (distributed to the investors) or published on an investor portal.

It is usually required by the lenders that the investors waive any defences, right of retention or set-off and counterclaim the investors may have with regard to the pledged/assigned claims and any transferability restrictions that may be applicable. According to the Collateral Law: (i) a debtor of a claim provided as financial collateral may waive its rights of set-off in writing or a legally equivalent manner, as well as any other exceptions *vis-à-vis* the creditor of the claim provided as collateral and *vis-à-vis* persons to whom the creditor assigned or pledged such claim as collateral; and (ii) the waiver is valid between the parties and enforceable against third parties. A proper waiver will give comfort to the lenders that the investors will pay their capital commitments upon the enforcement of the security interest without challenging their obligations.

Given the above, and to pre-empt any difficulties with the investors, it becomes usual to include “bankable” financing provisions in advance in the fund documentation (notably the partnership agreements and/or the subscription arrangements), such as: investors’ acceptance of the possibility for the fund and its general partner to borrow and pledge the available capital commitments; the security taker’s right to initiate and enforce capital calls; waivers of set-off and defences to funding; provisions allowing the security taker to give instructions to the investors upon the occurrence of an event of default; and subordination of the investors’ claims, etc. Particular attention should be paid to the “no third-party right” provisions in limited partnership agreements. Lenders and security takers should be expressly mentioned as third-party beneficiaries in order to avoid any interpretation issue as to whether they may benefit from the waivers of the investors’ defences and set-off rights, and other “bankable” financing provisions included in the fund documentation. In addition, if the investors’ capital commitments are structured as obligation to subscribe for units, interests or shares, a specific undertaking of the investors to fund their commitments, notwithstanding the impossibility of the fund to issue such units, interests or shares (notably in case of insolvency), should also be included in the fund documentation. Such undertaking is also important in case of suspension of the NAV calculation of the fund, which may result in an inability to issue units, interests or shares in certain cases. In case of investors’ commitments structured as debt commitments, specific waivers and subordination provisions may be needed.

Concerning the right of the fund to make capital calls and enforce the obligations of the investors to contribute capital, it should be considered that such right is an ancillary right to the pledged/assigned claim (*droit lié à la créance gagée/transférée*) and, as a result, the security taker may be entitled to exercise that right in accordance with the provisions of the security interest agreement. This view is supported by the Collateral Law, which provides that the pledge/assignment of a claim implies the right for the security taker to exercise the rights of the security provider linked to the pledged/assigned claim. Without prejudice to and independently of the above, Luxembourg security interest agreements provide for a power of attorney granted by the security provider and its general partner in favour of the security taker to make the capital calls, send funding notices and require the investors to make payments into the pledged accounts, it being understood that this power of attorney may be subject to certain limitations arising under Luxembourg law (notably in case of insolvency).

The Collateral Law allows the enforcement of a security interest over claims upon the occurrence of any trigger event contractually agreed between the parties (including in the absence of payment default) without prior notice (*mise en demeure*). Until the adoption of the Law of 20 July 2022, the Collateral Law was silent on how to handle, in practice, the application of the enforcement proceeds in the absence of a payment default and acceleration of the secured debt. The Collateral Law, as amended by the Law of 20 July 2022, now expressly allows the security taker to apply the enforcement proceeds against the secured obligations, even when the latter are not yet due and payable at the time of enforcement (unless agreed otherwise). Subject to the terms of the fund documents and certain Luxembourg regulatory requirements, in respect of pledges, the security taker (as pledgee) may, *inter alia*: (i) serve a funding notice on the investors, requesting payment into the pledged accounts; (ii) request direct payment from the investors; (iii) appropriate the pledged claims (at a value determined using the valuation method agreed upon by the parties); (iv) sell the pledged claims by way of a private sale (at arm's length conditions) or a public sale; or (v) request a court to attribute the pledged claims. Concerning assignments for security purposes, in the event of the security provider's failure to perform the relevant financial obligations, the security taker (as assignee) is discharged from its obligations to retransfer the assigned claims up to the amount of the secured obligations.

As certain Luxembourg funds have now started to mature, and given the large number of subscription line refinancings currently taking place, lenders should pay particular attention to (i) the fund's term (to ensure that the termination date of the credit facility falls before the fund's term), and (ii) the fund's commitment/investment period (to ensure that the fund will still be able to draw investors' commitments to repay its borrowings and indebtedness, following the termination of the commitment/investment period).

The security interest over bank accounts (held in Luxembourg) into which investors are required to fund their contributions may be created by way of a pledge in accordance with the Collateral Law. The pledge agreement must be evidenced in writing and perfected in accordance with Luxembourg law. It may be signed by way of electronic signature subject to certain conditions. In practice, as a result of their general terms and conditions, Luxembourg account banks have a first-ranking pledge over such accounts. Provided the terms and conditions do not prohibit pledges, the pledge will become valid and enforceable against the account bank and third parties once the existence of the pledge has been notified to and accepted by that bank.

Luxembourg funds may also use NAV or asset-backed financing arrangements, which have become increasingly popular. These borrowing arrangements are facilities made available to a fund (or a special purpose vehicle (SPV) held directly by the fund) with recourse to the portfolio of assets of the fund. The borrowing base is calculated on the NAV of the assets of the fund (being the primary source of repayment). Lenders will analyse the underlying investments as well as cashflows and other distributions that the fund will receive from those investments. Depending on the investment strategy and the structure of the fund, the security package may be composed of pledges over loans, claims and/or bank accounts into which investments proceeds are to be paid with the aim to allow the lender to control the distributions paid on the underlying assets. Sometimes, the security package may also include a pledge over equity interests issued by any entity holding (directly or indirectly) the underlying investments. To the extent that the loan is made available at SPV level, NAV lenders may require that the fund guarantees the obligations of the SPV borrower and/or provide credit support.

In case of NAV financings, the constitutional documents of the fund and the SPVs should be reviewed, with a particular focus on (i) the possibility to use leverage and grant security interests, (ii) the borrowing/indebtedness limitations, (iii) the permitted duration for borrowings and other indebtedness, and (iv) the use of proceeds. If equity interests issued by a holding entity are part of the collateral securing the NAV financings, the constitutional documents, the shareholders' arrangements and the financial arrangements at the level of the holding and underlying entities have to be considered in order to assess whether there are any restrictions or change of control provisions.

Hybrid products combining subscription financing features and NAV financing features are gaining popularity among fund managers seeking a single financing available through the fund's life cycle. Evergreen funds (which are open-ended fund structures with no termination date) can particularly benefit from hybrid financing to achieve their long-term financing needs.

### **Involvement of AIFMs in fund finance transactions**

With the AIFM being entrusted with the portfolio management and risk management of the AIF, it is important to consider on a case-by-case basis whether the AIFM needs to be involved in relation to fund finance arrangements.

The review of the AIFM documentation is part of the standard due diligence made by subscription line lenders to understand whether and how the AIFM should be involved in the financing. Different situations may arise. The general partner of the fund may have delegated to the AIFM the power to issue drawdown notices to the investors and/or the power to enter into financing arrangements on behalf of the fund. In other cases, the fund documents may provide that the AIFM has to consent to the fund's financing arrangements and/or the security interests over the fund's assets.

In relation to NAV and leverage financings, obtaining the AIFM's consent must be considered, given that the entry into such financings may interact with the portfolio management and risk management duties of the AIFM, and such arrangements shall be taken into consideration by the AIFM for leverage calculation and disclosure purposes.

Depending on the powers of the AIFM, the provisions of the fund documents and the type of financing, lenders may require that the AIFM becomes a party to the finance documents or issue a letter confirming its consent or non-objection. Delegation by the AIFM to portfolio or investment managers must also be taken into consideration.

It is also common for Luxembourg funds to be directly or indirectly involved in the financing of their portfolio entities, by issuing guarantees, letters of comfort or equity commitment letters. It must be assessed whether the consent of the AIFM is required, given that such arrangements may be part of the investment strategy and portfolio management of the fund in certain situations. In addition, guarantees, equity commitment letters or similar instruments issued by the fund may constitute leverage at the level of the fund in certain cases. Therefore, the AIFM may need to take such credit support into consideration for leverage calculation and disclosure purposes.

### **Involvement of depositaries in fund finance transactions**

Authorised AIFMs must appoint a depositary in Luxembourg for each AIF they manage. It is also mandatory for RAIFs, SIFs and SICARs to appoint a depositary in Luxembourg. The depositary of a Luxembourg fund is generally in charge of the safekeeping and supervision of the fund's assets and the control over the transactions of the fund (including compliance with investment policies and monitoring of the cashflows). As the ultimate purpose of depositaries is to enhance investors' protection, lenders should ensure that the legal obligation to appoint a depositary is met by the fund. In addition, lenders must verify whether the depositary should be notified of and/or provide its consent in relation to the financing transaction and the related security package. Depositary agreements may contain a pledge granted by the fund over its assets in favour of the depositary. In this case, it must be assessed whether such pledge conflicts with the financing arrangements and, if so, a specific release of such pledge will be required. On the fund side, the best practice is to inform the depositary of any financing arrangements relating to the fund, in order to allow the depositary to properly perform its duties.

### **GDPR impact on fund finance transactions**

Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data (GDPR) regulates how personal data (relating to natural persons) is processed and transferred. In the

context of fund finance transactions, a point of attention is how personal information regarding investors and their commitments may be transferred to the lenders in order to determine the borrowing basis and take the security interests over the available capital commitments. As a result, GDPR provisions and consents are included in the fund documentation in order to authorise the fund and its general partner to share such information with the lenders and transfer such information outside of Europe.

## EU Securitisation Regulation

Regulation (EU) 2017/2042 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2017, laying down a general framework for securitisation and creating a specific framework for simple, transparent and standardised securitisation (**EU Securitisation Regulation**), came into force on 1 January 2019. Certain fund finance transactions (notably leveraged transactions) and borrowing entities may potentially fall within the scope of the EU Securitisation Regulation, which would trigger a broad array of obligations for the borrowing entity, but also for originators, sponsors and certain investors (among others, requirements with regard to risk retention, due diligence, transparency and disclosure, restrictions on sale to retail investors, etc.). In order to determine whether such obligations would be applicable, one must assess whether the transaction meets the definition of “securitisation” as set out in the EU Securitisation Regulation and whether any of the involved entities may be considered a securitisation special purpose entity (**SSPE**) for the purpose of the EU Securitisation Regulation.

Article 2(1) of the EU Securitisation Regulation defines “securitisation” as a transaction or scheme, whereby the **credit risk associated with an exposure or pool of exposures is tranchéd**, having both of the following characteristics:

- payments in the transaction or scheme are dependent upon the performance of the exposure or pool of exposures; and
- the subordination of tranches determines the distribution of losses during the ongoing life of the transaction or scheme.

It follows from the above definition that a transaction would only fall within the scope of the EU Securitisation Regulation if the securitised credit risk were tranchéd. The EU Securitisation Regulation defines “tranche” as:

- a contractually established segment of the credit risk associated with an exposure or a pool of exposures;
- where a position in the segment entails a risk of credit loss greater than or less than a position of the same amount in another segment; and
- without taking account of credit protection provided by third parties directly to the holders of positions in the segment or in other segments.

Furthermore, transactions falling within the “specialised lending” exception (as described in article 147(8) of Regulation (EU) 575/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on prudential requirements for credit institutions and investment firms) are not subject to the EU Securitisation Regulation, even if the above conditions are satisfied.

In addition, it must be assessed whether any of the involved entities may be considered an SSPE for the purpose of the EU Securitisation Regulation. According to article 2 of the EU Securitisation Regulation, an SSPE is defined as “a corporation, trust or other entity, other than an originator or sponsor, established for the purpose of carrying out one or more securitisations, the activities of which are limited to those appropriate to accomplish that objective, the structure of which is intended to isolate the obligations of the SSPE from those of the originator”.

The definition of securitisation under the EU Securitisation Regulation is thus quite large and it is therefore advisable to assess each transaction (notably any transaction involving entities investing in credit assets and receiving financing with different payment priorities and seniorities) and the involved entities on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the above conditions are met.

## Key developments

### Luxembourg Restructuring Law

When negotiating the security documentation and structuring the enforcement trigger events, the provisions of the Luxembourg law of 7 August 2023 on business preservation and modernisation of bankruptcy law (**Restructuring Law**) have to be considered. The Restructuring Law has introduced reorganisation proceedings and measures in order to provide relief to debtors in financial difficulties.

Investment funds governed by the Product Laws (such as Part II UCIs, SIFs, SICARs and RAIFs) are not covered by the Restructuring Law, but the other investment funds and AIFs fall within the scope of application of the Restructuring Law.

The key takeaway is that the Restructuring Law and the opening of the reorganisation proceedings thereunder do not affect the enforceability of the security interests under the Collateral Law.

That being said, the Restructuring Law contains certain limitations with regard to termination or modification of agreements or enforcement by creditors of their rights thereunder against the debtors during the reorganisation proceedings. According to article 30 of the Restructuring Law, the opening of proceedings for a judicial reorganisation (or a request to this effect) cannot serve as a legal basis for the early termination or otherwise modification of an agreement, notwithstanding any contractual provision to the contrary. In addition, a statutory remedy period of 15 days for a contractual breach by a debtor is applicable. Article 30 of the Restructuring Law also allows the debtor to suspend the performance of its contractual obligations for the duration of the stay provided that such suspension is imperatively required for the judicial reorganisation.

Although article 30 of the Restructuring Law does not explicitly mention “acceleration”, it may be not excluded that acceleration of debt may be restricted by virtue of this article.

As already indicated, the enforceability of the security interests under the Collateral Law is not affected by the opening of the reorganisation proceedings under the Restructuring Law. That being said, such security interests can only be enforced upon the occurrence of the contractually agreed trigger event. If the parties have contractually agreed that the pledge enforcement trigger event is the acceleration of the underlying debt and not merely an event of default, the lenders have to consider the limitations on acceleration described above. If the acceleration of the underlying debt is impossible due to such limitations, the contractual conditions for the enforcement of the security interest will not have been met and the enforcement of the security interest may not be possible for the duration of the reorganisation proceedings.

As a result, trigger events in the pledge documentation and the enforcement provisions in the underlying facility documentation need to be assessed on case-by-case basis. In order to provide comfort for the lenders, one of the possibilities is to ensure that the pledge enforcement triggers do not depend on the acceleration of the underlying debt and that the security interest can be enforced already at the occurrence of any event of default (without acceleration of the underlying debt). If such option is not commercially acceptable, the opening of the reorganisation proceedings under the Restructuring Law and the filing therefore shall be included as additional independent triggers for the pledge enforcement, alongside the acceleration of the underlying debt. The enforcement of the security interests under the Collateral Law at the occurrence of such trigger events should still be possible.

## The year ahead

In the current economic slowdown, subscription line financing continues to be an essential tool for Luxembourg fund managers, providing liquidity and flexibility in the earlier stages of a fund's life cycle.

In parallel, NAV financing has gained significant traction as a key source of liquidity, helping fund managers navigate liquidity constraints and drive value creation in later-stage investments. We expect the use of NAV financing to continue expanding. Similar to subscription line financing, we anticipate that fund managers and limited partners will soon be aligned on the use of NAV financings.

Additionally, the fund finance market has witnessed the entry of non-traditional lenders, such as private debt funds pursuing direct lending investment strategies. These non-bank lenders are expected to play an increasingly important role, providing new sources of financing in the fund finance market.



## Endnotes

- 1 According to recital 78 of the AIFMD.
- 2 ESMA questions and answers on the application of the AIFMD, ESMA34-32-352.
- 3 Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 231/2013 of 19 December 2012 supplementing Directive 2011/61/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to exemptions, general operating conditions, depositaries, leverage, transparency and supervision (**Level 2 Regulations**).
- 4 SIFs, SICARs and RAIFs are obliged to appoint depositaries in any event on the basis of the SIF, SICAR and RAIF Laws, respectively.



**Vassiliyan Zanev**

Tel: +352 466 230 257 / Email: [vassiliyan.zanev@loyensloeff.com](mailto:vassiliyan.zanev@loyensloeff.com)

Vassiliyan Zanev leads the fund finance practice of Loyens & Loeff in Luxembourg. He represents a variety of financial institutions, investment funds and corporations across a range of structured finance and lending transactions, with particular emphasis on fund finance, securitisation and real estate finance. Vassiliyan has extensive experience in the financing of Luxembourg alternative or regulated investment fund borrowers (including by way of capital call subscription credit facilities and permanent leverage solutions). Vassiliyan is a member of the EMEA Advisory Council of the Fund Finance Association.

**Marc Meyers**

Tel: +352 466 230 306 / Email: [marc.meyers@loyensloeff.com](mailto:marc.meyers@loyensloeff.com)

Marc Meyers heads the Luxembourg Investment Management team of Loyens & Loeff. Marc specialises in structuring, regulatory and transactional work for Luxembourg alternative investment fund structures, with a particular focus on private equity, property/infrastructure and debt funds. Before joining Loyens & Loeff, he established the Luxembourg legal practice of another Benelux law firm. He worked for several years in the Luxembourg office of a leading international law firm, as well as in the New York and London offices of the US firm Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP. Marc is an active member of several working groups within the Association of the Luxembourg Fund Industry, as well as the Luxembourg Private Equity and Venture Capital Association. He is a member of the Luxembourg and New York Bars.

**Maude Royer**

Tel: +352 466 230 276 / Email: [maude.royer@loyensloeff.com](mailto:maude.royer@loyensloeff.com)

Maude Royer is a Partner in the finance practice of the Luxembourg Investment Management team of Loyens & Loeff. Maude acts on a full range of finance transactions, with particular focus on fund finance. She acts at all levels of the fund capital structure, advising investment funds (including real estate, private equity, infrastructure and debt funds, as well as funds of funds), fund managers and financial institutions. Her expertise includes capital call financing, GP financing, NAV financing and other hybrid products, asset-based financing, real estate financing and general corporate financing.

**Loyens & Loeff Luxembourg SARL**

18–20 rue Edward Steichen, L-2540, Luxembourg

Tel: +352 466 230 / URL: [www.loyensloeff.com](http://www.loyensloeff.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](https://globallegalinsights.com)